



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

May 14, 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. B.J. Watts and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Mr. Walker attended by phone.

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 except Mr. Hendry but he was simply out of the room at the time roll was taken; he returned shortly after. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Freitas asked to add one action item to the agenda: the initiation of the rulemaking process for teacher evaluations. Superintendent Ritz said that will take the chair and three other members to add the item in accordance with the Board Operating Procedures. Dr. Oliver said he would agree with adding that item. Superintendent Ritz stated the chair prefers that not be added at this time. Ms. Neal, Mr. Elsener, and Ms. O'Brien expressed agreement with Dr. Freitas. Superintendent Ritz reiterated her position. Dr. Oliver asked for it to be added to the next meeting's agenda and Superintendent Ritz stated it was so noted for the next meeting as an action item. The Board voted to approve the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board voted to approve the minutes from the April 9 meeting.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

There was no statement from the chair.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Ms. O'Brien commented on payment options in light of last year's settlement with CTB McGraw-Hill and this year's interruptions. She said the settlement required credits for future interruptions. She said she hoped any arrangement with CTB regarding the interruptions would be handled within their current arrangement and not leading into any future potential contracts, so as not to cause vendors to shy away from the RFI process because of the perception that Indiana already has committed to an arrangement with CTB. Dr. Freitas asked for any potential changes to the contract to be brought before the Board first for transparency. Superintendent Ritz stated she would take that under consideration and speak to counsel.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Joan McCormick, from ICASE, was the first public speaker Superintendent Ritz invited to the podium. She provided some information about the IMAST assessment, given to students with disabilities in grades three through eight. She said these students are expected to participate in the regular curriculum and graduate with a diploma. Ms. McCormick said Indiana will no longer be offering IMAST after this year. She said ISTAR, for students with serious disabilities, will also be going away. She expressed a desire to have conversations to prepare these students for assessment. Superintendent Ritz said the new accountability system includes growth for all students. Superintendent Ritz said the remaining public comments will be taken at the time the relevant agenda issue is before the Board.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Governing Body Plan Change for Northeastern Wayne School Corporation; B. Governing Body Plan Change for Kankakee Valley School Corporation; C. Approval of February 2015 ADM count date

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to approve the consent agenda; Ms. O'Brien moved and Mr. Watts seconded the motion. Mr. Albert, Mr. Elsener, Dr. Freitas, Mr. Hendry, Ms. Neal, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, Mr. Walker, Mr. Watts, Ms. Whicker and Superintendent Ritz all voted to approve the consent agenda. Approval of all three items carried by a vote of 11-0.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

- A. Determining rule language development for adjunct and superintendent license requirements in REPA III

- Superintendent Ritz invited Jill Shedd, Executive Secretary for the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, to speak on this issue. Ms. Shedd stated that the adjunct permit is not needed in light of the other alternative routes to teacher licensure. She said Indiana has plenty of qualified teachers in as it is. She stated the adjunct permit lowers the standards for licensed teachers.
- Keith Gamble, a teacher and Vice-President of the Indiana State Teacher's Association, spoke next. He said he was against the adjunct permit. He stated there are already pathways for experts to become teachers. He said there isn't a demand for a new license, the need is for better marketing for the existing pathways. He said the devaluing of pedagogy is a tragedy that will result from this new license. He stated this is reckless experimentation with education.
- Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services for the Indiana Department of Education ("Department"), and Dr. Michelle McKeown, General Counsel to the Board, facilitated this discussion. The discussion began with a brief overview of the language as presented to the Board and an overview of some other alternative routes to licensure. Ms. Neal inquired about what adjunct language is before the Board. Superintendent Ritz said the options are: 1) to strike it and not entertain it in REPA III, 2) to entertain it as it was originally published in REPA III, or 3) consider the rewrite that reflected Board direction and public comment.
- Dr. McKeown explained that the proposed title for the new permit is the Career Specialist Permit. She went on to explain that the modifications to the language are: 1) limiting it to secondary education, 2) changing its timespan from five years to

two years, 3) requiring participation in a pedagogy program that would have to be provided through a Board approved provider, and 4) requiring 6,000 work hours in a field in which the candidate would be teaching. Dr. McKeown explained the old language required the teacher have an effective or highly effective evaluation four out of the five years in order to renew for another five year period. That was removed when the timespan was shortened to two years. She explained the candidates would still be evaluated as all other teachers are in Indiana, it just wouldn't be tied to this permit. Ms. O'Brien asked about whether it could be transferred to another type of permit; Dr. McKeown said they were looking for guidance from the Board concerning that issue. She stated under the current language as modified it would be renewed for two year periods with the same name; it would not lead to another type of license.

- Dr. McKeown then explained the difference between this permit and some other alternative pathways to licensure; she explained that with the emergency permit the school would have to apply on the applicant's behalf and it also requires a shortage area. Dr. Oliver commented that he does not support the adjunct permit. He said the concerns are a lack of training around standards, insufficient pedagogy, and flexibility in the rules as they exist. Ms. Neal asked where the evidence is that teacher training programs are better than on the job mentorship. Dr. Oliver asked if there was research that says the opposite. Superintendent Ritz stated the pedagogy training she received for special education was very important in her experience. Ms. Neal agreed as it relates to special education and elementary education but disagreed when talking about high school. Mr. Albert disagreed with Ms. Neal. Ms. O'Brien inquired about modifying the emergency permit so it doesn't have to include a shortage area.
- Dr. McKeown responded that there are other issues involved as well. She said the emergency permit can only be renewed a couple of times and the school corporation has to have already identified the candidate and apply on their behalf. Dr. McKeown stated that the Board could go back and amend language to the emergency permit. Mr. Walker asked about the timing of the pedagogy requirement under the Career Specialist Permit. Ms. Regnier said a person could go a year without starting the pedagogy requirement. Dr. McKeown said the Department or the Board could require pedagogy and mentorship be implemented within the first year before approving the program. Mr. Walker suggested a requirement of immediate enrollment in a pedagogy program and would like to limit the renewals before a candidate must transition to another license.

- Mr. Elsener commented that schools and educators are held accountable for student learning outcomes. Therefore, he said he was for opening it up to allow schools to hire talented teachers; he reiterated that schools would have the option, they would not be required to hire people that hold this permit. Ms. O'Brien suggested rolling the changes into the emergency permit so the applicant could apply on their own and there would be no shortage area requirement. She said she liked the idea of then it spinning into a traditional license. Dr. Oliver expressed concern over the lack of quality controls if the new permit is adopted.
- Ms. Whicker said her big issue is the lack of initial pedagogy and pedagogy testing. She said it is important before they are given a year's worth in front of students. Ms. Neal said the goal is to get the best teachers in the classroom no matter how it's done. She said the proposal is modest and will only be used by principals to hire innovative, talented teachers. She said this only gives flexibility and recommended going back to the original language with the addition of an effective or highly effective rating four out of the five years.
- Mr. Albert said the adjunct permit in either form is not necessary because there is flexibility already in place. The adjunct permit is repetitive, he said. Dr. Freitas asked for clarification again regarding the differences between the new permit and existing permits. Dr. McKeown reiterated the differences. Dr. Freitas concluded there are major differences between them. Mr. Albert said there are already enough permits in place to give anyone who wants to teach an opportunity to teach. He said the new permit will reduce knowledge of the content area. Dr. Freitas said the quality assurance happens at the local level and that won't change with this new permit.
- Superintendent Ritz moved to permanently strike the language for adjunct license in REPA III, but said her motion wouldn't preclude doing something like Ms. O'Brien suggested. Dr. Oliver seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-5 against Superintendent Ritz's motion; therefore, the motion to strike all adjunct language permanently from the REPA III rule was voted down.
- Ms. Neal moved to return to the original language but add requirements that the teachers be rated effective or highly effective four out of the five years and complete a program in pedagogy. Dr. Freitas seconded for discussion. The Board discussed pedagogy starting earlier. Dr. Freitas made a friendly amendment that the pedagogy requirement start immediately upon employment as determined by the local school district. Ms. Neal agreed with the amendment. Dr. McKeown then clarified the pedagogy language in the original adjunct section as published, outlining the 6 required areas of pedagogy. Dr. Freitas said his motion deals with the

timing of the pedagogy program. The board voted 9-2 against Ms. Neal's motion as amended by Dr. Freitas.

- Mr. Hendry moved to vote on the language as modified by staff and presented today by Dr. McKeown with the addition that the pedagogy program start immediately. Mr. Walker seconded. Sarah asked Mr. Hendry if his motion dealt with the components of the original adjunct language or the career specialist. Mr. Hendry clarified that his motion dealt with the language of the career specialist permit. Board voted 8-3 to carry Mr. Hendry's motion.
- Superintendent Ritz said we have the adjunct going forward but that she would also like to see a comparison about what that might look like within the emergency permit instead. Dr. McKeown asked for clarification and Superintendent Ritz stated we are wanting you to proceed with the language on the career specialist but also want to see the emergency permit side by side so there may be further conversation.
- Dr. McKeown and Ms. Regnier then discussed the temporary superintendent's license in the REPA III rule as modified after comments by the public and the Board. Dr. Freitas asked about a provision that the superintendent be successful for the three year period; Ms. Regnier said there isn't language to that effect in the current draft. Dr. Oliver said the waiver already exists; the issue is that it's not portable if they want to move to another district. He said if they have already done three successful years in that position, effective or highly effective, they should be able to convert to a traditional superintendent's license. Ms. Regnier raised the issue of whether that person would have to be required to pass the superintendent's licensure test upon conversion. Dr. Oliver said he hadn't envisioned that because the current waiver doesn't require that. He went on to say it's a reasonable requirement.
- Ms. Whicker asked why we need another pathway if they have the ability to move by having the district process another temporary license application. Ms. Regnier explained that the legislature has given local school boards more flexibility in hiring superintendents as well without a license. She explained that reciprocity usually still requires completion of a state approved preparation program.
- Superintendent Ritz moved that the Board move forward with the current temporary superintendent's license language in REPA III without changing or expanding on it. Mr. Albert seconded. The Board voted the motion down.
- Dr. Oliver moved that the proposed language in its final state include that a superintendent with a temporary license who has three successful years (three out

of three years of effective or highly effective ratings) of experience and passes the state examination for the district administrator's license be eligible for an actual five year superintendent's license. Mr. Elsener seconded the motion. The Board voted and the motion carried by a vote of 8-3. The Board then took a recess.

-- RECESS --

- The Board returned from recess and Superintendent Ritz stated she wanted to alter the discussion agenda by moving up the lead partners since people were there to speak about that.

B. Freeway school accreditation extension request

- Dr. Freitas moved to approve, the motion was seconded and the Board voted 11-0 to approve.

C. Board approval of order language from Hamilton Heights v. Fayette adjudication

- Dr. Freitas moved to approve the language, Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion and the Board voted 10-0 to approve the language; Superintendent Ritz abstained.

D. Updated SBOE staff job description to reflect new SBOE Executive Director

- Ms. O'Brien moved to update the SBOE job description, the motion was seconded and the Board voted 10-0 to approve the updated job description; Superintendent Ritz abstained.

IX. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES

There was no discussion regarding this agenda item.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

E. Lead Partner contracts

- Teresa Brown, Assistant Superintendent of Outreach at the Department, and Dr. McKeown took the podium. Ms. Brown explained that the Board must decide if the contracts should be continued for a year. She said they sent the scope of work to the Board for review. Ms. Brown said they are working on the funding issue and will have more details at the next Board meeting.
- Indianapolis Public Schools (“IPS”) Superintendent Dr. Lewis Ferebee presented to the Board a proposal for a change from the traditional lead partner approach to a more localized transformation model. He said this proposal is driven by two principles: 1) local interests should drive transformation, and 2) that the transformation process is most effectively achieved and sustained at the local level. Dr. Ferebee outlined the proposal, including implementation and comparison data. He stated it’s important they take the lead locally to improve student outcomes. Dr. Ferebee presented four components of the IPS transformation model: 1) staffing, 2) instructional and support strategies, 3) school climate, and 4) monitoring systems. Dr. Ferebee stated they imbedded national standards in their model as well. He said this is different than the external lead partners because IPS owns it and they will be working with their own employees. He said one of the main things that drive their model is developing good leadership. He also expressed the importance of family involvement. Dr. Ferebee said this process is ongoing and they will continue to make adjustments along the way. He concluded by saying they will continue to report to the Board, providing updates and presentations.
- Dr. Oliver commented on the great work Dr. Ferebee is doing at IPS. He went on to say he liked the presentation and agreed with the principles presented. He inquired about how leaders will be selected. Dr. Ferebee said they are currently in the process of revising the principal selection process. He said there must be buy-in for the school leader before they can be successful. He said the community and school staff should be involved in that process. He said the interview and selection process will be more rigorous.
- Ms. O’Brien commented that she appreciated the work Dr. Ferebee has done and said the presentation was great. She inquired about potential funding issues if the waiver doesn’t go through. Superintendent Ritz said funding mechanisms are by the school. She stated that there will not be a loss of money with losing the waiver. Superintendent Ritz went on to say the Department does not plan on losing the waiver. Superintendent Ritz also commended Dr. Ferebee.
- Mr. Elsener said he echoed what Ms. O’Brien said. He went on to say he would like to see clear quantifiable targets for student successes so the Board could see the

progression rate. Mr. Elsener said he looked favorably on this. Mr. Albert appreciated having feedback and information brought forward. He asked how they were going to present that to the community for support. Dr. Ferebee said they have been proactive and have already had these conversations. He said they are seeing parents taking a more active voice and displaying a greater willingness to be involved. He said the work can't be done without the community. Dr. Ferebee said they have established ambitious achievement targets already for their schools and would be happy to provide that information to the Board.

- Dr. Freitas asked if the principles discussed in the presentation would apply to all IPS schools. Wanda Legrand, Deputy Superintendent with IPS, said the model would be applied to all the schools. She stated they divided the district up into three learning communities, an east, west and then a magnet community, that will each be supervised by an academic improvement officer. Ms. Legrand stated the program will be implemented this summer with respect to the priority schools. Dr. Freitas said an assessment dashboard is also important. He then asked about how they plan to sustain a change in culture. Dr. Ferebee spoke about a shift in culture through professional development. He said he will not allow IPS to play the victim; rather, he said they will work hard to serve the students in their schools.

D. Public hearings on Year 5 schools

Ms. Brown explained that they are wrapping up the reviews in the seven "year four" schools and will be ready for to review the "year five" schools. She asked for direction on when the Board wants the hearings to take place with regard to the "year five" schools. Ms. Whicker said if the schools are prepared the sooner the better so they can begin implementing. The Board had a consensus to move forward with those in June.

A. SBOE staff updates

Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, said there was one update. She stated that the Bob Guffin is the new Executive Director to the Board. Ms. Fiddian-Green commented that Mr. Guffin recently served as principal for Harshman magnet school at IPS. She said when he started there the passing rate for the ISTEP was 28% and that grew to 73% as of the 2012-13 school year. He was also recognized in the 2010-2011 year as being the middle school with the greatest performance growth in the state. She then introduced Mr.

Guffin to make a few comments. He commented that Harshman has a great staff. He also said he was looking forward to meeting with each Board member and working with the Board.

B. New standards implementation

- Superintendent Ritz invited Amy Horton, Superintendent of Student Achievement and Improvement at the Department, to discuss this issue with the Board. She outlined Indiana's statewide transition plan. She explained the goals are: 1) 100% awareness, 2) responsiveness, 3) support, and 4) engagement. Ms. O'Brien said she appreciated the good work that went into the transition process. She stated that her request in March was for information to come forth to support schools in terms of agreements with vendors on supplemental materials. She said without this support there is concern that the districts will continue with previous curriculums that won't be aligned with the new standards. She asked for an update on providing information regarding vendor supports for the approved textbook lists. Ms. Horton said to date there has not been any work done on that but that it's certainly up for conversation and if that's the will of the Board they would consider it. Superintendent Ritz asked for clarification and Ms. O'Brien said she was looking for supplemental materials to be negotiated. She said it's important for the Department to do this so that schools are not scrambling to find supplemental curriculum materials matching what the schools have currently adopted.
- Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent at the Department, responded that local choice is a factor, which is why they created the rubric. She explained that this will help schools identify what parts of the curriculum do not align. Ms. Shockey said the Department does not have a process anymore of adopted textbook recommendations for school corporations. Ms. Shockey said they can certainly put together some identified resources, but the significant number of choices would make this difficult. Ms. O'Brien said it's easier for the Department to speak to vendors and inquire about aligned materials. She stated it's important to help schools fill in the gaps in the standards. Dr. Oliver agreed that would be helpful and the field would appreciate that. Ms. Shockey said they can reach out to the major ones. Ms. O'Brien said an approved resource list would be helpful, as had been done before with prior standards. She pointed out that the price may be more reasonable if the inquiry is statewide rather than just one district. Superintendent Ritz said they could meet with major vendors. Ms. O'Brien stated that based on past experience

she believes there is a system in place to help identify gaps and fill them in. Mr. Albert said when the vendors were aligned the cost of the books were less.

C. HEA1005 update

- Ms. Horton presented this issue to the Board. She gave a brief background on the issue of graduation waivers and then reiterated three options the Board can choose from. Ms. Horton also presented waiver rate data to the Board for consideration in making the decision. She said the next step would be picking an option and then the notification process to schools after that. Ms. Horton stated that Mr. Walker had made a request for additional information about the number of high schools based on the size of the high schools and that they didn't drop that data in yet because they didn't want to subdivide the data even more; she said they can certainly do that in preparation for the June meeting though. Ms. Whicker inquired about the inclusion of special needs students. Ms. Horton said they can try and get that data.
- Mr. Albert discussed the waiver process and the importance of diplomas for children. He said the fewer stipulations the better. He said more stipulations will cause schools not to give diplomas to kids who are college and career ready. Superintendent Ritz echoed that sentiment. Dr. Oliver asked if there is review of the remediation plan that is required for schools that give waivers over the percentage threshold. Ms. Horton said it's a new law but they will entertain options for how they will go about that. Dr. Freitas asked for further discussion regarding review of the plan. Mr. Walker expressed concern about the use of waivers and the potential for abuse. Mr. Albert explained there are explicit criteria that must be met before a waiver can be granted. He said each case is treated differently. Mr. Walker asked where the 10% figure came from. Ms. Horton said that figure came from a Department review of the data.
- Dr. Oliver suggested running these percentages by a group of principals in the field to get feedback; there was consensus that this was a good idea and the Department said they would work on this. Ms. O'Brien said she appreciated Mr. Albert's comments and said it's important to consider the intent of the law and to keep in mind that it stemmed from a problem; she didn't want to give false hope of a child's readiness. Dr. Freitas asked about data regarding the percentage of waivers given to special education students, and the reasons for the waiver. Debbie Dailey, Director of Information Services for the Department, stated that they do collect data for special education and information on who received a waiver. She said they could match those two components to aggregate the data to see the number of special

education students who received a waiver. Dr. McKeown clarified that students with disabilities have a right to a diploma if their case conference committee determines that they should have one and they meet the other requirements. She stated the other requirements are that they: 1) must maintain a C average, 2) must attempt to take the assessment each year it is offered, 3) must maintain a 95% attendance rate, and 4) must get approval from the subject content teachers.

F. Accountability update

Ms. Dailey and Molly Chamberlin, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer with the Center for Education and Career Innovation, updated the Board concerning this agenda item. Ms. Dailey said work has been underway to provide additional data with respect to the new accountability model. She detailed what they are currently working on with respect to the data and explained the recommended subcommittees. Ms. Dailey also discussed alternative accountability measures and college and career ready indicators. Dr. Oliver asked at what point they think there will be a nexus between the discussions by the subcommittee on assessment and discussion on A-F. Ms. Chamberlin responded that it would be when the RFPs come back. Dr. Oliver commented it should take place before the RFP is written because certain assumptions with regard to A-F should be reflected in the RFP. Ms. Chamberlin said assumptions for A-F are captured in the RFI.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

Board operations was not discussed.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

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