



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda

May 2, 2018

9:30 AM (ET)

Indiana University East  
Whitewater Hall - Lobby  
2325 Chester Blvd.  
Richmond, IN 47374

**Board Members Present:** Dr. Jennifer McCormick (Chair), Mr. BJ Watts (Vice Chair), Dr. Byron Ernest (Secretary), Mr. Gordon Hendry, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Maryanne McMahan, Mr. Tony Walker, Ms. Katie Mote, and Dr. Steve Yager.

**Board Members Absent:** Dr. Vince Bertram and Mrs. Cari Whicker.

- I. **Call to Order**
  - a. Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
- II. **Welcome and Comments from Chancellor Dr. Kathryn Cruz-Uribe**
  - a. Chancellor Kathryn Cruz-Uribe thanked the Board for hosting the meeting at Indiana University East (“IU East”). She also gave information regarding the students IU East serves and the online courses the school offers.
    - i. Mr. Hendry thanked the school for hosting the Board.
- III. **Approval of the Agenda**
  - a. Dr. McCormick stated that it had been recommended that new business item J, Choice Scholarship Waiver, be removed from the agenda.
  - b. The amended agenda was approved by a voice vote.
- IV. **Approval of the Minutes**
  - a. The minutes from the March 21 work session and the April 4 meeting were approved by a voice vote.
- V. **Statement from the Chair**
  - a. Dr. McCormick thanked IU East for welcoming the Board and hosting the meeting.
- VI. **Board Member Comments and Reports**
  - a. None.
- VII. **Public Comments**
  - a. John Elcesser, representing the Indiana Non-Public Education Association, commented on the Choice Scholarship Waiver and stated that he believed that the General Assembly gave the Board the power to grant these waivers and that letter grades do not always tell the full story.
- VIII. **Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Success**
  - a. Indiana University East Dean of Education Dr. Jerry Wilde Presentation
    - i. Dr. Wilde gave a presentation of the opportunities and partnerships within the School of Education at IU East.

1. The school has about 250 students and almost all of these students have a placement in a public school.
2. Jamie Buffington-Adams, Assistant Dean for the School of Education, shared the experiences the school creates regarding educating students through partnerships.
- ii. Dr. McCormick asked what type of participation the school was getting from their mentor-experiences.
  1. Dr. Wilde responded that an issue was finding a time that worked for everyone, but the school overall did get a great response.
- iii. Dr. Freitas congratulated the school on all of their recognitions and their work in field experiences. He also asked about the third grade academy and if it was related to the IREAD-3.
  1. Dr. Wilde responded it was, and although not the sole focus, it is a critical factor.
  2. Dr. Freitas further asked if they had been able to track the intervention of the academy with student success.
  3. Dr. Wilde responded that those students have a much higher success rate and the program absolutely has a positive long-term impact.
- iv. Mr. Walker asked if project-based learning was in the school's curriculum.
  1. Ms. Buffington-Adams responded that this was important, especially in the secondary level, and it was used mostly at the theoretical level.
- v. Discussion starts at [12:10](#).
- b. Preparing Students for Life in the World of Manufacturing 4.0
  - i. Dr. Ernest introduced the program and shared the experience of all stakeholders who traveled to Switzerland and Germany and too see how the field could integrate other tools into education and how Horizon Education Alliance was successfully accomplishing this.
  - ii. Mr. Brian Wiebe, Executive Director of Horizon Alliance, shared information about the Organization and how they have made business and education come together.
  - iii. Dr. Jason Harrison, Director of Facilitation, shared the organization's experience in creating a model that helped education and businesses work together to create education-workforce development. He also shared the experiences that the group went through on their journey to understand the Swiss and German education models.
  - iv. Dr. Ernest mentioned that one of the most impactful parts of their trip to Germany was the Global Smart Manufacturing Summit.
    1. He learned that all the stakeholders involved concluded that career exploration, exposure to manufacturing, externships for teachers, and internships and apprenticeships were thought of as very important for students age 10 and under. They also thought team projects, long projects, pre-apprenticeship programs, teaching of

systems and programing, and some sort of real world education are valuable for students age 10 and up.

- v. Mr. Drew Wood, Principal of Northridge High School, shared the success of the Swiss apprenticeship model and the ability of the States to utilize parts of that model to help put students into a career.
- vi. Mark Melnick, Technical Trainer from Benteler Automotive, shared his experience in creating a program that would help students get into the workforce.
  - 1. Dr. McCormick asked what percentage of their employees had an associate's degree or higher. Mr. Melnick responded that it was around 20 percent and they were working on raising that number.
  - 2. Ms. Mote asked what the wages of these students was when they were employed in this sector. Mr. Melnick responded that after a student completes the apprenticeship program they will be able to make \$24-\$31 an hour.
  - 3. Dr. McCormick asked if there were any qualifications for high school students in internship or apprenticeship positions. Mr. Melnick responded that the model for high schools in Elkhart was just beginning, but they could accept students as young as 16.
- vii. Cindy Grider, representing Robert Weed Corporation, shared their experience of bringing educators into the industry and sharing how this influences education especially within Elkhart County.
- viii. Jared Kendall, representing Lippert Components, shared his experience in the manufacturing industry and creating a pipeline between manufacturing and education.
- ix. Dr. McCormick congratulated Elkhart County on their work in this area and shared that the Department was doing a lot of work to make CTE concentrators successful, but they were struggling in modernizing this process, so they look forward to any help that may be offered from the Alliance.
- x. Dr. Yager asked how many students the industry could accommodate within Elkhart County and how they planned to implement Graduation Pathways in schools.
  - 1. Mr. Wiebe responded that he had been told there would never be enough students available to fill the need.
- xi. Mr. Walker asked if classroom instruction would have to change in order to implement this model.
  - 1. Mr. Wood responded that he was a firm believer in project-based learning and the classroom was doing some of these things, but it would need to change to take the practical from the theoretical. He also expressed that the teachers needed to be more prepared for this change.
- xii. Discussion starts at [30:03](#).

**IX. Consent Agenda**

- a. The Consent Agenda was approved by a voice vote. The consent agenda items were: A. South Central Area Special Education Cooperative, B. Freeway

Accreditation Contract Extension Schools Expiring 2018, C. Adoption of WIDA Standards and ACCESS Cut Scores, D. 2018-2019 Formative Assessment Grant Funding Distribution Formula, E. Course Title and Descriptions Additions 18-19, and F. Form for Withdrawal to a Non-Accredited Nonpublic School.

**X. New Business – Action**

- a. Dana Christian School
  - i. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board, shared that Mr. Harold House, the school’s administrator, was asking for Freeway Accreditation for Dana Christian School and what this accreditation would mean for the school.
  - ii. Mr. Harold House shared his experience in opening this school and the need in the community.
  - iii. Dr. Freitas asked if the school would have to come back after year 1 if this accreditation was granted.
    1. Mr. Murphy responded that this would create a contract with the school and the Board assuring that the school would meet certain benchmarks for a 5-year period.
    2. Dr. Freitas further asked what would happen if the school did not meet their benchmarks during that time period.
    3. Mr. Murphy responded that the school gets a 1-year reprieve and the school can then apply for a 3-year reprieve, but at the end of the contract period, the Board can look at the benchmarks and make a decision from there.
    4. Dr. Yager asked why Board Staff would be involved in the review of the schools.
    5. Mr. Murphy responded that although Freeway Accreditation is solely within the Board’s purview, the Department houses the Office of Accreditation.
  - iv. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the Freeway Accreditation.
  - v. Discussions starts at [1:29:23](#).
- b. Kokomo Public Schools Intervention Petition
  - i. Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Performance & Transformation, gave a brief overview of the school’s plan to restructure three of the schools within Kokomo School Corporation into Transformation Zones.
  - ii. Dr. Jeff Hauswald, Superintendent of Kokomo School Corporation, shared information about the schools and the targets they have set to assure academic improvement. He also shared why the corporation was asking for early intervention for these three schools and how early intervention would help these schools start performing at optimal levels.
  - iii. Dr. Freitas asked if the school had projections for their long-term outcomes.
    1. Dr. Hauswald responded that this plan went until the 24-25 school year and they planned to measure variables throughout this plan through an assessment dashboard.
  - iv. Dr. McCormick asked how anything in the plan was unique to a transformation zone.

1. Dr. Hauswald responded that having one of these levers was not unique, but having all 16 of the levers at play made the plan unique and comprehensive.
  2. Dr. McCormick further asked what the benefit of calling this a transformation zone would be as opposed to just labeling this as a plan for school improvement.
  3. Mr. Sandlin shared that generally restructuring a school into a transformation zone offered benefits of flexibility and a framework that is sustainable.
  4. Dr. Hauswald also mentioned that the schools were asking for early intervention because they would like to have continued assistance in making this plan sustainable.
- v. Dr. Freitas thanked the Corporation for seeking assistance prior to assistance being necessary and being proactive. He also mentioned the rarity of engaging the community and commended the corporation. He also asked what mechanisms the schools were going to use if they did not meet their goals in the specified amount of time.
    1. Dr. Hauswald responded that the outside consultants were very helpful in the creation of this plan and flexibility had been built into this plan in order to shift resources.
  - vi. Dr. Hauswald introduced the three principals involved in this creation of this plan and mentioned how instrumental they were to creating such a comprehensive plan.
  - vii. Dr. Yager mentioned that he appreciated the portion of the plan dealing with recruiting and retaining teachers. He also asked if there were staffing reassignments due to changes such as making the school day longer.
    1. Dr. Hauswald responded that the plan accounted for the changes within the 5-year plan and this plan helped because it incentivized teachers to come to these schools.
  - viii. The Board voted to 9-0 to approve the school intervention petition.
  - ix. Discussion starts at [1:37:42](#).
- c. Social, Emotional, Behavioral Health Plan
- i. Tim Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, shared the background of the creation of this memorandum and that Indiana Code 20-19-5-1 requires the Department to make recommendations to the Board regarding a children's social, emotional, and behavioral health plan for Board approval. This memo is a request for the Department to begin recommendations to the Board in order to start rulemaking.
  - ii. Mr. Walker stated that he asked Mr. Schultz to look into this because he believed there was a serious need for this within schools and was hoping to find out what the triggers were to allow schools to engage with the students and he believed not following this statute was a complete oversight and needed to be corrected.
  - iii. Dr. McCormick clarified that every school's plan is submitted to the Department and shared what the Department is already doing in this

area. She also mentioned her concern about using a plan that was 12 years old in the creation of a new rule.

1. Mr. Walker also informed that he did not support creating the rule based off the 2006 plan, but instead wanted new information for the creation of this rule.
- iv. The Board voted 9-0 to request a formal presentation of social, emotional, behavioral recommendations from the Department.
- v. Discussion starts at [2:25:04](#).
- d. Dropout Recovery Proposed Rule
  - i. Mr. Schultz shared the rules that Board staff has created and explained why those rules were written in such a way and informed that the Department has also written their own version of the rules and given their explanations as well.
    1. The reason that the rule regarding dropout recovery services was written the way it was currently is because it is directly linked to graduation requirements as opposed to courses, which allows for more flexibility.
    2. The definition of “at risk” currently reflects the way the federal Department of Education has defined “at risk” in the Every Child Shall Succeed Act (“ESSA”). The current definition states that a student must receive the dropout recovery services for half the year enrollment, while the Department changes this to enrollment for at least 162 days.
    3. Finally, the students are being removed from the graduation calculation of the school in which they are enrolled.
  - ii. Mr. Watts clarified that voting to approve this would not mean the exact language written would be approved, just that the rulemaking process could begin.
    1. Mr. Schultz responded that this would allow the notice of intent to be filed and begin the formal rulemaking process.
  - iii. Dr. Freitas asked if the Board was being used to arbitrate between Board staff and Department staff recommendations.
    1. Mr. Schultz responded that he did not see it as arbitrating, but explaining the differences and concerns of each.
    2. Dr. Freitas then asked to go through each issue one by one to hear each agency’s explanation of the rule.
  - iv. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability, came forward to share why the Department had made the proposals in language they had made.
    1. The Department was looking at this through an implementation lens and trying to make sure there were no ambiguities within the rule.
    2. The definition of dropout recovery services is concerning because the current definition does not explain that these services are meant to be specifically tailored to credit accumulation or recovery services. Also, the grade level that this is applicable to is not mentioned or clarified.

- a. Mr. Schultz stated he drafted the language to allow for maximum flexibility.
- v. Mr. Schultz also stated that the Board could vet these rules with schools like the Crossing who specifically serve this area and that this was just to get the ball rolling; these aren't the final rules.
  - 1. Ms. Paino responded that all schools were able to offer these services so it may be a better option to reach out to all schools through public comment instead of schools that specifically offered these services.
- vi. Mr. Watts stated that he would like to see a document with the recommended changes from the Department as opposed to voting on the specified initial language.
  - 1. Dr. Freitas agreed and stated that putting this initial language out and receiving public comment, which may include the Department's comments, seemed like the proper way to proceed. He then moved to approve the initial language created by the Board's attorney.
- vii. Dr. Yager asked if implementing this for public comment would follow the same procedures as the accountability rule, meaning having public comment meetings throughout the State.
  - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that the law requires one formal hearing, but Staff was happy to accommodate the Board and have multiple hearings throughout the State.
- viii. Dr. McCormick asked if the flexibility that Mr. Schultz brought up earlier, meant the flexibility to exclude students from accountability.
  - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that his comment of flexibility was tied to who qualifies to be a part of this program and the definitions follow the definition used in ESSA.
  - 2. Dr. Yager then asked if that was a good or bad thing.
  - 3. Dr. McCormick responded that if you asked a principal or superintendent, it was probably a good thing when seeing your letter grade, but the Department wants to make sure that no student slips through the cracks and isn't accounted for. For the Department, this seems irresponsible to allow schools to not be held accountable for specific students.
  - 4. Ms. Paino stated the definition of at-risk used in ESSA is irrelevant here because none of these things will apply at the federal level, but only at the state.
- ix. Dr. Yager asked for an explanation of using enrollment for half the year versus enrollment for 162 days to be determined as at-risk.
  - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that currently under ESSA, if a student does not attend your school for more than half the year they are automatically pulled out of the school's accountability calculation.
- x. Mr. Hendry recommended going back and looking at the information to figure out what language to use and then coming back at the next Board meeting.

1. Dr. McCormick responded that this work has already been done and the Department shared their language to make sure the Board was aware that they had some real concerns with the language being shared with the public.
  2. Mr. Schultz responded that he would be happy to change the language as the Board desired, but recommended approval because the rulemaking process is a lengthy one.
  3. Dr. Yager asked if there was a time issue in this rule.
  4. Mr. Schultz responded the longer we wait the longer the schools won't have guidance on how to implement this rule.
  5. Mr. Schultz responded that hopefully this would be approved by the middle of the 18-19 school year.
- xii. Dr. Yager asked if the rule was following ESSA in certain instances but not in others.
1. Mr. Schultz responded that the rule followed ESSA as closely as possible, but in some instances it was not possible due to State statute.
- xiii. The Board voted 6-3 to approve the proposed rule; Mr. Walker, Dr. Yager, and Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- xiiii. Discussion starts at [2:33:57](#).
- xv. Dr. Yager then asked what was happening now after this approval.
1. Dr. McCormick responded that this language would be put forth.
  2. Mr. Schultz then stated that he would appreciate Board members informing him if they would like to see public meetings be held around the State.
  3. Ms. Mote then asked what the expense was to the State for having those meetings around the State in order to help inform their decisions.
  4. Mr. Schultz responded that this information would be provided to the Board members.
  5. Mr. Watts responded that the Board had to make sure that this was time well spent.
  6. Dr. Ernest responded that the issue of transparency is not an issue to him because everything is posted online and you are able to give public comment from wherever you are located.
  7. Dr. McCormick responded that this was a very important issue and needed complete transparency. She stated that just having the online touch is not enough.
- e. Local Career and Technical Education (“CTE”) Concentrator Framework
- i. Steve Baker, Principal of Bluffton High School, shared comments from the Principal’s leadership group regarding CTE. The comments from this group were that this document was complicated, but that the group was ready to implement this plan.
    1. Dr. Yager asked if Wells County had the ability to implement such strong industry and education partnerships as Elkhart County has.



2. Mr. Baker responded he believed it was possible, but in their own way because they had different industries than Elkhart so they would look different.
- ii. Alicia Kielmovitch, Senior Director of Policy and Legislation, shared that this document was modelled after the locally created pathways document that was previously approved by the Board. However, because it pertained to local creation of CTE concentrators it had some differences in order to stay aligned with the purposes of CTE.
- iii. Dr. McCormick asked what the plan was for the current CTE pathways that are already approved and students are already on the path to accomplishing those pathways.
  1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that the Governor’s Workforce Cabinet was involved in this so it was complicated because not every decision was made at the Board level.
  2. Ms. Mote pointed out that HEA 1426 changed the whole way CTE was done and dispersed the authority across multiple agencies.
  3. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that this would still be done in a similar fashion as previously followed, but instead of making a recommendation solely by Board staff, Board staff would now consult the other agencies in making a recommendation before presenting their recommendation to the Board.
  4. Matt Voors, Executive Director for the Board, stated that it was his understanding that the existing State approved CTE Concentrators would be grandfathered in for now.
- iv. Ms. Mote asked for clarification regarding the difference between Local CTE Concentrators and Locally Created Pathways.
  1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that they were very similar, but the CTE Concentrator required a series of six credits that were completed in sequence, whereas the locally created pathways could be more flexible.
  2. Dr. McCormick stated that there is a funding issue because of state CTE funding and federal Perkins funding. Locally created pathways were easier to accomplish because they did not need to meet certain qualifications in order to receive Perkins funding.
  3. Ms. Kielmovitch stated that schools were worried about how rigorously the Board was going to apply this provision.
- v. Dr. Yager asked why the Department was included in the agencies that would work on making a recommendation to the Board.
  1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that the statute said Board staff must include CHE and DWD, but they were not limited to only including those agencies.
  2. Dr. Yager further asked why then they would not include a 9-12 current public school practitioner in this process.
  3. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that this was not protocol nor her decision to make.

4. Ms. Mote then asked if this information was shared with practitioners before it was released to the Board.
5. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that this information was vetted with over 100 stakeholders before it was shared with the Board.
6. Ms. Mote responded that this was an important part of the document.
7. Dr. Yager stated that he wasn't implying this wasn't important, but that he felt it was important to keep practitioners in the process for the application portion of this pathway.
8. Dr. Yager made a motion to adopt this with the inclusion of a high school principal to be included in the review process.
9. Dr. Freitas clarified that the people named are employees of the state and further asked why we would limit this outside person to a public high school principal as opposed to private high school principals, parents, CTE directors, etc.
- vi. Dr. Yager's motion failed 5-4; Dr. Yager, Mr. Hendry, Dr. McMahon, Mr. Walker, and Superintendent McCormick voted in favor (IC 20-19-2-2.2(c) requires 6 votes for official action).
- vii. The board then voted 8-1 to approve a motion by Dr. Freitas to adopt the framework as originally presented; Dr. Yager voted against the motion.
- viii. Discussion starts at [3:01:22](#).
- ix. The Board voted by a voice vote to move new business item I. Resolution Regarding Committee on Virtual Charter Schools, up to the next item.
- x. Dr. McCormick excused herself from the meeting because of a scheduling conflict.
- f. Resolution Regarding Committee on Virtual Charter Schools
  - i. Mr. Hendry shared that this resolution was to create a committee in order to review the status of virtual charter schools and to delve into the issues and make some recommendations for the Board and General Assembly. He also shared that Dr. McMahon and Mrs. Whicker have agreed to be a part of this committee.
    1. Mr. Watts asked if it was his intention to limit this to a 3-person committee.
    2. Mr. Hendry responded that a small committee would probably be better in this circumstance.
    3. Mr. Watts shared the Dr. Ernest probably had the most expertise in that area.
    4. Mr. Hendry responded that he believed it would be very important for Dr. Ernest to heavily weigh in on these recommendations to ensure students attending virtual charter school receive the best possible education.
  - ii. The Board voted 8-0 to approve the Resolution.
  - iii. Discussion starts at [3:33:34](#).
- g. Work Sessions

- i. Mr. Voors shared that the recommended work sessions related to guidance for graduation pathways in preparation for the summit that will occur in June. The proposed date is May 23<sup>rd</sup>.
  - 1. It was mentioned that some Board Members would be unavailable and Board Members asked for a poll to pick the date that worked best for them.
- ii. Dr. Freitas asked if it was possible to schedule these meetings around the regular business meetings.
  - 1. Dr. Yager asked if it was possible to do the day before a regular business meeting.
  - 2. Mr. Voors responded they could definitely take this into consideration.
- iii. Discussion starts at [3:37:11](#).
- h. Initiate Rulemaking – HEA 1399 Elementary Teacher Content Licenses
  - i. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board, recommended the Board begin the rulemaking process to amend their existing rule concerning teacher content licenses as required by HEA 1399.
  - ii. The Board voted 8-0 to initiate rulemaking.
  - iii. Discussion starts at [3:40:40](#).
- i. Initiate Rulemaking – SEA 217 Dyslexia Screening; Professional Awareness; Resources
  - i. The Board voted 8-0 to initiate rulemaking.
  - ii. Discussion starts at [3:41:51](#).

## **XI. Discussion and Reports**

- a. Madison STEAM Academy Intervention
  - i. Dr. Kenneth Spells, Superintendent of South Bend Community School Corporation, shared data regarding Madison STEAM Academy’s Academic improvement and introduced the team working in the school.
    - 1. Deb Martin, Principal of Madison STEAM Academy, shared the school’s vision of success and the 6 pillars of school improvement that the school has been following.
    - 2. Dr. Kay Antonelli, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, shared current data from the school that provided evidence of robust and sustainable improvement.
    - 3. Dr. Wendy Folk, Director of Primary Centers, shared the 6 pillars behind the school’s academic improvement.
    - 4. Dr. John Ritzler, Director of Research and Evaluation, shared the 5 specific benchmarks the school was using to evaluate performance.
    - 5. Mrs. Darice Austin-Phillips, Director of Title I Programs, shared a video of the teachers at Madison STEAM Academy empowering their students to take charge of their own learning.
  - ii. Dr. Freitas thanked the school for making the drive and asked if the school tracked the mobility rate, and if so, how they were addressing it.
    - 1. Ms. Martin shared that previously only 21% of the students would stay with them for over 2 years, so the corporation changed the

school into a magnet school, which provided transportation for all students in any part of the district.

2. Dr. Freitas then asked what number of students are staying at Madison before it became a magnet school and how many new students were coming in.
  3. Ms. Martin responded that bringing 5<sup>th</sup> grade students into the school has made the school jump up to 635 students from 560 students.
  4. Dr. Freitas also asked for some of the circumstances that affect Madison such as free and reduced lunch rate.
  5. Ms. Martin responded that they are a very high poverty school, with nearly 80% of students being on free and reduced lunch rate and shared that there are a lot of partnerships in the school, making it a community school.
  6. Dr. Freitas asked for information regarding outside consultants.
  7. Ms. Martin responded that the school has had several consultants, one being ASCD, who is an expert on differentiated instruction. They have also begun using Focus-5, which brings theater into the classroom.
- iii. Discussion starts at [3:42:33](#).
- b. Assessment Update
- i. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Department, provided an assessment update.
    1. Mr. Hendry congratulated the team on their work.
  - ii. Discussion starts at [4:22:20](#).
- c. Indiana Youth Institute – State of the Child Update
- i. Charlie Geier, Vice President of Indiana Youth Institute, shared with the Board the information that the State of the Child campaign puts forward and how to better understand the state of the children in Indiana.
  - ii. Discussion starts at [4:26:36](#).
- d. CSUSA Transition Liaison Introduction
- i. The candidate had an emergency that took him out of the State, but contract negotiations have begun.
  - ii. Discussion starts at [4:44:47](#).

## **XII. Adjournment**

- i. The meeting was adjourned by a voice vote.