



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda
July 11, 2018
9:00 AM (ET)
Indiana Government Center South
Auditorium
302 West Washington St.
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Board Members Present: Dr. Jennifer McCormick (by phone), Mr. BJ Watts (Vice Chair), Dr. Byron Ernest (Secretary), Dr. Vince Bertram, Dr. David Freitas (by phone), Mr. Gordon Hendry, Dr. Maryanne McMahon, Mr. Tony Walker, Ms. Katie Mote, Mrs. Cari Whicker, and Dr. Steve Yager.

Board Members Absent: None.

- I. Call to Order**
 - a. Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
- II. Approval of the Agenda**
 - a. The agenda was approved by a voice vote.
- III. Approval of Minutes**
 - a. The minutes from June 13 were approved by a voice vote.
- IV. Statement from the Chair**
 - a. None.
- V. Board Member Comments and Reports**
 - a. Mr. Hendry reported the Virtual Committee held their first meeting and that a second meeting would be scheduled with the information posted on the Board's website.
 - b. Dr. Ernest applauded Elkhart County schools for their work in Graduation Pathways and the partnerships they have created.
 - c. Mr. Walker requested to have a meeting scheduled in Northwest Indiana in 2019.
- VI. Public Comment**
 - a. None.
- VII. Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Successes**
 - a. Locally Created Pathway – Jay School Corporation
 - i. Alicia Kielmovitch, Senior Director of Policy and Legislation for the Board, gave information regarding the school's locally created pathway and how they have gone above and beyond the requirements of a locally created pathway.
 - ii. Chad Dodd, Principal of Jay County High School, shared information on the county in which the school operates and the success of the program.
 - iii. Rusty Inman, Executive Director for the John Jay Center for Learning, shared the story of how and why the program was created and the program's goals of giving students employable skills for industry.

- iv. Mr. Dodd shared the need for this program within their county and the successful numbers the program had already generated.
- v. Lisa Deck, Director of Education and Workforce Cultivation for the Indiana Education Workforce Innovation Network (“EWIN”), shared information regarding EWIN and the program’s goals of creating systematic change within communities.
- vi. Dr. Ernest commended the county on their work and expressed hope that Graduation Pathways codified the need for this work and opened more doors for these programs. He also expressed amazement at what giving students currency and options in their education does for them. He then asked for more information regarding the 46 student workers.
 - 1. Mr. Inman responded that 11 of those students self-pay, which means 37 are receiving tuition payments by their companies, but all students in the program are currently employed. Even though the students are employed, they see the value in this program because of the pay increase it rewards them upon completion.
- vii. Mr. Watts asked if the age limit of 18 was a problem for the work based learning.
 - 1. Ms. Deck responded that there are workarounds for this issue and other states have begun using best-practices that Indiana is looking into.
 - 2. Mr. Inman shared that some manufacturers are looking exclusively for seniors to be involved in this program because younger students just aren’t ready yet.
- viii. Dr. Ernest asked how the program stayed agile in keeping up with what they need to be teaching, especially in regard to buying equipment.
 - 1. Mr. Inman shared that their current equipment is state-of-the-art, which may change in the next 5 years, but they meet with their partners quarterly and ask for their help financially, which they have been very receptive to.
- ix. Dr. Ernest commended the county on their work in this program and recommended using this as a model. He then asked about the skills-track training and if it included relevant math training.
 - 1. Mr. Inman responded there are six math dual credit hours involved in this pathway.
- x. Dr. Bertram commended the county on their work and inquired about program data.
 - 1. Mr. Inman responded that they use Wright State University data, which showed that 98% of students who went through this program are still employed in the industry and have a median income of \$87,000. He also responded that the average entry-level position in this field makes \$37,000.
- xi. Mr. Walker asked how they would know when the saturation point is met within this pathway and field.

1. Mr. Inman responded they would have to listen to their manufacturers and go from there, but currently the need in many counties is immense.
- xii. Ms. Mote asked if there was a way to intentionally sequence courses to achieve some degree outcome, such as an associate's degree, instead of only receiving employment.
 1. Mr. Dodd responded that an intentional sequence was the end goal, but the goal was focusing on skills rather than certifications.
- xiii. Dr. Yager asked what the most difficult part of this process was and what speed-pumps other school corporations could expect in going through this process.
 1. Ms. Deck responded she always cautions people about quick-fixes and they need to be looking for a system that continues to be innovative.
 2. Dr. Yager then asked what the most difficult challenge in keeping this program moving was.
 3. Mr. Dodd responded consistency with curriculum was very difficult.
- xiv. Dr. Yager asked how the school responded to students who were on this pathway, but changed their mind after a few years of being on this path.
 1. Mr. Dodd responded that Jay County is very fortunate because they run on a block schedule, which allows students to get on and off pathways much more easily.
- xv. Dr. Yager asked if the Board was voting on this matter and if this pathway would be added to a library.
 1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that this did not need to be voted on because the school's pathway already meets at least one enumerated post-secondary competency in the Graduation Pathways, and that it would go into the library of pathways on the Department's website.
 2. Dr. Yager followed up by asking how many locally created pathway applications the Board has received and how many have met the standards.
 3. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that they have received nine applications and three have been approved.
 4. Dr. Bertram asked for further clarification regarding the application process, especially for those corporations that go above and beyond the requirements for a locally created pathway.
 5. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that since this has not actually been implemented yet, there is some confusion around these required bullet points, so those applications should stop coming in when things are clarified.
 6. Mr. Dodd responded it was his understanding that because this was in the manufacturing field this would fall under the manufacturing pathway and the application was not necessary.
- xvi. Discussion starts at [5:23](#).

VIII. Consent Agenda

- a. The Consent Agenda was approved by a voice vote.
 - i. Dr. Bertram recused himself from discussion and voting on item E. CTE Pathway Plans due to a potential conflict of interest with Project Lead the Way.

IX. New Business – Action

- a. Freeway Accreditation: Israel School of Excellence
 - i. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board, gave background information on both schools coming forward and the Staff’s recommendation to approve freeway accreditation for both schools.
 - ii. Dr. Yager asked about the nepotism policy because an administrator’s spouse is on the school’s board and recommended adding the nepotism law in the school’s policy.
 - iii. The Board voted 11–0 to approve the school’s freeway accreditation.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [1:16:10](#).
- b. Freeway Accreditation: Al-Haqq Foundation Academy
 - i. The Board vote 11–0 to approve the school’s freeway accreditation.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [1:19:30](#).
- c. Choice Scholarship Waiver Request: Horizons Christian Academy
 - i. Mr. Hendry made a motion to approve Staff’s recommended determination.
 - 1. Mr. Walker asked if this was a legal motion.
 - 2. Mr. Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, shared that a motion to approve the staff recommendation was an appropriate action.
 - ii. The Board voted 11-0 to approve the Staff’s recommendation.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [1:20:09](#).
- d. Resolution: Graduation Pathways Policy Guidance
 - i. Ms. Kielmovitch shared the clarifications made since the Board last saw the guidance document in May.
 - ii. Mr. Hendry commended the staff for their hard work on this comprehensive document. Mr. Watts and Dr. Ernst echoed this.
 - iii. Dr. McCormick asked if the Resolution and Guidance were being voted on separately or together.
 - 1. Mr. Watts responded that this would be a joint vote.
 - iv. The Board voted 10–0 to approve the Resolution. Dr. Bertram recused himself from the discussion and vote due to listed Project Lead the Way courses.
 - v. Discussion starts at [1:22:00](#).

X. Discussion and Reports

- a. Distressed Unit Appeals Board Presentation: School Corporation Fiscal and Qualitative Indicators Committee
 - i. Courtney Schaafsma, Executive Director of the Distressed Unit Appeals Board, gave a presentation regarding the School Corporation Fiscal and Qualitative Indicators Committee and their plan for the coming months.

1. The committee has not yet started the discussion of what the indicators will be, but the statute which created this committee provided some potential indicators.
 2. This list of indicators will be publicly available on January 1, 2019.
 3. The committee is made up of a number of State agencies and a representative of the school board association.
- ii. Mr. Hendry clarified that the task of the committee was to look at the state of affairs within school corporations.
1. Ms. Schaafsma shared that the first step was to prepare these indicators for all school corporations and then use the indicators to see which school corporations have concerning numbers.
 2. Mr. Hendry followed up by asking if the 7-year trends information was looking backward or forward.
 3. Ms. Schaafsma responded that these would be looking backwards, but the committee may provide a spreadsheet for projected numbers as a useful tool.
- iii. Dr. Bertram asked if there was going to be alignment with other credit-rating agencies.
1. Ms. Schaafsma responded that they would be looking at this from two standpoints: 1) credit-rating agencies who already have a very robust process, whose mimicking may be very helpful and 2) being cognizant of impacting school corporations' bonds.
 2. Dr. Bertram followed up by asking what the appropriate debt to Assessed Valuation ("AV") ratio should be.
 3. Ms. Schaafsma responded that this would be part of the work of the committee to decide what those thresholds should be.
 4. Dr. Bertram then asked if she believed this number would be the same for each district.
 5. Ms. Schaafsma responded that she did not believe so.
 6. Dr. Bertram followed up by asking how she saw this interacting with other tax agencies within districts and things that would affect district's AV.
 7. Ms. Schaafsma responded that she would like to focus on things that are within the district's control.
 8. Dr. Bertram expressed that this was a great opportunity to inform the public on school financing.
- iv. Ms. Schaafsma then shared what the committee saw happening in the 2019 school year.
- v. Mr. Walker asked if the underlying philosophy was that school corporations that get in trouble had to get their way out of the debt or if there was any new state money accompanying this process.
1. Ms. Schaafsma responded there is currently no more funding added to the schools being placed on these lists.
 2. Mr. Walker followed up by asking if there was any way to increase funding.

3. Mr. Schaafsma shared that schools could do a referendum or try to increase student enrollment.
- vi. Discussion starts at [1:26:05](#).
- b. Update: 2017-2018 School Quality Reviews
 - i. Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Performance and Transformation for the Board, shared that the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) did an incredible job in this process and ensured it was beneficial to each school.
 - ii. Robin LeClaire, Director of School Improvement for the IDOE, gave a presentation regarding the process of school quality reviews, their success in this process, and plans for the future.
 - iii. Ms. LeClaire recognized her entire team for their work.
 - iv. The Board applauded the team for their work.
 - v. Discussion starts at [1:56:02](#).
- c. Update: Assessment
 - i. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for IDOE, provided an assessment update including a new initiative, Assessment Literacy.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [2:05:34](#).
- d. Update: Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Health Plan
 - i. Ms. LeClaire gave an update on the plan and shared that the mental health supports in schools subcommittee met on June 28th and is looking to bridge work between different agencies to create one screener and find supports before a screener is used.
 1. The team has met and scripted a video for all schools for awareness on the multi-tiered system of support.
 2. Dr. McMahon asked how long the video turnaround would be.
 3. Ms. LeClaire responded they would likely need a week or two to do edits.
 - ii. Mr. Walker asked for more information regarding the screeners.
 1. Ms. LeClaire shared that if students are identified as being at-risk, there were screeners they could go through to identify what they are dealing with and what supports they could use.
 - iii. Dr. Bertram asked if there were any laws or regulations she believed were creating barriers to meet the needs of these students.
 1. Ms. LeClaire responded that there were certain laws creating barriers such as obtaining information, which would take legislative action to correct.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [2:11:23](#).
- e. Discussion: Accountability Timeline
 - i. Matt Voors, Executive Director for the Board, asked if the Board was open to continuing this discussion, if they wanted to continue this work, and if there was any interest in bringing a national expert to an August Work Session.
 - ii. Dr. Bertram shared that he wanted to pick it up and ensure that it was aligned with the Board's other initiatives and desired outcomes.
 - iii. Dr. Ernest asked if this would be in conjunction with the August meeting.

1. Mr. Voors responded that the dates would be contingent on whether the Board wanted an expert to come in.
- iv. Ms. Mote shared that having an expert in the room would be a priority in her opinion.
- v. Mr. Walker shared that he was looking for a complete overhaul of the accountability system and it needs to be spoken about sooner rather than later so it can be implemented sooner.
 1. Mr. Hendry echoed Mr. Walker's comments and expressed a desire to have a full-fledged discussion.
- vi. Mr. Watts expressed a desire to look into social and emotional learning.
- vii. Mr. Voors shared that he would begin looking for dates in mid to late August and schedule a work session.
- viii. Dr. Bertram asked if Board staff has identified states that have an accountability system that Indiana would like to look to.
 1. Mr. Voors responded that he had not yet looked into this because he didn't know if the Board wanted to continue this discussion.
 2. Dr. Bertram followed up by sharing that he did not want to be confined to using another state's model, but instead construct their own that met the State's needs.
- ix. Discussion starts at [2:18:04](#).

XI. Adjournment

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