



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda

August 1, 2018

9:00 AM (ET)

Indiana Government Center South

Conference Room B

302 West Washington St.

Indianapolis, IN 46204

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

Board Members Absent: Dr. David Freitas.

- 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 July 11 were approved by a voice vote.
- IV. Statement from the Chair**
 - a. None.
- V. Board Member Comments and Reports**
 - a. Mr. Watts shared that the field expressed concern over the federal level accountability categories and mentioned having a conversation about this topic.
 - i. Mrs. Mote expressed that the only way to address this issue would be to have the Indiana Department of Education (“Department”) amend the ESSA plan.
 - ii. Dr. Yager then asked if another way to address the issue would be to amend the State plan to match the ESSA plan.
 - iii. Mr. Watts then expressed aligning the systems may not be the best option due to the cap on growth, for example.
- VI. Public Comment**
 - a. Eric Lewis, representing Charter Schools USA, expressed concern over the availability of SIG funds for Emma Donnan Middle School.
 - b. Megan Worcester, representing the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association Advocacy Committee, reiterated the importance of world languages in education and urged having discussions about this in the new diploma and pathways.
- VII. Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Successes**
 - a. None.
- VIII. Consent Agenda**
 - a. The Consent Agenda was approved by a voice vote.

IX. New Business – Action

- a. Locally Created Pathway: Wa-Nee Community Schools
 - i. Scot Croner, Superintendent of Wa-Nee Community Schools, came forward to give a presentation regarding the corporation's locally created pathway application.
 1. The corporation worked with Horizon Education Alliance to create a pathway centered around RV Construction, which is very important in their county and would help students gain high wage, high demand jobs.
 - ii. Dr. Bertram asked if there has been constant growth for the RV industry specifically.
 1. Mr. Croner shared that although the industry took a hit during the recession, the changes that the industry has made makes them very confident in their ability to have longevity.
 2. Dr. Bertram responded that he wants to know what will happen to those students who complete a pathway in a specific industry if the industry they are trained for suffers economic displacement and the students don't go on to post-secondary.
 3. Mr. Croner responded that it was important to embed employability skills and dual-credits so students can have the option of higher education.
 4. Dr. Bertram then asked if the employers were also committed to continuing education of the students when they enter the workforce.
 5. Mr. Croner responded the employers were absolutely committed, especially in their area.
 6. Mr. Watts responded that he believed these skills were transferable. He also mentioned this was the type of pathway he was excited to see.
 7. Dr. Ernest also commended the corporation and mentioned the portion of this application he appreciated the most was the transferability of skills.
 - iii. The Board voted 9–0 to approve the school corporation's locally created pathway. Mr. Hendry was not present during this vote.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [11:40](#).
- b. Teacher Preparation Program: Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis
 - i. Scott Bogan, Director of Higher Education and Education Preparation Programs, shared information regarding the schools and programs coming before the Board today.
 - ii. The Board vote 10–0 to approve the teacher preparation program.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [19:04](#).
- c. Teacher Preparation Program: Indiana Wesleyan University
 - i. The Board voted 10–0 to approve the teacher preparation program.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [21:29](#).
- d. Teacher Preparation Program: University of Southern Indiana

- i. The Board voted 10–0 to approve the teacher preparation program.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [22:26](#).
- e. Teacher Preparation Program: Indiana University Southeast
 - i. The Board voted 10–0 to approve the teacher preparation program.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [23:11](#).
- f. Choice Scholarship Waiver: Holy Cross Central School
 - i. Timothy Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, shared that he proposed granting this request for the waiver based on the more than 20 point gain the school saw in their accountability score during the previous year.
 - ii. Mr. Hendry shared that he would be voting against this solely because approving this would mean granting a waiver and he believed this action would make the exception the rule.
 - iii. The Board voted 7-3 to approve the recommendation. Mr. Hendry, Dr. Yager, and Dr. McCormick voted not to approve the waiver.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [23:59](#).
- g. Choice Scholarship Waiver: Holy Angels Catholic School
 - i. Mr. Schultz shared that the school did have an increase in their accountability grade and that more than 50% of all students achieved high growth in both math and ELA and therefore recommended approving the waiver.
 - ii. Mr. Hendry echoed his previous comments and expressed a hope that the school continued to improve, but did not believe that the Board should reward school for receiving Ds and Fs.
 - iii. Dr. Yager asked for Mr. Schultz to further explain the growth issue.
 - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that for the '16-'17 school year 51% of the students were placed in the high growth category for ELA and 50% of students were placed in the high growth category for math as well.
 - iv. Dr. Bertram asked what the statute specifically says that authorizes the Board to grant a waiver. He further asked if it was a waiver to delay or a reward system.
 - 1. Mr. Schultz read the applicable statute.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram then reiterated that the statute required a majority of students showing academic improvement.
 - 3. Mr. Schultz responded that he made this recommendation based on the totality of the circumstances.
 - 4. Dr. Bertram then shared that the statute was a delay in consequences as opposed to a reward for those schools. He then asked if when the legislature provides a waiver statute, if it was the responsibility of the governing board to grant the waiver if the expectations of that waiver have been met.
 - 5. Mr. Schultz responded that generally speaking that is the expectation.
 - 6. Mr. Hendry responded that he wanted to take issue with that because the term “may” in the statute gives the Board discretion to make this choice. He shared that this school has had a very slight

- improvement, increasing their overall ISTEP pass rate by only 7.5%, making their overall pass rate below 20% and that he did not believe schools should be rewarded for this.
7. Mr. Watts followed up by sharing that a 7.5% overall ISTEP increase is pretty high.
 8. Mr. Hendry shared that he wasn't criticizing the school, but believed this was a philosophical issue that gave discretion to the Board to stop the school from accepting new students if they could not improve.
- v. Dr. Bertram asked if there were any other instances where students were limited in their choice of schools due to the school's performance.
 1. Mr. Schultz responded that he believed that this was the only instance of this.
 2. Dr. Bertram then responded that there is no other place where these choices are limited, with the exception of choice scholarship schools and what they are really doing by not granting these waivers is cutting off access for a very small number of schools.
 3. Mr. Hendry responded that that was true for public schools, but this was a private school and they are held to a higher standard because they are receiving tax-payer dollars.
 - vi. Heather Willey, representing Notre Dame University, shared information regarding the context of the two schools being voted on.
 1. The University of Notre Dame has contracted with the Archdiocese of Indianapolis to ensure academic improvement within all of their schools.
 2. These schools are very challenging because they are about 95% free and reduced lunch and most students are dual-language speaking.
 3. There has been a tremendous difference in the schools since Notre Dame has stepped in.
 - vii. Christian Dallavis, representing Notre Dame ACE Academics, reiterated Notre Dame's role within these schools and shared their concern that receiving sanctions at this point would stop the schools from continuing the improvement they are currently seeing.
 1. ACE is committed to working with the Archdiocese for the long haul and improving the achievement gap within these schools.
 - viii. Mrs. Whicker asked if the schools who come before the Board today would presumably have to come before Board next year if they again receive a D or F.
 1. Mr. Schultz shared that this was correct.
 2. Mrs. Whicker then expressed that she was a believer in growth and in choice, but other schools around the State had the same contextual situations. She also mentioned that the school would have to show at least the same amount of growth next year to not have to come back before the Board and she would not consider

this with as much leniency next year if they could not continue this growth.

- ix. Dr. Yager asked to go back to the growth increase and shared that he also did not believe that 7.5% increase was that significant of an increase. He also asked for clarification regarding the data decreases the school went through and if this information mattered.
 - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that this number mattered, but he was trying to give an overall picture of the school.
 - 2. Dr. Yager then asked what they were looking at to show improvement if they saw a decrease in certain areas.
 - 3. Mr. Schultz responded that he believed that because the school had demonstrated that a significant amount of students had been placed in the high growth category in both math and ELA, coupled with the fact that their overall score improved, the requirements of the statute had been met.
 - 4. Mr. Dallavis shared that the small school population means that the 15% decrease is representative of two students.
 - 5. Dr. Yager shared that one student affecting the entire grade happens all the time.
- x. Dr. Bertram asked if the overall pass-rate mattered in granting the waiver, according to the statute.
 - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that the statute required academic improvement for a majority of students and because this is a non-specific requirement, he looked at the totality of the circumstances.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram then expressed that an increase in the overall grade was not required, just improvement.
- xi. Mr. Hendry shared that there are clearly issues with the legislation that need to be addressed. He also expressed appreciation for the improvements that the school has made and wished them well.
- xii. Dr. McMahon commented that the Board is in a place where they are not given clear guidance, which is uncomfortable, but she believed that the intent behind this legislation is to see if these schools have had enough academic improvement to feel confident that they are on the right track.
- xiii. Dr. Yager shared that he understood that one student can make the difference in changing a letter grade, but there is no avenue for public schools to find a remedy for this one student like there is for choice scholarship schools, which seems unequitable.
 - 1. Dr. Bertram shared that he agreed, but none of these schools were coming before the Board to change their grade and that in those schools, students and parents still have the choice to go there, regardless of their performance.
- xiv. The Board voted 8–2 to approve the recommendation. Mr. Hendry and Dr. Yager voted not to approve the waiver.
- xv. Mrs. Mote asked if another remedy for these schools would be to petition for an exemption from their A-F grade.

1. Mr. Schultz responded that if she was referring to the A-F appeal process that any school could request an appeal based off of their circumstances.
 2. Mrs. Mote shared that she brought this up because when dealing with these small n-sizes, this may be a better option for these schools to consider.
- xvi. Discussion starts at [26:08](#).
- h. Freeway Accreditation: Apogee School for the Gifted
- i. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board, shared that the school operates in Indianapolis and seeks to serve gifted and talented students.
 - ii. The Board voted 10-0 to approve the freeway accreditation.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [59:38](#).
- i. Freeway Accreditation: Repairer of the Breach
- i. Mr. Murphy shared that this school was under a one-year observation period, that the Department had concerns regarding their accreditation petition, and the Board staff joined in those concerns.
 - ii. Dr. Ewing, Principal of Repairer of the Breach, gave materials to the Board showing how the concerns presented by the Department have either been corrected or been shown not to be concerns due to additional information.
 - iii. Mr. Hendry asked for a summary of the information provided in the packet.
 1. Dr. Ewing shared that she was requesting reconsideration for Freeway Accreditation due to the success of her program and the services her school provides.
 - iv. Dr. Bertram asked if the school received any State funding.
 1. Dr. Ewing responded for the current school year the school would receive professional development funding.
 2. Dr. Bertram asked what the financial consequences of this not being approved would mean.
 3. Mr. Murphy responded that if the school was not accredited they would not be able to receive choice scholarship students in the coming year, but they could come back after another year of observation and petition the Board again.
 4. Dr. Bertram then asked if the school was receiving any choice scholarship students currently.
 5. Dr. Ewing responded they were not, but expected to in the next school year.
 - v. Mr. Hendry asked for the basis of the recommendation.
 1. Mr. Murphy shared that the original concerns came from the Department through their observation period and Board staff agreed with their conclusions. He also expressed that even assuming all of the concerns had been met, there likely wasn't enough time for the Department to look at all of these issues again before the choice scholarships were due.

2. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability, shared that the Department conducted a phone interview with the school and then went through this information with Board staff to create a joint recommendation.
- vi. Ms. Paino shared the information gleaned from their observation period that led to the final recommendation not to approve the school's petition.
 1. The school did not have any tested students, so there was no performance data available.
 2. The school did not have enough students to be subject to the Department of Health requirements, so there was no way to ensure the building was up to standards.
 3. There is no requirement to have licensed teachers giving instruction, but there must be one to administer the assessment and the school had no plan to meet this requirement.
 4. The school gave no discipline plan and a loose criminal background check plan in their petition. They also stated that the school was aimed at serving a high-risk population, but served no students in the 6-12 grades, which is typically the grades high-risk students are in.
- vii. Dr. Bertram asked if these same conditions applied to a school that was already accredited if they would make the same recommendation to the Board.
 1. Ms. Paino responded she would make this recommendation.
- viii. Mr. Hendry asked if the Department had any reservations about the recommendation.
 1. Ms. Paino responded that they did not, the school can pursue accreditation next year or through a third-party.
- ix. Dr. Bertram asked how many issues have been fixed or addressed.
 1. Dr. Ewing responded that all of the issues had been fixed or addressed. She also shared that some of these issues were just a misinterpretation.
 2. Dr. Bertram then asked if she believed all the concerns raised were valid at the time they were made.
 3. Dr. Ewing shared she did not believe this because of the misinterpretation.
 4. Dr. Bertram then asked if she believed the school would meet the expectations if they were to reapply.
 5. Dr. Ewing shared that she knew the school would presently meet the expectations.
- x. The Board voted 9-1 to approve the Board's recommendation to deny Freeway Accreditation. Mr. Walker voted to approve the Freeway Accreditation.
- xi. Discussion starts at [1:47:25](#).

X. Discussion and Reports

- a. Update: Diploma

- i. Dr. Jennifer Jensen, Assistant Director of Math Instruction for the Department, updated the Board on the math transition course, which the Department is working on in conjunction with a number of different stakeholders to place students directly into credit bearing courses in college.
- ii. She also updated the Board on the alternate algebra II course.
 1. The Department is working to adopt curriculum, but this requires standards, so the timeline presented is to develop the standards for this course.
 2. The Department also proposes bringing together a group of stakeholders to create an applied algebra II course in order to ensure that this is not the end of the students' math careers.
- iii. Dr. McMahon asked for clarification as to why the standards for the applied algebra II course and the previous algebra II course would have different standards.
 1. Dr. Jensen responded that there would be a lot of overlap between these courses, but there are certain standards that really gear students towards calculus and are very theoretical, which may be removed.
 2. Dr. McMahon then expressed concern regarding the difficulty of creating new standards under a time constraint and asked if she had any more information regarding this.
 3. Dr. Jensen shared that some schools were already implementing this without the guardrails necessary and they have had these types of courses in the past, so there is capacity to teach this course at the applied level.
- iv. Mrs. Mote thanked Dr. Jensen for her work and shared that the work of this joint committee has been systemic in nature. She also shared concerns regarding the timeline and the deviation from the guidance that has been provided by the Dana Center around how the alternative algebra II course can be a part of the systematic revision of the teaching and learning approach to ease students into these math courses.
 1. Dr. McMahon expressed that the committee knew about this program, but was focusing on the standards around the course piece as opposed to the whole curriculum.
 2. Dr. McCormick responded that she had just been made aware of the information from the Dana Center, but the current charge is to look at the course and curriculum and the information being provided is regarding standards within the course, not the entire course curriculum.
- v. Dr. Bertram asked what percentage of students will have to take algebra II or this alternative course.
 1. Dr. Jensen responded that the goal would be that 100%.
 2. Dr. Bertram followed up by asking how many employers say algebra II is absolutely essential for a skilled workforce and how important these skills really are in her opinion.

3. Dr. Jensen responded that she believed most of algebra II was applicable, but that a bigger question also needed to be answered regarding sustainability and getting students out of math too early will likely shut doors for those students.
- vi. Mr. Walker asked who on the SBOE staff was working with this committee.
 1. Dr. Jensen shared that when looking at this committee she reached out to Dr. McMahon and Mrs. Mote to have representation.
 2. Mr. Walker shared that eventually if the Board was going to be called on to vote on this he would like one of their staff members to be involved.
 3. Marsha Bugalla, General Counsel for the Department, expressed that Dr. McCormick appoints the committee that reviews standards.
 - vii. Mrs. Mote asked if the steering committee had the opportunity to speak with Commissioner Lubbers regarding moving forward with the applied algebra II component of this independently of the systemic focus that is the work of the steering committee.
 1. Dr. McCormick responded that the committee has spoken with Commission on Higher Education (“CHE”) and initially this was going to be two different courses, a math transition course and an applied algebra II course, but are now being brought together, which has created overlap of these two committees.
 2. Dr. Jensen shared that CHE representatives expressed an interest in getting behind a course that included most of algebra II as opposed to completely getting rid of algebra II because many colleges predicate admission on completion of this course.
 - viii. Dr. Yager asked for more information regarding the schools she mentioned earlier that are already using a course similar to this proposed course.
 1. Dr. Jensen shared that there were schools that were trying things like this and the Department has reached out to them because they are concerned that they are not covering all of the required algebra II standards, but still calling the course algebra II.
 2. Dr. Yager asked if there is cause for concern if they weren’t meeting the required standards.
 3. Ms. Bugalla responded that curriculum is done at the local level, so if they are not following this curriculum with fidelity there is no way to know, but Dr. Jensen and her staff work with schools to help them meet these standards.
 4. Dr. Yager expressed concern over students being short-changed at the end of their experiences due to the lack of following standards by the school.
 5. Dr. Jensen shared that the Department’s concern is that students will be in a class that is not taught at the appropriate level of rigor and they will believe they are ready for college-level courses, but

will need remediation without realizing they are not being taught all the algebra II standards.

- ix. Mr. Murphy shared that it was the State Board's responsibility to make these determinations, which is important to point out because decisions will be made before the vote comes before the Board, so Board staff highly recommends having a staff member involved in this process and receiving monthly updates.
- x. Dr. Ernest shared that there is a need for algebra II, even for those students who go straight into the workforce. He also reiterated what he heard in this discussion, which is that the Board has the ultimate authority to make decisions regarding algebra II and asked how to proceed from here.
 1. Mr. Murphy shared that the Board could take a vote or pass a resolution regarding what the Board would like to see happen due to the Board's high level of control regarding this issue.
 2. Dr. Bertram asked how much the Board wanted to get involved in writing courses or other consequential things because the Board has final say in a number of things, so why are they so concerned about algebra II?
 3. Mr. Murphy shared that this was important because it involves alignment to graduation pathways.
 4. Dr. Bertram then asked if there should be an expectation that staff is involved in any of these matters from the beginning.
 5. Mrs. Mote supported this and stated that creating this expectation would create a great opportunity.
 6. Dr. McCormick shared that none of these concerns have been previously expressed, but they are well aware that the Board's voice needs to be heard at the meetings, which is why two members have been asked to be on the committee.
 7. Mr. Murphy shared that they appreciate Board members being involved, but Board staff has been unable to gather any information surrounding this committee.
 8. Dr. Yager asked if Board staff asked to be a part of the committee.
 9. Alicia Kielmovitch, Senior Director of Policy and Legislation for the Board, shared that there was originally interest in having this be a joint grant from the Governor's Office, SBOE, IDOE, and CHE, but it then became just IDOE and CHE. Board staff is trying to be a part of the algebra II committee, but has thus far been unsuccessful.
 10. Dr. McCormick shared that CHE took control of the transition committee and how that committee was set up.
- xi. Dr. Bertram made a motion for a State Board staff member to be placed on the steering committee.
 1. Mr. Schultz shared that this was a discussion item, so if the Board would like to take a vote on the item, it could be added to the action item agenda if the Chair determines there are special circumstances and that is affirmed by three other Board members.

2. Dr. Bertram requested they make this an action item.
 3. Mr. Watts supported this request.
 4. Mrs. Whicker and Dr. Ernest seconded this motion.
 5. Mr. Hendry asked if anyone was objecting to involving Board staff at this point.
 6. Dr. Ernest shared that he believed they needed to take action because he had heard that Board staff has attempted to be involved and has not been able to have involvement thus far.
 7. Mr. Murphy confirmed this statement.
 8. The item was moved to an action item.
- xii. Dr. Bertram made a motion requesting a State Board staff member be a part of the committee.
 - xiii. The Board voted 10-0 to approve the motion.
 - xiv. Discussion starts at [1:02:21](#).
- b. Update: CTE-Perkins
- i. Stefany Deckard, Director of CTE for the Department, gave information regarding Perkins funding and the reauthorization of Perkins, which occurred the previous night and will be referred to as Perkins-5. This funding will take effect on July 1, 2019.
 1. There would need to be a state plan drafted and reviewed before implementation, which would require the plan to be submitted by January 1, 2019. This would be a tight timeline to create an entirely new plan, so it is recommended to create a one-year transition plan.
 2. There are currently three fiscal grant years open under Perkins-4, which run on a 27 month cycle. The State currently has used \$11.7 million of the grant dollars with an additional \$9.9 million obligated, leaving an unobligated balance of \$2.8 million.
 3. The State also had a summer expansion grant, the outcomes of which are currently being reviewed.
 - ii. Ms. Deckard also updated the Board on CTE, including work-based teacher internships, the career exploration team, and the CTE action team.
 - iii. Dr. Ernest asked Ms. Deckard if after reviewing Perkins-5, she believed the suggested transition plan would fit well with the CTE Committee of the Governor’s Workforce Cabinet.
 1. Ms. Deckard responded that she believed the plan would fit well and that the timing of this fit perfectly because it gave the State time to figure out what this looks like before implementation.
 2. Dr. Ernest clarified that some of the work that needs to be done would not go into effect until after shifting to the plan.
 3. Ms. Deckard responded that this was correct.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [2:16:55](#).
- c. Update: Graduation Pathways
- i. Robin LeClaire, Director of School Improvement for the Department, shared that the Graduation Pathways website is now live and contains the

Pathways Memo and the Pathways in practices information. It also takes care of specific issues with course codes and clusters.

- ii. Discussion starts at [2:28:06](#).
- d. Update: Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Health Plan
 - i. Ms. LeClaire gave an update on the social, emotional, and behavioral health plan.
 - 1. The Governor's report that is to be released today will help the new plan be put in place.
 - 2. The 2006 plan was reviewed and current deliverables have been created.
 - 3. They have also engaged other child State agencies to weigh in on the current status of issues from the 2006 plan.
 - 4. A draft for social, emotional competencies is in the works currently and will be completed by the end of August.
 - 5. The recommended revisions to the plan will be data driven and informed and there should be a recommended plan to present by January 1.
 - ii. Dr. Bertram asked to what extent social, emotional issues affect school climate and student performance.
 - 1. Ms. LeClaire responded that there are a lot of social emotional issues that affect students every day and trauma-informed care is an important part of professional development that is required to meet the needs of students. She also shared that 80% of students are responsive to social emotional whole group learning and the percentage of students who need more than this is about 15%.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram then asked where the gaps are in social, emotional learning and what investment needs to be made to ensure proper and effective social, emotional learning.
 - 3. Ms. LeClaire shared that she believed investing in these data collections to inform decisions and investing in professional development for teachers to understand social, emotional behaviors in the classroom would help ensure students are learning these skills.
 - 4. Dr. McCormick shared that the Department is working on reorganizing the Department to have a point person in this arena and having conversations with legislators about funding.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [2:31:05](#).
- e. Update: Assessment
 - i. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Department, provided an assessment update.
 - 1. There have been many updates to training efforts in order to secure test security and ensure educators are very comfortable with the new delivery platform moving forward.
 - a. Dr. McMahon asked if training for non-staff was the same training that teachers received or if it was differentiated.

- b. Dr. Flores shared that the standard agreement remained the same, but it could be differentiated slightly locally.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [2:40:51](#).
- f. Update: 2017-2018 A-F Grade Timeline
 - i. Ms. Paino gave an update regarding the A-F Accountability timeline for the 2017-2018 school year.
 - ii. Mrs. Whicker shared that last year the grades were released about a month before this.
 - 1. Ms. Paino responded that this is due to the date of the Board meetings. The data will likely come in a few days after the October meeting.
 - 2. Mr. Watts asked if the meeting could be changed or if they could have a special meeting be held.
 - 3. Dr. Bertram asked if rescheduling the meeting would affect any other dates.
 - 4. Mr. Voors shared that this was a road meeting so he would look into both options.
 - 5. Dr. Bertram asked if everyone could participate telephonically.
 - 6. Mr. Voors responded that there must be at least five members physically present.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [2:46:32](#).
- g. Update: Federal School Improvement Grant Funding
 - i. Matthew Voors, Executive Director of the Board, gave an update regarding SIG funding, including the action the Board took, the state law, and the federal response to these funds.
 - 1. These funds support the improvements and interventions on which the Board votes and approves.
 - 2. The Department is responsible for ensuring appropriate distribution of these funds.
 - 3. ESSA gives states significant flexibility in choosing how to define comprehensive or targeted support, this definition is up to the State.
 - ii. Dr. Yager asked to clarify how Indiana has chosen to define comprehensive or target support schools.
 - 1. Ms. Paino responded that Indiana's ESSA plan states the bottom 5% of Title I schools or all F schools, whichever is higher.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram asked how this definition could be expanded.
 - 3. Nathan Williamson, Director of Title Grants and Supports for the Department, shared that Indiana's current language is more expansive than the federal requirements and going beyond this number would require an amendment to the ESSA plan. He also clarified that although the federal government does not necessarily place a maximum allotted amount of schools, they would not allow all schools to be placed in this category because the state is required to prioritize based on the highest need.

4. Mr. Voors clarified that this definition could be expanded with amendment of the ESSA plan.
- iii. Dr. Yager asked for clarification as to if they were to follow the State plan or the ESSA plan.
 1. Mr. Voors responded that they had to follow the ESSA plan, but should keep in mind that it is the Board's obligation to fully fund the turnaround academies.
 2. Dr. Yager shared that the bottom line was do we fund more schools with less money or fund fewer schools with more money per school and asked how and when that determination was made.
 3. Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Performance and Transformation for the Board, clarified that the purpose of this presentation was to ensure that the action the Board took was in compliance with federal law. He also shared that three of the schools have already been deemed eligible, but ten other schools' eligibility will not be determined until later in the school year.
- iv. Discussion starts at [2:49:43](#).
- h. Update: Proposed Dyslexia Rule Language
 - i. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board, updated the Board on the Dyslexia rulemaking process and shared the requirements for this rule listed within the controlling statute.
 1. The Board has worked closely with the Department on this rule and has already implemented public comment into the rule.
 - ii. Dr. Ernest asked if all of the comments were incorporated into the rule thus far.
 1. Mr. Ranney responded that he received additional information this morning which has not yet been incorporated into the rule.
 2. Mrs. Whicker expressed appreciation for incorporating the public comments, but also asked for a summary of the public comments going forward.
 - iii. Dr. McMahon shared that she did not see the word "annually" and wanted to clarify this.
 - iv. Dr. Yager clarified the process for this rule promulgation.
 1. Mr. Ranney shared that the Board has rulemaking authority, but this rule deals largely with Departmental functions so they are generally deferred to in these situations.
 - v. Discussion starts at [3:05:13](#).

XI. Adjournment

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