



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda

April 4, 2018

9:00 AM (ET)

Indiana Government Center South

Conference Room B

302 West Washington Street

Indianapolis, IN 46202

Board Members Present: Dr. Jennifer McCormick (Chair), Mr. BJ Watts (Vice Chair), Dr. Byron Ernest (Secretary), Dr. Vince Bertram, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Maryanne McMahon, Mr. Tony Walker, Mrs. Cari Whicker, Ms. Katie Mote, 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 the Minutes**
 - a. The minutes from March 7 were approved by a voice vote.
- IV. **Statement from the Chair**
 - a. Dr. McCormick recognized Fort Wayne Community schools for being the first Indiana school district to be the recipient of a Title III distinguished school district.
- V. **Board Member Comments and Reports**
 - a. None.
- VI. **Public Comments**
 - a. None.
- VII. **Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Success**
 - a. Indiana Arts Commission
 - i. Paige Sharp, Director of Programs for the Indiana Arts Commission, gave a presentation regarding the success of this education program, especially in regards to arts integration.
 - ii. Stephanie Haines, Arts Education and Accessibility Manager, shared more about the research and success within the PACE program the Commission has created.
 - iii. Christy Burgess, Shakespeare Outreach Coordinator for Notre Dame's Robinson Learning Center, gave a short demonstration of a drama integration lesson that has been used within this program.
 - iv. Dr. McCormick thanked the school for creating a quality partnership for schools.

- v. Dr. Freitas stated that this was terrific reminder of how important the arts are in education, especially in regards to student achievement.
- vi. Dr. Bertram mentioned the importance of integrating all subjects and creating a connection between subjects.
- vii. Mr. Hendry stated that he appreciated the Commission coming today and expressed the importance of this work in spurring creative learning.
- viii. Discussion starts at [2:06](#).

VIII. Consent Agenda

- a. The Consent Agenda was approved by a voice vote.

IX. New Business – Action

- a. The Independence Academy Choice Scholarship Waiver

- i. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board, shared with the Board that Independence Academy was back to present additional data that showed that the school has had academic improvement, as the Board requested at last month’s meeting.
 - 1. Board and Department staff recalculated the graduation rate with corrected data, but this did not have an effect on the graduation rate due to the school’s small size.
 - 2. Staff also recalculated the school’s data if the n-size would have been set to 0. The Department found that this would improve the school’s grade from an F to a C.
- ii. Dr. Freitas asked what criteria that Board was to apply in making these decisions.
 - 1. Mr. Ranney responded that under this statute, the Board may grant a waiver if the school has demonstrated that a majority of its students have demonstrated academic improvement. Academic improvement is not defined in statute, so at this time the Board has seemed to view academic improvement as an increase in letter grade or an increase in their accountability score.
 - 2. Dr. Freitas asked if these were the two guardrails that the Board had to use and if it was possible that they could go beyond these two guardrails and end up granting a waiver when they have previously denied another school in the same situation.
 - 3. Mr. Ranney responded that this was possible, but the statute says may, so there are other reasons that the Board may choose to not grant the waiver.
 - 4. Dr. Freitas mentioned that there was a danger of being inconsistent if the Board did not stay within these two guidelines and asked if the Board was bound by what they have done in the past.
 - 5. Mr. Ranney responded that this was not binding precedent, but it did establish practices of the Board and consistent application of the statute was the goal of the Board.
 - 6. Mr. Walker expressed that the reason the Board could not have a bright-line rule because of the specific context of each school.
- iii. Ms. Mote expressed concern over the plans for student progress and how this may allow the Board to look at growth or proficiency differently and

if that added an additional layer of showing academic improvement that was not required by the law.

1. Mr. Ranney responded that this indicator was an additional element that the school had used in order to show academic improvement and that Board staff has recommended at looking at the state test scores to calculate A-F grades.
 2. Ms. Mote followed up by stating that these students have already been given the support they need to perform alongside their peer and that she believed allowing an additional indicator would be in violation of the law.
 3. Mr. Ranney responded that it would not violate the laws in this case because those indicators were not used in calculating their accountability grade, but in order to attempt to demonstrate academic improvement.
 4. Mrs. Whicker responded that those students who have an IEP have been given supports and accommodations for exams and are to be counted in the calculation.
- iv. Dr. McCormick asked if the calculation was made using the State Board of Education's rule.
1. Mr. Ranney responded that the Department staff did use those rules and when the grade was recalculated using the corrected graduation data, the grade did not change.
- v. Mr. Watts asked what granting the waiver would allow the school to do.
1. Mr. Ranney responded that granting the waiver would allow Independence Academy to accept new Choice Scholarship students.
 2. Mr. Watts followed up by expressing that the students coming to this school were coming from high performing districts because this facility is better suited to meet the needs of their students in the parent's opinion.
- vi. Mr. Walker stated that academic improvement is not synonymous with accountability improvement.
- vii. Dr. Bertram mentioned that this was a matter of choice to him. Parents are trying to access resources to serve these students and was very interested in the school being able to offer these opportunities to students. He also mentioned that he believed that part of a waiver process was acknowledging the limitations of a single assessment and the burden of the school was to share other instances of academic improvement with the Board. He also said the legislation was intentionally left open to allow the Board to make decisions on an individual basis and therefore did not want to set a bright-line rule for this.
1. Mr. Hendry responded that he did not believe this was establishing precedent and the Board was still figuring its way through this rule.
 2. Dr. McCormick then asked if the Board was not bound by their own rules.

3. Mr. Ranney responded that the Board was bound to their rules in regards to A-F grades, but this provision did not have specific rules.
 4. Mr. Hendry expressed concern over granting every waiver just because a parent would want to send their child to that school and using a disparate application of this waiver. He also mentioned this was issue was dealing with taxpayer dollars and he wasn't sure what the best decision was for those who the Board was accountable to.
 5. Dr. Bertram asked why we would limit the children the school could accept if the parent's wanted to send their children to that school.
- viii. Dr. Bertram made a motion to approve the waiver.
- ix. Dr. Yager mentioned that having a work session to work on the guidelines for these cases might be a good idea. He also mentioned that he was concerned about the precedent that the Board might be setting with past decisions and the decisions made today.
1. Mr. Hendry responded that these decisions were not setting legal precedent and the Board would not be bound legally by the decisions made in these cases.
- x. Ms. Mote asked for Board members to articulate what factors they were looking at to make their decision to help pull out the rationale for other schools in the same situation.
1. Dr. McCormick stated that this definition was so broad currently that an exact definition couldn't be created today.
 2. Ms. Mote further explained that the memo from the school regarding their explanation of academic improvement listed a number of factors and it would be beneficial to further explain how and why the Board was making this decision in this case.
- xi. Mr. Walker mentioned Independence Academy was present and he would like to hear from them to flesh out some of the issues presented.
- xii. Dr. Bertram asked if viewing the school as achieving academic improvement by one factor alone was acceptable.
1. Mr. Ranney responded that this was correct, but Board staff was recommending using the data points generated through the traditional accountability model.
 2. Dr. Bertram further mentioned that this factor could be different in each context.
 3. Mr. Ranney also expressed that Board had to decide if they wanted to use the traditional n-size number or make the n-size 0 in these cases.
- xiii. Carol Gassen, Board President for Independence Academy, and Susan LeVay, Co-Founder of Independence Academy, came forward to express why they believed the school had achieved academic improvement and answer any questions from the Board members.

- xiv. Dr. Yager asked for clarification on how many of their students took the ISTEP test and were included in the information given to the Board members.
 - 1. Ms. LeVay responded that all students had taken the test except for 1 or 2 whose parents opted-out of taking the exam. She also mentioned that the school was not accountable for all of the students that went to the school.
 - 2. Dr. Yager further asked if the students who were placed there by their home school were included in the home schools accountability grade.
 - 3. Ms. LeVay responded that they were only included in their home school's grade.
 - 4. Dr. Yager then asked for clarification regarding the number of students that were included in calculating this accountability grade.
- xv. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability for the Department of Education, came forward to explain how this school's accountability grade was re-calculated after changed the n-size requirement from 30 to 0. In this case, after taking out students who were not present for more than 162 days or did not have valid test results, the n-size for this school was 16 students in regards to proficiency and 12 students for growth in the middle school level. In the high school level, there were 5 students in the n-size for growth and proficiency.
- xvi. Dr. Bertram asked if the practice of receiving students from their home schools and the funding along with them would continue if the waiver was not granted.
 - 1. Independence Academy responded that it would continue.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram then stated that if a student was placed there by its school the student could receive funding, but if the student's parents wanted to send them there, they could not receive funding.
 - 3. Ms. Gassen responded that 9 students were there by Choice Waiver and 11 students by placement from their home school.
- xvii. Mr. Walker mentioned that he believed aggregating the data back was irrelevant and the only thing that was important for this decision was how the students currently at the school were performing.
- xviii. Mr. Hendry asked how many new students the school was hoping to add to the population by the next school year.
 - 1. Ms. Gassen responded that it varied, but in any given school year they hoped to bring in at least 5 new students.
 - 2. Mr. Hendry then asked of those 5, how many did they anticipate being on Choice Scholarships.
 - 3. Ms. Gassen responded it was usually 2/3 of the students.
- xix. Mr. Hendry asked if the school operated as a charter school how that would affect the schools every day operation.
 - 1. Ms. LeVay responded that she was told that in order to be sponsored by the Mayor's office and proceed as a charter school

that they would need to have 150 students and the school never intended to become that large.

- xx. Dr. McMahon asked if a student decided that their school was the best option for them if they would ever tell that student that they could not work with them.
 - 1. Ms. LeVay responded that they had to have a diagnosis of high functioning autism and that the school kept a student to teacher ratio of 6 – 1.
- xxi. Dr. Hendry expressed frustration with the fact that the waiver process was out of control and needed guidelines and control to function properly.
 - 1. Dr. Bertram responded by stating that the schools coming forward have some sort of academic achievement or they wouldn't have asked for a waiver in the first place.
 - 2. Dr. McCormick and Mr. Hendry both responded that they did not believe that assumption was true.
- xxii. The Board voted 5-6 to deny the waiver request; Mr. Watts, Mr. Walker, Dr. Bertram, Dr. Ernest, and Dr. Freitas voted in favor.
- xxiii. Discussions starts at [24:36](#).
- b. Faith Academy Choice Scholarship Waiver
 - i. Tim Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, presented information regarding the circumstances of Faith Academy and the school's request for a waiver in consequences.
 - ii. Pastor Dennis Walton, Founder of Faith Academy, shared information about the extenuating circumstances the school has been experiencing and the actions the school was taking to combat those circumstances and turn the school around to achieve academic improvement.
 - iii. Dr. Yager asked why the school replaced 50% of their teaching staff and how many teachers they had on staff.
 - 1. Pastor Walton responded that some teachers were let go and some decided to leave on their own. He also informed that the school decided to let their previous Principal go and currently had 6 teachers on staff.
 - iv. Dr. Yager asked if he correctly heard that the school was no longer going to accept high school students in the coming years.
 - 1. Pastor Walton responded that was correct.
 - v. Dr. Bertram asked what evidence the school would point to show that a majority of students had achieved academic improvement.
 - 1. The new Principal for the school stated that the school created a data analysis and had found the areas where students needed to improve. They also worked with an expert in doing this analysis and have seen a small improvement thus far, but if they continue using this they would have had more improvement.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram responded that this meant the school had no academic improvement.

3. The Principal followed up with stating that school had not yet taken another assessment so they did not have that information.
- vi. Dr. Freitas applauded the school for their efforts to show improvement in the future, but believed that the school did not have any data during the preceding year to show that there has been any improved academic achievement, which is what the statute requires.
- vii. Mr. Hendry wished the school well, but did not believe this Board could grant a waiver when the school went from a D grade to an F grade.
- viii. Mr. Hendry expressed that even though the students were coming to them multiple grade levels behind, growth was a large percentage of the accountability calculation, so if the students were improving at all, that would show up in the growth calculation.
 1. Pastor Walton responded that this was not set yet and was just a recommendation. He also mentioned that the school did not receive Title I funding until the week before ISTEP testing and this predicament harmed the school.
 2. Dr. Bertram responded that turning away students did not align with the school's mission and the school needed to think about what was going to happen to these students when they were turned away.
- ix. Mr. Watts then made a motion to approve the waiver request, pursuant to Robert's Rules, which requires a positive motion.
- x. The Board voted to 11- 0 against the motion to approve the waiver request.
- xi. Discussion starts at [1:29:38](#).
- c. RFI/RFP for Special Management Teams pursuant to IC 20-31-9-4
 - i. Mr. Schultz introduced the resolution seeking the Board's approval to start the development of an RFI or RFP seeking potential vendors for special management teams to be available to work with schools that have been taken over by the Board.
 - ii. Mr. Walker mentioned that he was opposed to this item because it was putting the cart before the horse and that the most important thing the Board had learned is that the school districts should be able to pick their own vendor to be successful.
 - iii. Dr. Bertram asked how long the process of vetting a vendor for takeover took.
 1. Mr. Schultz responded this varied, but generally, an RFP review took 3 – 6 months depending on the complexity and an RFI was approximately half that time.
 2. Dr. Bertram followed up by asking how long that contract would remain valid.
 3. Mr. Schultz responded that a properly structured RFI or RFP could dictate that the proposal being put forward would be valid for whatever amount of time was determined.
 4. Dr. Bertram asked how this would affect how the organizations that would be responding responded because they wouldn't know

- exactly what situation they were responding to or what actions they would need to deliver.
5. Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Improvement and Transformation for the Board, responded that this was getting away from the procedural aspects and into the policy aspects and the recommendation here was for an RFI/RFP that left the door open.
 6. Dr. Bertram then asked if the needs of the RFP/RFI have changed over a period of time if that could be easily revised.
 7. Mr. Schultz responded that if it is a substantial change that was not envisioned in the RFI/RFP they may have to start over. He also mentioned that the RFI option may be better option because it takes a little less time and is more flexible.
- iv. Mrs. Whicker asked if this process would create a list of vendors that the schools were able to choose from as opposed to assigning a vendor to the school.
1. Mr. Schultz responded that this was the vision behind this option.
 2. Mr. Sandlin responded that creating a menu of vetted vendors is permissible and that they have received feedback that forcing a relationship between a vendor and a school was ineffective. He continued that the goal here is to take the burden off schools and vet vendors beforehand so the school can chose from that list. This would not be an exhaustive list of all vendors, but one that contained all the vetted vendors that allowed the turnaround process start more quickly.
- v. Dr. Freitas stated that he supported this action because past practice has created a very long process and not having a menu of vetted vendors made the Board prolong the process for months in order to find an acceptable vendor and this was just a proactive measurement.
- vi. Dr. Freitas made a motion to approve the Resolution.
- vii. Mr. Hendry stated that this was just getting to procurement out of the way so they could make quick decisions if need be.
- viii. Dr. Yager asked for clarification regarding the process a school would have to go through if the school wanted to pick a vendor that was not on the list.
1. Mr. Sandlin responded that schools that have failed five years in a row were put on notice by a public hearing that was held during which the school gave their input as to what they believed the next steps would be. During this hearing they also usually mention a vendor that they would like to partner with. This partnership would be fully vetted and reviewed by himself. This full process usually took about 12 months because the school was put on notice in year 5, but did not have to take action until year 6.
- ix. Dr. Bertram clarified his concern was how long a vendor could be kept on the RFP list if they are not presently being used as a vendor and how long this would remain valid.

1. Mr. Hendry responded that he believed stipulating keeping the contract valid for up to 3 years was reasonable and then negotiate other contract terms from that as opposed to going through this process yearly.
 2. Mr. Walker responded that the condition of the vendor could change significantly within a year.
 3. Mr. Hendry responded that they could stipulate in the RFP that if there was a material change to the vendor that they would have to inform the State of this change.
- x. Dr. Ernest asked how a vendor would get paid if they partner directly with the school as opposed to being placed on the list of vendors.
 1. Mr. Sandlin responded that there was nothing preventing that option from occurring. This Board had the option to direct federal school improvement grant dollars to a turnaround academy.
 - xi. Mr. Watts clarified that this is an optional list and the school is not required to use this list.
 - xii. The Board voted 9-2 to approve the Resolution; Mr. Walker and Dr. Yager voted no.
 - xiii. Discussion starts at [2:06:12](#).
- d. Locally Developed Pathway Guidance
- i. Steve Baker, Principal of Bluffton High School, shared his experience of leading a focus group of principals in the Board's efforts of making the most effective Graduation Pathways and expressed support of the Locally Created Pathway Guidance.
 1. Dr. Yager asked what kind of obstacles Mr. Baker was referencing in regards to the pathways.
 2. Mr. Baker responded that a lot is happening that hasn't happened in the past, so they are looking for more information on how this process will work and what opportunities will be available for schools.
 3. Dr. McCormick informed that many CTE concentrators were already defined due to federal funds and asked if he was looking for flexibility in these courses through locally created pathways.
 4. Mr. Baker expressed concern that some areas would change because the responsibility of this designation was shifted from the Department to the Board.
 - ii. Alicia Kielmovitch, Senior Director of Policy and Legislation, came forward to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this guidance.
 - iii. Dr. Bertram shared appreciation of the potential of a library of approved pathways, but implementing this would be a challenge because all schools are different and the way this is written, any differences would require the next school to come before the Board to get nearly the same pathway approved.
 - iv. Mr. Walker asked if a school could create an athletics pathway.

1. Dr. Ernest responded that he wasn't going to say no to anything because that was part of the flexibility of the plan.
- v. Dr. McCormick stated that everyone needed to get on the same page. The message being sent to each high school was very different based on regional needs and being flippant with the Board's discretion didn't seem fair.
 1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that questions that she has continued to receive include whether all locally created pathways have to be aligned to high wage, high demand data and if so, what are we using for this determination.
 2. Dr. Freitas informed that the memo said to do this when possible and leaving it as optional made him comfortable with the recommendation.
- vi. Dr. Yager stated that he did not know what substantively meant and wanted to know what parameters a school had to fit in to be deemed substantively different enough to require resubmission of nearly the same pathway.
 1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that her caution was that the Graduation Pathways were meant to align to a student's post-secondary interests.
- vii. Dr. Ernest asked if Dr. Yager and Dr. Bertram were suggesting that if a school gets approval for a locally created pathway, that then all other schools that use the same name as the school that already received approval should also be approved.
 1. Dr. Bertram responded that he was only suggesting that there would be a lot of different graduation requirements because two schools could come forward and create pathways in the same area, but use different limits, so those two schools would be graduating students at different requirements and a minimum needed to be set for that pathway.
 2. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that a good way to look at this would be any time the Board approves a pathway, they will be setting a floor for that area.
- viii. Ms. Mote asked for what purpose the Board would use annual reports of the effectiveness of the pathway and how that would be used because she believed the goal of the pathways was to give students currency in their post-secondary outcomes.
 1. Ms. Kielmovitch responded that other agencies within the State already tracked this data longitudinally, which made it easier to use this information and it would be up to the Board if they so desired to change the pathways based on this information.
 2. Dr. McCormick informed that some students would potentially be left out of this data, which creates gaps in the information.
- ix. Mr. Walker made a motion to approve the motion.

- x. Dr. Ernest informed that this guidance had approval from practitioners, which is what the Board requested, so he saw no reason to not support this.
 - 1. Mrs. Whicker responded that she wasn't saying that she didn't approve the guidance, but that there were still details that needed to be flushed out.
- xi. Dr. Freitas expressed that this was a policy, not implementation, which are very different things. He also asked for clarification about the library of locally created pathways and asked if these options would be a library of precedent.
 - 1. Ms. Kielmovitch expressed that she imagined it as extending the possible options for pathways that would satisfy the graduation requirements.
- xii. Dr. Bertram expressed concern regarding the flexibility for all school types when using this guidance and approving pathways. He also expressed concern that creating the pathways in this way may create unintended consequences of forcing schools to graduate students in less favorable ways.
 - 1. Dr. McMahon stated that it seemed logical that when reviewing these locally created pathways to set a minimum that will be applicable to all schools.
- xiii. Dr. Yager thanked Ms. Kielmovitch for her work in creating this policy, but stated that he could not support something that uses a term so vague as substantively. He also mentioned concern over whether or not schools had to transport students to accomplish these pathways and if anyone who came into contact with the students in the course of accomplishing these pathways required a criminal background check to occur.
- xiv. The Board voted 10 – 1 to approve the locally created pathways guidance; Dr. Yager voted no.
- xv. Discussion starts at [2:46:56](#).
- e. CTE State Plan Approval and CTE Update
 - i. Stefany Deckard, State CTE Director for the Department, informed the Board on the status of the State administration of the Perkins Act and district data regarding concentrators.
 - 1. Perkins Act IV was authorized in 2006 and at that time all states had to submit a 5 year State plan. If there were any revisions or technical changes to that State plan the State has to submit four different items.
 - 2. The Perkins Act IV requires the State to submit an updated budget, request to extend the State plan, revisions to the State plan, and State proposed performance levels to continue to receive annual allocation of funding, which the State is hoping to continue to operate under for the next school year.
 - 3. Ms. Deckard recommended a full review of the plan starting in June to ensure the State plan aligns with the changes that have been made at the federal level.

- ii. Dr. Ernest asked if the teachers and counselors in industry project was being utilized and if this area needed to be expanded.
 - 1. Ms. Deckard responded that they were indeed being utilized and she believed that it needed to be expanded because this will come into play when discovering how to direct the State's leadership dollars.
 - 2. Dr. McCormick asked if the teachers and counselors instituting these programs had to be at the high school level or if they could be at the middle school level.
 - 3. Ms. Deckard responded it currently says grades 9-12, but believes this could be an opportunity to expand that area.
 - 4. Dr. Ernest asked if there would be an opportunity to change the way this whole program was looked at and make it look more like an externship.
 - 5. Ms. Deckard responded that changing the way the program looks is definitely a possibility and she welcomed any ways to make this program stronger because it plays an integral part of in education.
- iii. Ms. Mote asked what the logic behind changing the performance level required from 95% down to 85%, especially given the pathways work that is so focused on concentrators.
 - 1. Chris Deaton, Senior InTERS Specialist for the Department, mentioned that the intent of the legislation is to have goals that push students but are still attainable. All the local district have their own achievement levels that are set for them that force them to continuously improve. He also mentioned that Indiana held themselves to a higher standard than most states because Indiana included all students in this indicator, not just those who the State could track post-secondary.
 - 2. Mr. Walker followed up by asking who was responsible for tracking those students postsecondary.
 - 3. Mr. Deaton responded that the local levels were held responsible, but a data match was also done with the Department of Workforce Development. He also mentioned that this method was successful at tracking the students and that the tracking was done until the second semester after graduation.
 - 4. Dr. Bertram asked if there were any incentives to continue to track students.
 - 5. Mr. Deaton responded that there was no incentive at the federal level to continue to track this, but this was useful information.
- iv. Dr. Bertram mentioned the traditional method of educating teachers was not that successful in introducing them to real life service areas and asked what pre-servicing teachers with this knowledge may look like.
 - 1. Ms. Deckard mentioned that one critical portion of CTE is the CTSO. CTSO was a great way to expose the teachers to that business industry and to look at the leadership skills that were being used in their classroom.

- v. Amanda McCammon, Chief of Workforce and STEM Alliances, gave an overview of the Teacher Assignment Code Additions.
- vi. Dr. Ernest asked if they foresaw any amendments happening to the plan after a review occurred.
 - 1. Ms. Deckard responded that she was not sure what would happen after the reviewing committee met especially due to the implementation of the Pathways.
- vii. Mr. Walker asked if schools could choose to make specific locally created pathways concentrators as well.
 - 1. Ms. McCammon stated that the focus of this was completely separate from the locally created pathways, but schools could choose to make a concentrator or a locally created pathway or both.
 - 2. Mr. Walker asked who was in charge of approving concentrators and if they did approve a concentrator if that would automatically approve it for a locally created pathway.
 - 3. Ms. McCammon responded that this was the responsibility of DWD, CHE, and State Board staff and that this would not mean automatic approval for the local pathway.
 - 4. Dr. Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, Chief of Staff for the Department of Education, responded that if a school wanted to apply to be a concentrator, there were different tracking and application systems for that option, but if it did not meet those standards, they could always bring it in front of the Board to be a locally created pathway.
 - 5. Dr. Bertram asked why a concentrator could not be included in the locally created pathway library.
 - 6. Dr. McCormick responded that the individual courses could be, but concentrators were a sequence of courses that would already be included in the concentrator pathway.
- viii. Ms. Mote asked what the process for receiving concentrator status was before the Session ended and enacted new legislation.
 - 1. Ms. McCammon responded that previously schools could follow the State approved course sequences or call DWD or the Department and ask for local consideration of a concentrator.
 - 2. She also asked what would happen with the previous set of concentrators in this new system.
 - 3. Ms. McCammon responded that she did not have the answer to this question because it was up to the Board to choose if they would like to change the concentrators.
- ix. The Board voted 11-0 to approve the CTE Approval Plan.
- x. Discussion starts at [3:34:10](#).
- f. Initiate Rulemaking – Indiana Diploma and Alternate Diploma
 - i. Mr. Ranney shared information about the passage of P.L. 192 and the new requirements of the Board and asked for permission to move forward with rulemaking.

1. The Board is required to establish one standard Indiana Diploma, consider math course requirements other than Algebra 2 in adopting new rules as part of the Core 40 Diploma, and create an alternative Diploma.
- ii. The Board voted 11-0 to approve the initiation of rulemaking.
- iii. Discussion starts at [4:26:02](#).

X. Discussion and Reports

a. Turnaround Academy Update

i. Indianapolis Public Schools

1. Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Superintendent of Indianapolis Public Schools, presented information to the Board regarding the status of the corporation's Turnaround Academies and how new models were successfully impacting those schools.
2. Mr. Walker asked about the order of preference he was seeing in terms of where students want to go to high school due to career options.
3. Dr. Ferebee stated that new career opportunities have seen less success because students and teachers are less aware of these, but he believes partnerships will increase the demand over time. He also mentioned that the most high demand areas are in IP Programming and Visual Arts.
4. Dr. McCormick asked if the corporation was thinking they would use traditional concentrators or locally created pathways to meet the Graduation Pathways requirements.
5. Dr. Ferebee responded that ideally the corporation would use as many locally created pathways as possible because it gave them the most flexibility.
6. Mr. Walker asked if the corporation was looking to find a turnaround partner for schools that may need this service in the future.
7. Dr. Ferebee responded that the corporation had success with vendor partnerships, but they hoped to continue to invest internally to improve student outcomes. He also mentioned that he was very comfortable with the models that the corporation was currently using to improve turnaround academies.
8. Aleesia Johnson, Innovation Officer for IPS, gave a presentation of the changes made within the three IPS turnaround academies and the success of those changes.
9. Dr. Freitas stated that he was looking for outcomes data of some kind and asked why this wasn't available. Ms. Johnson responded that this was due to a grade configuration change and a change in the operation of the school and preliminary summative outcome based data would be available in June.
10. Dr. Bertram asked what the district's policy was regarding student suspensions and expulsions. Ms. Johnson responded that all the schools were ensuring proactive and positive cultures and

encouraged schools not to leverage these options before using others.

11. Dr. McCormick asked if the Graduation Coach being used was an IPS employee and if so how many were being used. Ms. Johnson responded that it was an IPS employee and there was one available at each high school.
 12. Dr. Freitas stated that he hoped growth was not being substituted for proficiency because the goal was not growth, but instead proficiency. Dr. Ferebee expressed that he agreed with this, but mentioned that the other indicators were important to look at as well to ensure the students who are at the proficiency level are still being pushed to achieve.
 13. Dr. Bertram then responded that it's important to look and see if there are other proficiency measures available because a student can be proficient in one area, but not in another.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [4:27:46](#).
- b. Assessment Update
- i. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Department, provided an assessment update.
 1. Dr. McCormick thanked Dr. Flores and her team for working so tirelessly and doing such great work to make ISTEP successful.
 - ii. Discussion starts at [5:10:30](#).
- c. Accountability Update
- i. Mr. Ranney provided information regarding the public comments to the proposed accountability model.
 - ii. Mr. Walker stated that he was opposed to halting the creation of a new accountability system because he believes there is a flaw in the current system, but schools are now locked in to using that system for another school year. He also mentioned that it was imperative for Board members to clearly state what they would like to see in the accountability system in order to articulate an accurate rule.
 - iii. Mr. Ranney also informed that the earliest the Board could implement a new accountability model would be for the 2019-2020 school year. The recommendation going forward is to hold a work session to discuss what the Board would like to do with the rule.
 - iv. Dr. Yager stated that he believed getting comments from all over the State was exactly how the Board was meant to operate and thanked staff for the work they did in implementing this.
 - v. Mrs. Whicker also thanked staff, but wanted to mention that the ESSA plan was successfully done through the State and it was believed that that plan was going to be the foundation for the State plan.
 - vi. Discussion starts at [5:12:18](#).
- d. Charter School Report
- i. Mr. Sandlin provided information about the evaluation of charter school outcomes in Indiana.

- ii. Dr. Freitas thanked Mr. Sandlin for doing this and mentioned the importance of expressing the outcomes of these students. He then asked how we assessed the authorizers and if it was part of this report or if it was a separate issue.
 - 1. Mr. Sandlin responded that this evaluation was done by authorizer. He also mentioned that Board staff posted evaluations of authorizers annually.
- iii. Dr. Bertram asked what the purpose of evaluating charter schools against like-traditional public schools was.
 - 1. Mr. Sandlin responded that he based this report off industry standards in evaluating this type of information. He also mentioned that judging charter schools of the whole state would create skewed results due to lack of accessibility.
 - 2. Dr. Bertram responded that this was his point and this is exactly what happens in the accountability system.
 - 3. Dr. Yager expressed agreement and mentioned that some of these issues were site-specific.
- iv. Dr. McCormick asked how the State compared to other states who were in similar states situations regarding closings of charter schools.
 - 1. Mr. Sandlin stated that he could not speak directly to closures, but did know that Indiana has ranked number one nationally overall for insurance of quality and accountability in charter schools.
- v. Mr. Schultz shared the Code that gave the Board the authority to review charter schools.
 - 1. Dr. Freitas responded that he was looking to see if there was any authority to review the authorizers.
 - 2. Mr. Schultz responded that in certain circumstances the Board had the authority to oversee authorizers.
 - 3. Dr. Freitas then asked the members if anyone would be opposed to adding data regarding authorizers to a Board meeting agenda.
- vi. Dr. Bertram asked if the difference in funding between charter schools and public schools was due to property tax revenue.
 - 1. Mr. Sandlin responded that it was largely through property tax and the Legislature did pass a grant to give more pupil funding for these schools.
- vii. Discussion starts at [5:24:47](#).
- e. SBOE Legislative Update
 - i. Ms. Kielmovitch highlighted the tasks that have been assigned to the Board resulting from the Legislative Session.
 - ii. Dr. Bertram asked if she expected this method of defining policy through legislation to continue.
 - 1. Ms. Kielmovitch stated she could not say what would happen in the future. Dr. McCormick said she believed this would continue.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [5:44:13](#).
- f. Dropout Recovery Rule

- i. Mr. Schultz shared the amended language to the dropout recovery rule which would include virtual charter schools. He shared that this is the very beginning stage and wanted to give the Board the ability to give any comments they might have before rulemaking took place.
- ii. Dr. McCormick asked what options schools had for dropout recovery services in the Code and if a traditional public school could take advantage of this service.
 - 1. Mr. Schultz responded that the school would need to enter into a contract with an accredited program. He also mentioned he did not believe the way the statute was currently written contemplate the idea of a traditional public school contracting with a traditional public school.
 - 2. Dr. McCormick responded that she was concerned that this would lead to a number of students not being held accountable to any school.
 - 3. Dr. Ernest asked who accredited these programs.
 - 4. Mr. Schultz responded that this accreditation was under the Board's authority.
- iii. Discussion starts at [5:49:09](#).

XI. Adjournment

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