

Business Meeting Agenda
August 2, 2017
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), Mrs. Cari Whicker (Vice Chair), Dr. Byron Ernest (Secretary), Dr. Vince Bertram, Mr. BJ Watts, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Maryanne McMahon, Mr. Tony Walker (by phone), 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 Agenda**
 - a. Under New Business, CSUSA was moved to Item A
 - b. Under New Business, Item E was added, the Growth to Proficiency Table for 16-17.
 - c. The Agenda was approved by a voice vote.
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. The Minutes July 12, 2017, were approved.
- IV. **Statement from the Chair**
 - a. Dr. McCormick commended the Board on the collaborative work on the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan for Indiana.
 - b. Dr. McCormick read off a list of consensus item attached to ESSA.
 - c. The Summary of Accountability Consensus Items were submitted for the minutes.
- V. **Board Member Comments and Reports**
 - a. Mrs. Cari Whicker expressed appreciation for the Board's participation in the ESSA process.
 - b. Dr. Steve Yager concurred with Mrs. Whicker.
 - c. Dr. Yager would like to see the panel increased in size from nine to 12 and to include a teacher, a counselor and an administrator and to have a vote in the final decision of the panel. He would like the Board to consider this change.
 - d. Mr. B.J. Watts also expressed appreciation regarding the Board's involvement in the ESSA plan.
- VI. **General Public Comment**
 - a. The following people made public comments at the meeting: Todd Bess, Dr. Jeff Butts, Kama Carter, Mark Russell, Ashley Thomas, Cherisse McGill, Seretha Edwards, Anna Chaney, LaToya Tahirou, Erma Lardyell.
- VII. **Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Success**
 - a. None

VIII. **Consent Agenda**

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

IX. **Adjudications**

- a. None

X. **New Business – Action**

- a. CSUSA Contract Extensions

- i. Mr. Hendry asked what does the trajectory of CSUSA’s plan look like.
 1. Ms. Hage said there have been continuous improvements in student progress.
- ii. Mr. Tony Walker said the conversation shouldn’t be about a contract extension, but about exit strategy.
- iii. Mr. Hage proceeded to discuss their plan including their partnership with IPS.
 1. Dr. Bertram asked if Dr. Ferebee of IPS agrees with the position.
 2. Mr. Hage stated that Dr. Ferebee and CSUSA are in agreement on student performance.
 3. Dr. Bertram asked about operating budgets and Mr. Hage said that it is \$21 million total for all three schools.
 4. Dr. McCormick asked about total number of students.
 - a. Emma Donnan –600 and in K-8.
 - b. Manual – 700
 - c. Howe is 400, but numbers are increasing.
 5. Dr. Bertram asked, based on what they know, research and student mobility, how challenging is it for students who move during any age span.
 - a. Mr. Hage said that it’s incredibly difficult for students. At Emma Donnan, they had the highest student turnover rate in the state of Indiana. In fact, 66% of students were new students every year.
 6. Dr. Bertram asked, what is the future of these schools after the contracts expire?
 - a. There are three or four options.
 - i. Some sort Innovation option, whether with IPS or CSUSA
 - ii. Turn them over to IPS completely
 - iii. Turn them into Charter schools
 - iv. Become Innovation schools that they already have
 - b. Any decision should be done in concert with the Superintendent, the Board and CSUSA under a workshop program.
 7. Mr. Hage says, if there is an alignment of contracts, the plan should be CSUSA comes back in a year and in a year have a working session, maybe a subcommittee and let that process provide information and let it be public and they can provide some recommendations about where the schools are headed.

8. Mr. B.J. Watts says that this extension levels the playing field and provides consistency and answer the questions of what's going to happen in the future.
9. Dr. McCormick asked why there was a misalignment with the contracts, Mr. Hage provided that history.
10. Mr. Walker reiterated that a single year renewal makes sense, but we need IPS on the record before the Board goes for two.
11. Dr. Freitas then moved to vote on the recommendation.
12. Mr. Gordon Hendry expressed concerns about extending the contracts for the high schools without hearing from IPS first.
13. Dr. Freitas asked Mr. Sandlin, since he has been in regular contact with IPS, if there was any concern expressed by Dr. Ferebee over this resolution.
 - a. Mr. Sandlin said that Dr. Ferebee had not expressed any concerns with the Board staff recommendation. However, if the schools were returned to IPS, by consent of the Board, after the contracts expire, IPS would close the schools.
 - b. Mr. Hendry and Dr. Bertram asked Mr. Sandlin to clarify to which Mr. Sandlin said that the only way IPS would close the schools is if the Board voted to return them to IPS after the contracts conclude with CSUSA. The Board does not have to return them to IPS and could take a number of different actions.
 - c. Dr. Yager expressed concerned about proceeding with a vote without knowing for sure what IPS's plans are for these schools once the contracts end.
14. Dr. Yager moved to table discussion until the next meeting with the input of IPS.
 - a. The Board voted 9-2 against tabling the conversation. Mr. Henry and Dr. Yager voted in favor of tabling the conversation.
15. Mr. Hendry moved to extend the contract by only one year.
 - a. The Board voted 7-4 against extending the contract for only one year.
16. Dr. Freitas moved to extend the contracts and to align them.
- iv. The Board voted 9-2 to extend the terms of the existing contracts with CSUSA to operate T.C. Howe High School and Emmerich Manual High School.
 1. Mr. Hendry explained his no vote as a desire for more deliberation on the discussion and to hear from IPS regarding these schools.
- v. After some discussion on the second recommendation from Board staff, Dr. Ernest moved that a revised version of the second recommendation be offered by Board staff.

1. Ron Sandlin offered the new recommendation which reads “that the intent of the State Board is to take action under I.C. 20.31.9-9 at the expiration of the approved terms.
 2. Dr. Ernest made a motion that the new language be voted on.
 - a. After discussion about whether the new language needed to be voted on or if the Board was just following the law, Mr. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board said that a vote wasn’t required, just that it needed to be put into the minutes
 - b. Dr. Ernest rescinded his motion.
- vi. [Discussion starts at 11:11:43.](#)
- b. Tipton Community Schools Resolution
- i. Sandi Cole, Co-Project Director with Hardy-Murphy of the INTASS project brought to the Board another resolution for an exemplary school district for teacher evaluation.
 1. Ms. Cole then provided a background of what a school needs to do get to this point.
 2. Ms. Cole then introduced the Assistant Superintendent of Tipton Community Schools, John Junco.
 - a. He said that he appreciates the Board’s support.
 - ii. The Board voted 11-0 on the Tipton Community Schools resolution.
 - iii. [Discussion starts at 2:42:22.](#)
- c. Indiana University Kokomo Teacher Preparation Program
- i. Scott Bogan, Higher Education Preparation Specialist announced that the Accreditation Council of the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation recently granted the School of Education at Indiana University Kokomo initial accreditation for seven years with areas for improvement.
 - ii. Dr. Shirley Aamidor was present to take questions.
 - iii. Dr. Freitas asked Dr. Aamidor to talk about one of the strengths of the program and that’s that teacher candidates are placed in partnership schools “early and often”.
 1. Dr. Aamidor proceeded to explain how that has worked.
 2. Dr. Freitas then asked about teacher retention and recruitment and ideas that Dr. Aamidor might have to promote the profession and retain and advance them within the profession.
 - a. Dr. Aamidor explained some of the difficulties and struggles that potential teachers face and the need to discuss other ways to bring potential teachers into the field.
 - iv. The Board voted 11-0 to approve continued state accreditation status for the School of Education at Indiana University Kokomo
 - v. [Discussion starts at 2:46:32](#)
- d. Alternate Assessment Procurement
- i. Dr. Charity Flores, the Director of the Office of Student Assessment, spoke on the Alternative Assessment Procurement. The scope of work will define key relationships to the ILEARN assessment for the population of students identified to ensure a cohesive system of assessments.

- ii. The Board also voted 11-0 to allow the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to procure a vendor or organization to support delivery of the alternate assessment beginning in 2018-19.
- iii. [Discussion starts at 2:57:58](#)
- e. Growth to Proficiency Table
 - i. Maggie Paino with Indiana Department of Education spoke on the Growth Proficiency Table for 16-17
 - ii. The Board voted 11-0 to approve the Growth Proficiency Table.
 - iii. [Discussion starts at 2:59:36](#)

XI. Discussion and Reports

- a. SBOE Turnaround Academy Update
 - i. Ron Sandlin from the State Board staff spoke on Turnaround Academy Performance Management System.
 - ii. He presented a recommendation that Beginning in 17/18, establish a performance management system to guide SBOE decision-making and evaluation of all turnaround academies that includes:
 1. The minimum expectation that all turnaround academies will receive a ‘D’ or higher rating after two years, and will meet the exit criteria for comprehensive status by the end of five years
 2. Performance agreements between each school and the Board outlining two- and five-year benchmarks aligned to the state’s A-F Accountability Model to serve as ‘proof points’ at critical stages in the intervention
 3. Annual leading indicators of performance the guide ongoing monitoring and support from the IDOE through the continuous improvement process.
 - iii. No action is required at this time as he is just providing an overview and key considerations. A plan for action will be brought before the Board at a later time.
 - iv. Dr. Bertram asked why we wait until schools fail before we implement those interventions.
 1. The Lead Partner model, explicitly as it relates to the transformation zone and in the innovation network schools, which are fundamentally focused on changing condition should not be used as a State Board intervention but that the State Board should create levers to incentivize school districts to do that earlier on to avoid state intervention.
 2. Dr. Bertram said that he wasn’t talking, necessarily, about State Board intervention, but more local intervention and the resources that are put in place to schools that are in failure to try and turn them around. Then what happens to that school when they leave Turnaround status and then what happens to the resources that were available.
 3. Dr. McCormick said that resources are of concern and that there has been a conversation with legislators, especially as we have school districts in fiscal in addition to academic distress.

- v. [Discussion starts at 3:02:10](#)
- b. Assessment Update
 - i. Dr. Charity Flores provided ISTEP+ Reporting update.
 - 1. Phase 2 reporting occurred on 7/31
 - 2. Final reports delivered to schools and corporations by 8/16
 - 3. Final ISTEP+ data reported to State Board in September
 - ii. Mr. Hendry asked when the information was presented last year.
 - 1. Dr. Flores said that her understanding was that the data was not presented until September and October because of mode adjustments that had to occur.
 - 2. Mr. Hendry saw that this is an improvement and thanked the Department of Education for moving up the timeline.
 - iii. [Discussion starts at 3:16:11](#)
- c. SBOE Technical Advisory Update
 - i. Cynthia Roach from State Board staff provided a TAC update.
 - 1. The ISTAR results were delayed last month and the TAC reviewed concerns around their delay as well as a plan for validating them to make sure that what comes to the Board is accurate. Once that is complete the results will come back to the Board on August 22, 2017 for approval.
 - 2. Regarding the CORE test. In April the TAC requested additional validity documentation from Pearson for review. The request was misinterpreted as high level and so the data the TAC received was only high level documentation and so Pearson is creating a very specific list of validity and reliability data that the TAC needs before they can move forward with their review. Once the TAC's review is done, that information will be sent to Pearson so they can complete their evaluation. Upon the completion the TAC will be writing a White Paper for the Board to review so they can see the results of the study.
 - a. Dr. Ernest asked when the TAC could anticipate getting the Board the information.
 - b. Ms. Roach said they will try to get the list to Pearson by August 21, 2017.
 - ii. [Discussion starts at 3:18:11](#)
- d. Graduation Panel Update
 - i. Dr. Ernest provided some highlights since the last board meeting including meeting format and structure.
 - ii. Dr. Yager expressed the importance of ground level people and practitioners to be involved in the decision making and process more so than just one meeting. Dr. Yager said that it was important that we had input from parents.
 - 1. Dr. Ernest said that it was difficult because how do you pick just one? And we also didn't want it to be so big that it wasn't functional. But to say that we don't value their input is wrong. The meetings will be public and live streamed. And that because of

how public these meetings will be that we value their opinion very highly.

- iii. Dr. Bertram asked Dr. McCormick how they went about schedule the ESSA meetings around the state.
 1. Dr. McCormick said that meetings were around the state and open to anyone who wanted to attend. That those who attended were divided into small groups that were led into very guided questions to gather input and they didn't want to leave the meetings as a free-for-all, that they wanted to maximize their time.
 2. Patrick McAlister was in charge of leading the meetings, but had small group leaders.
 3. Dr. Bertram said that ESSA meetings were very organized, that information was collected, a plan was put together and then made available publically.
 4. Dr. Bertram did ask if the meetings should be made available around the state to make sure as many voices as possible are heard.
 5. Dr. McMahon asked if the Panel could be expanded to make sure that people who feel that these pathways are near and dear are not left out of the conversation and the decision making process.
- iv. Dr. Yager's biggest concern is that teachers and counselors are being left out of the final determination of recommendation, but that they have a vote, a seat at the table.
- v. Dr. Yager then made a motion to keep the original nine panel members, but then to add a secondary classroom teacher, a secondary counselor and a secondary administrator to the Graduation Pathways Panel.
 1. Dr. Freitas made a motion to amend Dr. Yager's motion by adding a parent representative.
 2. Dr. Freitas made another motion to amend Dr. Yager's motion by adding a non-public school representative.
 3. Dr. Freitas made another motion to amend Dr. Yager's motion by adding a representative from the rural community.
 - a. Ms. Mote said that she was getting uncomfortable by throwing out the good for the perfect by continuing to add additional groups.
 - b. Dr. Freitas said that so many are being excluded, but that the Board is wanting to take action by additional members
 4. After discussion, there was agreement on a parent representative and a non-public school representative, but they would be voted on separately.
 5. However, before any of that can be done, the rules of the Board must be suspended first.
- vi. Dr. Yager then asked the Board to suspend the ordinary rules of order to change the composition of the panel.
 1. The Board voted 6-5 to suspend the rules. Dr. Ernest, Dr. Freitas, Ms. Mote, Mr. Walker and Mr. Watts voted against suspension.

- vii. Dr. Yager made a motion to add a secondary classroom teacher, a secondary counselor and a secondary administrator to the Graduation Pathways Panel.
 - 1. Dr. Freitas made a motion to amend Dr. Yager’s motion by adding a parent representative.
 - a. The Board voted 10-1 to approve a parent representative. Dr. Yager voted no.
 - 2. Dr. Freitas made a motion to amend Dr. Yager’s motion by adding a non-public school representative.
 - a. The Board voted to approve a non-public school representative 6-5. Mr. Hendry, Dr. McMahon, Mr. Walker, Mrs. Whicker and Dr. Yager voted no.
- viii. A motion was made to vote on the amended motion from Dr. Yager.
 - 1. Point of clarification from Mr. Watts that the addition of the new members will not delay the start date of the Panel meetings.
 - 2. The Board voted 11-0 on the amended motion.
- ix. [Discussion starts at 3:20:47](#)

XII. Adjournment

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

XIII. Attachment

- a. ESSA Federal Plan

Summary of Accountability Consensus Items

- 1. School Quality/Student Success Indicator for kindergarten through 8th grade**
 - Long-term goal: school climate & culture assessment
 - Short-term goal: addressing chronic absenteeism indicator that awards points for schools that have persistent attendees and improving attendees
 - A persistent attendee is a student who attends at least 96% of her enrolled days
 - An improving attendee is a student who improves attendance by at least 3% from prior to current school year
 - Goal set that at least 80% of students at a school meet the definition of either a persistent or an improving attendee
 - Indicator would only look at students enrolled at least 162 days at the school
- 2. School Quality/Student Success indicator for 9th – 12th grade**
 - Utilize current college & career readiness indicator & maintain the current goal of 25% of graduates demonstrating college & career readiness
- 3. English Language Proficiency Indicator for kindergarten through 12th grade**
 - Awards points for students who meet or exceed annual growth targets or who attain English language proficiency during the school year
 - Uses a growth to standard model to calculate growth on the WIDA assessment toward English language proficiency
- 4. Academic Progress Indicator**
 - Continue to utilize the current growth metric, including the current growth to proficiency table

5. Indicator weights

- Grades 3-8
 - Academic Achievement: 42.5%
 - Academic Progress: 42.5%
 - English Language Proficiency: 10%
 - Addressing Chronic Absenteeism: 5%
- Grades 9-12
 - Academic Achievement: 15%
 - Academic Progress: 15%
 - English Language Proficiency: 10%
 - Graduate Rate: 30%
 - CCR Achievement: 30%
 -

6. Data Practices

- A minimum N-size of 20 to be used for accountability calculations & minimum n-size of 10 for data reporting purposes
- Accountability calculations will consider data from the school year being assessed only, and will not aggregate data from previous school years for purposes of meeting the minimum n-size.