



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda

February 14, 2018

9:30 AM (ET)

Indiana Government Center South

Conference Room B

302 West Washington St.

Indianapolis, IN 46204

**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, Mr. Tony Walker, Ms. Cari Whicker, Ms. Katie Mote, and Dr. Steve Yager.

**Board Members Absent:** Dr. Maryanne McMahon

- I. **Call to Order**
  - a. Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance
- II. **Approval of the Agenda**
  - a. Mr. Watts made a motion to add the TAC report to the Discussion and Reports section of the agenda.
  - b. The Board voted to approve this motion by a voice vote.
- III. **Statement from the Chair**
  - a. Dr. McCormick thanked everyone for being patient and wished a happy Valentine's Day.
- IV. **Board Member Comments and Report**
  - a. Mr. Hendry commented on the school funding process, particularly in regards to Indianapolis Public Schools and expressed his concerns with the nearly billion dollar tax increase proposal.
    - I. Dr. Bertram clarified that this not a Board initiative, but the statement of Mr. Hendry alone.
  - b. Dr. Yager commented on the focus groups that he attended regarding graduation pathways and expressed his appreciation for the cross-section of attendees.
- V. **Approval of Minutes**
  - a. The minutes from January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 were approved by a voice vote.
- VI. **Public Comment**
  - a. Dr. Todd Bess, representing IASP, commented on the new accountability rule and expressed the association's concern regarding the growth and on-track indicators. Dr. Bertram asked if there was research that indicated that freshmen year success correlated with graduation rate. Dr. Bess responded that it may be, but he was hearing from principals that they felt they could catch freshmen up later. Dr. Yager clarified the dates of the public feedback meetings and encouraged Board members to attend those meetings.
  - b. Josh Wenning, representing the Region Eight Service Center, commented on the locally created graduation pathway. He asked for guidance on how to create the best and most widely accepted locally created pathway. Dr. Bertram asked how he

was thinking about outcomes and to what he wanted this indicator to lead. Mr. Wenning asked what specific outcomes the Board was looking for and expressed a desire to reach an outcome to give the students more options. Dr. Yager asked if there was a timeline for this pathway that could be expected. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board, mentioned that Board staff intended to get guidance to the Board by March, if possible. Dr. Bertram clarified that the point of locally created pathways was to allow districts to have flexibility and address local issues. Mr. Murphy said the document would not be meant to limit innovation, but to have a sense of what the Board was looking for in these pathways. Mr. Watts commented that the less prescriptive the Board could be, the better.

- c. Jeff Butts, representing MSD Wayne Township, expressed concern over the work of the Board, Board staff, and the general assembly in creating a cohesive plan for the success of Indiana's scholars.
- d. Erma Lardyell, interested parent and family advocate, expressed concern regarding special needs children in the public school system and the lack of knowledge on the part of parents.

## **VII. Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Success**

- a. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Charter School
  - I. Kevin Teasley, founder of the Greater Education Opportunities Foundation, gave a presentation regarding the success of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Charter School in Gary, Indiana.
    - i. The school is a K-12 school serving 934 students, 25% of which are taking college level courses on a college campus, which aims to beat poverty in education.
  - II. Dr. McCormick thanked the school for their work and asked if the school was capped with students.
    - i. Mr. Teasley responded that they were at capacity and had students taking class in the hallway. He informed that they would like to grow, but were cognizant of the budget challenges within Gary Community School and have another school that has grown out of this school. He also mentioned that many students were out in college courses so they were not taking up the facility at all times.
    - ii. Dr. McCormick asked if the facilities weren't their barrier to growth, what their barrier was.
    - iii. Mr. Teasley responded that the facility was the barrier at this point because they can't put the younger students on college campuses. He also informed believing in this non-traditional system was a barrier to the growth of the school.
    - iv. Dr. Bertram asked if there were open and vacant school buildings in Gary and why they could not be used by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Charter.
    - v. Mr. Teasley responded he believed they could not be occupied because there were liens on the buildings.
  - III. Dr. Bertram expressed he would help in the school's endeavor however possible. He then asked how many students would get scholarships to college.

- i. Mr. Teasley responded that most students are 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars, but they also receive academic scholarships.
    - ii. Bertram asked why then did the school have to pay for full college tuition and how to fix this issue because the students would receive free tuition if they waited until college instead of having the school pay for it in high school.
    - iii. Mr. Teasley responded that this was a solution, but not the only solution and that conversations need to be had about the use of the 21<sup>st</sup> scholar scholarship.
  - IV. Dr. Ernest asked Raven, a student who received her bachelor's degree while in high school, where her motivation came from to earn her degree while in high school.
    - i. Raven responded that her family valued education and seeing other students receive an associate's degree in eighth grade made her want to do that as well.
    - ii. Dr. Bertram asked Raven what she wanted to do as a career.
    - iii. Raven responded that she is currently teaching at 21<sup>st</sup> Century and would like to get her master's degree in teaching in the future.
  - V. Discussion starts at [36:53](#).

**VIII. Consent Agenda**

- a. The Board approved the Consent Agenda by a voice vote.

**IX. New Business – Action**

- a. Indiana University Bloomington Teacher Prep Program
  - I. Scott Bogan, Higher Education Preparation Specialist for the Department of Education, recommended that the Board approve Indiana University Bloomington's Teacher Preparation Program.
  - II. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the program. Dr. Freitas recused himself from the vote because he is a professor at Indiana University.
  - III. Discussion starts at [0:03](#).
- b. Indiana University East Teacher Preparation Program
  - I. Mr. Bogan recommended final approval for Indiana University East's early childhood licensure program.
  - II. Dr. Bertram asked what the demand was for early childhood education.
    - i. Dr. Jerry Wilde, an education professor from the school, responded that there were plenty of childhood education programs, but believed this program would increase the performance of these educators.
  - III. Dr. Bertram asked if people were seeking this certification currently.
    - i. Dr. Wilde responded that it was a popular minor and that the school believed if it was offered students would take it.
  - IV. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the program. Dr. Freitas recused himself from the vote because he is a professor at Indiana University.
  - V. Discussion starts at [2:24](#).
- c. University of Saint Francis Teacher Preparation Program

- I. Mr. Bogan recommended that the Board recognize the school's accreditation granted to the school by the Accreditation Council of the Council of Educator Preparation for their program.
  - II. Dr. Freitas asked if the school had advanced programs and if that was a separate visit for accreditation.
    - i. Mr. Bogan responded that the advanced programs the school offered had not been reviewed, but that would begin in two years.
  - III. Dr. Freitas also asked what the school's plan was to ensure the instruments being used met reliability and validity.
    - i. A program representative responded that the school has hired a new faculty member who worked at a large university and has brought in new information around this and with his help and the faculty, a new rubric has been designed that is holistic and been piloted in the field. After piloting this rubric, it will be reviewed and then fully implemented if successful.
  - IV. Dr. Freitas asked for more information regarding the school's clinical program.
    - i. The representative responded that the students started at a small school during their freshmen year and then by the time they graduated had at least 400 hours out in the field and at different locations.
  - V. The Board voted 10-0 to approve the program.
  - VI. Discussion starts at [4:28](#).
- d. Chokmah Freeway Accreditation
- I. Matt Voors, Executive Director for the Board, informed the Board that Board staff recommended that the Board approve the school's freeway accreditation request.
  - II. Mark Eastway, CEO and Founder of Chokmah Institute, provided more information regarding the school and asked for questions from the Board.
  - III. Dr. Freitas asked how many years the school had been operating.
    - i. Mr. Eastway responded that this was a new school and that the freeway accreditation was something new.
  - IV. Dr. Freitas asked if the school was in partnership with the Crossing.
    - i. Mr. Eastway responded that they did not have a formal partnership with the Crossing, but the Crossing mentioned they would be willing to help however possible. He also informed that the school was looking to do nearly the same thing as the Crossing and do it well, to have success in the first year.
  - V. Dr. Freitas asked why the Board wouldn't wait for a year to get some data from the school.
    - i. Mr. Eastway responded that this was a concern of the new law by creating a more facilitative process, so there would be an advantage to have access to Indiana Choice Scholarships and credit recovery. He also mentioned that the school expected that the Board would look at their numbers and be very pleased.

- VI. Dr. Freitas mentioned he had reservations about approving a school with no data and would like to wait a year until there was data in front of the Board.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that funding is very important to the targeted student population and without that funding the data provided in the first year would not be based off the group that the school hopes to reach.
- VII. Dr. Freitas asked how many students the school currently had enrolled.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that the school was not advertising until this meeting had concluded.
- VIII. Dr. McCormick asked if the Board had approved a school without data before.
  - i. Brian Murphy, Chief of Staff for the Board, mentioned that the Board had approved two programs that were not exactly the same, but we're similar. He also mentioned that Board staff made the recommendation to approve based off of the school's model based on the Crossing, their plan, and the facilities.
  - ii. Dr. Bertram asked what the consequences would be of not having freeway accreditation for year one.
  - iii. Mr. Murphy responded that without accreditation legally the school would not be able to receive choice scholarships.
- IX. Dr. Yager asked what the school's projected enrollment was and if the program was all online.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that the minimum was planned for 20 and a maximum of 35. He also informed the program was online, but the school was looking into a blended approach.
- X. Dr. Yager asked about the contracts created with other schools to receive drop-out students.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that there has not yet been a formal contract, but the school stated that this would be something they would like to participate in.
- XI. Dr. Bertram asked how the school would be funded if the school could not get Choice Scholarships.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that it would limit the type of students that the school could take in.
- XII. Dr. Ernest asked if the school had any other public partnerships.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that he had been working with the assistant to the Bishop and if this program was extended beyond the pilot, it would be an extension of the United Methodist Church, but they would like to see how the school did after a year.
- XIII. Dr. Yager asked for clarification regarding past practices in these situations and if the school could legally run with their plan without approval from the Board.
  - i. Tim Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, responded he did not have more to mention regarding past practices because this is a

relatively new statute. He also quoted the statute and informed that the Board may approve without having data in front of them.

- XIV. Dr. Bertram asked about the relationship between the school and the United Methodist Church.
  - i. Mr. Eastway responded that he has been in conversations with the church Superintendents and the church has said that they will create a partnership after seeing fruits from the school in the next year. He also informed that this practice was consistent with how the church goes about funding.
- XV. Dr. Yager clarified he was very interested in the thoughts behind the program and expressed dissatisfaction with parents who are frustrated with a school and homeschool their children in response, so he supported the mission of drop-out recovery.
- XVI. Mr. Eastway clarified that non-accreditation would affect the school's ability to contract for drop-out recovery.
- XVII. The Board voted 7-3 to deny the school's freeway accreditation.
- XVIII. Discussion starts at [10:04](#).
- e. Crosspointe Christian Academy A-F Appeal
  - I. Mr. Schultz recommended allowing the school to submit more data to correct their data entries and to allow the school to present their case.
  - II. Brent Floyd, Administrator at Crosspointe, acknowledged the errors in the reporting process and expressed the school's ignorance regarding the mathematical errors. He also expressed the fact that the school had received a null grade designation in the past years, which led to the error not being obvious prior to this.
  - III. Dr. McCormick expressed that there was still an uncertainty regarding the data.
    - i. Dr. Ernest asked Dr. McCormick what that meant.
    - ii. Dr. McCormick responded that it turned to cohorts and there was no data correcting that students were in the wrong cohort.
    - iii. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability for the Department, further explained the issues in the audit. She expressed that the Department had not received any documentation regarding the need to change the cohort the student had been placed in. Ms. Paino also clarified that the code is clear that a student may only be placed in one cohort.
    - iv. Mr. Murphy asked if that has always been the Department's stance, even in regard to New Palestine.
    - v. Ms. Paino responded that that has been the Department's stance since she has been there.
  - IV. Mr. Schultz clarified that Staff was recommending that the school be given the opportunity to submit data to the Department for correction.
  - V. Dr. Yager asked how long the school has known about the errors and why the data has not yet been submitted to the Department.

- i. Ms. Paino clarified that the school has the ability to submit data during the audit and the appeal window. There had not been any data submitted to support the appeal during the appeal process.
  - VI. Dr. Freitas asked if this was the school's final appeal, meaning if the school submitted data to the Department and the data was not accepted, would the school be able to appeal back again to the Board.
    - i. Mr. Floyd responded the school understood the process was over, but they would like to have the opportunity to submit the data.
  - VII. Dr. Bertram asked if there was a question around timeline or if it was an issue of data accuracy.
    - i. Mr. Floyd responded that this was an issue around data accuracy because this would change the graduation rate in the next few years.
  - VIII. Mr. Schultz informed that this was the last stage of the appeal, but not the last appeal. He informed if they had a question regarding the data they could go further in this issue. He also clarified that the Staff was recommending the school be able to submit the data to the Department.
  - IX. The Board voted 9-1 to approve the appeal; Superintendent McCormick voted no.
  - X. Discussion starts at [33:11](#).
- f. Ambassador Christian Academy Choice Scholarship Waiver
  - I. Danielle Graham-Harris, Principal of Ambassador Christian Academy, asked the Board for a waiver regarding the schools letter grade designation and a delay of consequences due to the schools new changes in practices.
  - II. Mr. Schultz recommended not granting the waiver because the school has remained at the same grade level for two years, which is what is proscribed by the statute.
    - i. Dr. Ernest asked if the Board agreed with Staff's recommendation no motion would be necessary.
    - ii. Mr. Schultz responded there would be a motion to adopt the recommendation.
  - III. Dr. Bertram asked how many schools were included in the school and how many students were in the school and how many were there by choice.
    - i. Ms. Graham Harris responded that it was currently one school that has 205 students in grades K-8, 5 of which were not there by choice.
  - IV. Dr. Bertram made a motion to approve the school's waiver.
  - V. Dr. Yager asked if the waiver was disapproved would the school lose their scholarships.
    - i. Mr. Schultz responded that the school would not lose their current scholarships, but would not be able to take additional scholarship students.
  - VI. Dr. Yager asked if there was any past practices in this arena.
    - i. Mr. Schultz responded that there was limited past practice in this area, but in the past the Board has denied the waiver.

- VII. Dr. Bertram asked if it mattered where these students were from, meaning a major consideration was that a majority of these students were coming from Gary Community Schools.
- VIII. State Senator Eddie Melton (D-3) came forward to express his support for allowing the school another year to address issues before disapproving the waiver now.
- IX. Dr. Freitas asked how much flexibility was within the statute and asked if the language in the memo was statutory.
  - i. Mr. Schultz responded that this was statutory language.
  - ii. Dr. Freitas clarified if the statute needed to be followed, changed, or if the Board could ignore statute.
  - iii. Mr. Schultz replied the basis for the recommendation was the statute.
  - iv. Dr. Freitas further asked how the school had demonstrated academic improvement, which the statute requires.
  - v. Ms. Graham-Harris responded that the school has shown academic improvement in growth in ELA and math.
  - vi. Dr. Freitas asked how the school was doing in proficiency.
  - vii. Ms. Graham-Harris responded that they were moving in the right direction for proficiency.
- X. Mr. Walker stated that students could have academic improvement from year to year that is not reflected in the standardized tests, so grading the students solely on the accountability grade was improper.
- XI. Ms. Mote requested an articulation of the definition of academic improvement, so that in the future in this same situation there can be a standard used.
  - i. Mr. Schultz responded that the issue presented is that there is no bright-line rule for this.
  - ii. Dr. Bertram asked if the school had had any academic indicators in which there had been academic improvement because the appeal process was not dependent upon the letter grade, but looking at the factors.
  - iii. Mr. Walker followed up with clarifying that there is potential to have improvement within a letter grade designation.
- XII. Ms. Mote asked if there was a remedy other than making a decision today to get more information to create an equitable and consistent standard.
- XIII. Ms. Graham-Harris explained the school also used acuity predictive assessments as an academic indicator.
- XIV. Mr. Watts asked what the impact would be if the Board waited on the appeal granting or waiver in order to receive additional data.
- XV. Mr. Hendry stated that a policy to provide more guidance to schools regarding the criteria needed for academic improvement and the appeal process would be beneficial.
- XVI. The Board voted 6-4 to deny the motion to approve the school's waiver, and asked the school to bring back more information at the next meeting.



- XVII. The Board recommended that the school submit data to show academic improvement and then come back before the Board in 30 days.
  - i. Dr. Freitas suggested the Board create the criteria for academic improvement in advance of the school coming back so the school knows what the Board is looking for.
  - ii. Mr. Hendry recommended creating a committee to work on this issue.
  - iii. Mr. Watts and Dr. Bertram stated they did not want to have strict guidelines to follow because this is a case by case analysis.

XVIII. Discussion starts at [8:30](#).

g. Election of Secretary

- I. Dr. Yager nominated Dr. Ernest for the position of Secretary.
- II. The Board voted 10-0 to approve Dr. Ernest as Secretary.
- III. Discussion starts at [46:57](#).

h. Gary Schools and Corporation Grade Placements

- I. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Department of Education, gave a presentation regarding the response analysis from Pearson on testing procedures taking place in the field especially within the Gary School Corporation.
  - i. Insufficient evidence was given to substantiate whether a test administration violation occurred in any of the schools in the corporation, except McCullough.
  - ii. The Department did a review of the procedures after hearing of irregularities by interviewing staff, which led to a finding of proper procedures not being followed by staff.
  - iii. The Department then did a further systematic review, which resulted in the findings that McCullough did not develop or use a formal test schedule, staff deviated from proscribed test administration procedures, and systematic patterns of irregularities.
- II. Due to the totality of the circumstances, the Department recommended invalidating all of the test scores for the Spring 2017 assessment.
- III. Dr. Yager asked who from the Department was involved in this effort.
  - i. Ms. Flores responded that there were aspects that the Assessment Team managed and have worked very closely with other Department teams knowing the aspects that needed to be considered.
  - ii. Dr. Yager thanked the individuals for their work in this effort.
- IV. Ms. Paino stated that the Department was unable to calculate an accountability grade for the 2016 – 2017 school year due to the lack of sufficient data in regards to testing for McCullough school and therefore requested Gary School be placed in the recommended categories.
- V. The board voted 10-0 to approve the grade placement of Gary Schools and Corporation.
- VI. Discussion starts at [47:57](#).

**X. Discussion and Reports**

a. Assessment Update

- I. Dr. Flores gave a presentation regarding assessment updates.
  - i. The WIDA and ISTAR Part 1 windows are currently open and neither exam has resulted in any significant concerns from the field.
  - ii. ISTEP+ Part 1 will be for grades 3-8 and 10 for those needing it for the first time or retesting.
  - iii. There has been increased online participation, especially in regards to ILEARN.
  - iv. Discussion starts at [59:42](#).
- b. Accountability Rule Timeline
  - I. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board, gave an update regarding the accountability rule suggested timeline.
    - i. The notice of public hearing has been published in the Indianapolis Star and the Register.
    - ii. Staff has arranged for five separate meetings across the state to accommodate public comments with a court reporter to give the comments to the Board more quickly.
    - iii. Staff also recommended two meetings for work sessions to make changes based on the comments received at the public hearings.
  - II. Dr. Ernest asked about the recommended work sessions and what was planned for those dates.
    - i. Mr. Ranney responded that these dates were recommended based off the Board's past practices and the time was to be left to the Board's discretion.
  - III. Mr. Hendry recommended pushing back the final vote to approve or disapprove to the May meeting and instead having more discussion during the April meeting.
    - i. Mr. Ranney informed that pushing the vote back until the May meeting would delay the effective date of the rule until the following school year. April 4<sup>th</sup> is the last day the Board can take action for the rule to be effective for the 2017-2018 school year.
    - ii. Dr. Ernest asked if April 4<sup>th</sup> was the last possible day or if it was the last day because it was the day on which the meeting was taking place.
    - iii. Mr. Ranney informed that the 6<sup>th</sup> is the real deadline, but Staff needed time to put together materials to submit to the Attorney General.
  - IV. Dr. Yager thanked the staff for having public hearings around the state and asked if a compilation of each meeting could be created and categorized to help the Board members review feedback from those who testify.
    - i. Mr. Ranney responded that each Board member would receive all of the comments and then be categorized.
  - V. Discussion starts at [1:01:34](#).
- c. SBOE Technical Advisory Committee Update
  - I. Mr. Schultz gave a brief update regarding the core assessments used in teacher licensing and the information found by the TAC Committee.

- i. Individuals came before the Board previously and asked that the Board review the core exams.
- II. Dr. Chad Buckendahl, Indiana Technical Advisory Committee member, gave a presentation regarding the core assessment program used for teacher licensing.
  - i. TAC, in this review, is looking to see that all the tests in the program can stand on their own in terms of evidence to support the decisions made about individual candidates. Evidence is usually looked at in the sources of validity, with respect to the content specifications and that the actual content is related to the job being performed, reliability of the scores, the scorers, and the decisions made about passing or failing, fairness, from a legal standpoint, and standard setting, meaning the process by which a standard passing score is set.
  - ii. After reviewing information for the past 10 months, TAC believes there is sufficient information to support continued use of the assessments, but there are areas that have been found where the assessment can be strengthened for continual improvement.
- III. Dr. Ernest asked if Dr. Buckendahl was one of the individuals who had a complaint regarding the core assessment exams, would he have concerns regarding the validity of the exam being the determiner of being able to take a job.
  - i. Dr. Buckendahl responded if he was a failing candidate who did not understand test development and validation, he would question the exam with the thought of the training program should have prepared me for this exam, but the difficult thing to understand is if the training program is not aligned directly to the expectation of the assessment, then the probability of success declines rapidly. A licensure test is not designed to be an indicator of a program's instruction, but to indicate that someone has the entry level skills in practice.
- IV. Mr. Watts asked if Mr. Buckendahl considered the State's current core test to be valid and reliable.
  - i. Mr. Buckendahl responded that since there are 60 different exams in this program, you can't generalize everything, but TAC believes that there is information to support the use and decisions that are currently being made by individuals for those programs.
- V. Dr. Bertram asked if a school reported that 30% of its students passed the Bar exam, for example, would that be a reflection on the school and if decisions about that school were made based on the passage rate of the Bar exam.
  - i. Dr. Buckendahl responded that in some cases decisions are made in these regards, but this depends on the jurisdiction. This can be an indicator of school success, but other information regarding the context would need to be known first.

- ii. Dr. Bertram further asked if it would be reasonable for colleges and universities to align their curriculum with the entrance or licensure exams.
  - iii. Dr. Buckendahl said he believed it would be reasonable, but he has seen higher education be unreasonable before. There would probably be an increase in the passage of the exams if there was an alignment in curriculum and the exams.
- VI. Dr. Ernest clarified that Dr. Buckendahl, knowing what he knows about the exam and the program, would recommend an individual seek another career if they could not pass the core exam after multiple attempts.
  - i. Dr. Buckendahl responded that if someone has taken the exam 10 times and still does not know what it takes to succeed on the exam, then he would question career path. The information about this exam is public and has been indicated that the exam aligns with the practice.
  - ii. Mr. Watts asked for clarification regarding the fact that each individual exam was valid and reliable.
  - iii. Dr. Buckendahl responded that each exam has to be able to stand on its own. Each test has shown to be valid in that there is evidence that this information is valid for an entry level practitioner in Indiana to know. TAC has asked for additional evidence about the program to strengthen the link between the exam and practice. He also informed that some of these exams do not meet the acceptable standard for reliability, but this can be associated with the very small sample sizes of some of the programs. Although lower than they would like, the reliability is not so low as to suggest that the scores could not be used.
  - iv. Mr. Walker asked if TAC has made a determination that any of the exams for the programs do not currently stand on their own.
  - v. Mr. Buckendahl responded that they have not identified any exam that could not stand on its own.
- VII. Dr. Yager asked if an individual who was licensed in another state would have to take the exam if they moved to Indiana.
  - i. Dr. McCormick responded that Indiana has reciprocity so they would not have to take the exam.
  - ii. Dr. Yager further asked if these exams were similar to Indiana's exam or measured the same thing.
  - iii. Dr. Buckendahl responded that they did not do any type of cross-state comparisons, but there are only two vendors in this space.
- VIII. Dr. Yager further asked if there were specific tests that were failed more often than other tests and whether there should be a focus on those tests rather than an overall general statement.
  - i. Dr. Buckendahl responded that he wanted to dissuade people from believing that pass or fail rates should influence policy decisions because this is largely a function of the ability of distribution of those who sign up to take the test. Instead, encourage the

consideration that the purpose of the core assessments is licensure and public protection and look to see which exam is being taken the most and think about that exam as this has the most potential for public impact and work through the system from there.

- IX. Dr. Ernest asked if there was data involving the pass rate after receiving remedial materials.
  - i. A Department representative responded that this data was not available, but they did have information regarding multiple testing.
  - ii. Mrs. Whicker also informed that there was minimal free remedial information online because the exam is specific to Indiana.
- X. Dr. Ernest asked if Indiana was using the right product.
  - i. Dr. Buckendahl responded that there were only two options for products to use, so the question is to what extent the product aligns with the entry level practice of teaching in Indiana. In using the current system, it is has been adapted to Indiana's needs. He also challenged the notion of availability of remediation materials because the purpose of the exam is not about education curriculum.
  - ii. Dr. Ernest followed up with asking if all the things outlined in the memo are done, the TAC team has confidence in the exams.
  - iii. Dr. Buckendahl responded the TAC team absolutely believed this would strengthen the confidence in the exam.
- XI. Dr. Ernest asked how the vendor would be held accountable to make these changes or how the process to make the changes would happen.
  - i. A Department representative responded that the vendor has already begun a number of the changes recommended, but a lot of these items will take a long time to complete. TAC will oversee the timeline created and ensure completion of these items.
- XII. Dr. Bertram asked if there were any other reasonable indicators that would create a process for people to get licensed who do not pass the exam.
  - i. Mr. Buckendahl responded that other states have offered alternate certification or a temporary credential in order to practice with a condition that they pass a state specific test. The challenge with having different processes is creating parallel systems that have to demonstrate comparability from an equity standpoint.
- XIII. Discussion starts at [1:13:44](#).

**XI. Adjournment**

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