



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Minutes
January 10, 2018
Indiana Government Center South
Auditorium
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. B.J. Watts, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Dr. Freitas, Dr. Maryanne McMahan, Mr. Tony Walker, 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. Mr. Hendry made a motion to move the proposed accountability rule item from a new action item to the discussion agenda with no action to be made at this meeting in order to have more discussion regarding the proposed added language.

- i. Ms. Mote asked what impact delaying the action item beyond this meeting would have.

I. Tim Schultz, General Counsel for the State Board of Education, responded that pushing back the vote would push back the overall rulemaking process, which may delay when the new rule would become effective.

II. Dr. Bertram further asked if this was to start the rulemaking process and to provide the opportunity to begin accepting public comment.

III. Mr. Schultz responded that this was correct.

- ii. Dr. Yager asked what the implementation plan and timeline would be if the rule was voted on at this meeting.

I. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the State Board of Education, responded that the notice of public intent to adopt a rule was published that morning. He also mentioned that pushing this date back would likely result in the rule not being applicable for the 2018-19 school year.

- iii. Dr. McMahan asked if it was possible to have further discussion and to move forward without including the newly added language in the proposal.

I. Mr. Ranney responded that the language written is a draft recommendation of the proposed rule for the Board to consider, but the Board has the authority to accept, reject, or modify the language. He also expressed that if the proposed rule was pushed

- back, it may result in schools being graded based off of the current A-F accountability system for the 2018-19 school year.
- II. Mrs. Whicker asked if there was a legal problem with continuing to grade schools based on the current accountability system.
 - III. Mr. Ranney responded that there was no issue with continuing to use the current accountability system for the 2018-19 school year.
- iv. Ms. Mote asked if there could be clarification regarding the timeline of when the Board received the rule and the period of time that informal feedback was solicited in order to dispel any misunderstandings. The timeline slides were posted.
 - v. Mr. Watts asked what the difference would be between publishing the rule as it is written in the proposal and then amending the rule from that point, and starting from what is in the ESSA plan.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that the Board simply needs to approve language that could be published in order to begin receiving public comment. He also clarified that there would be ample time to amend the proposed rule based on public comment.
 - vi. Dr. Bertram asked what the timeline would be to make adjustments to the rule after receiving public comment.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that the Board would have as much time as it needs, but they would be working against the 2018-19 school year if they wanted to have a new rule in place by then. Mr. Schultz also informed that after public comment had been taken and incorporated, a final draft would be presented to the Board for Board approval.
 - vii. Dr. Freitas clarified that he received the rule in November and had given his feedback at that point. He asked if other Board members had also given feedback at that point.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that a large amount of feedback from the Board was reflected in the draft. Dr. McCormick also informed that the “green” language in the draft was language that had been amended from the ESSA plan.
 - viii. Mr. Hendry informed that he would like to have a full Board discussion before the language was proposed in order to have a starting point for discussion and public comment without amended language.
 - ix. Dr. Yager asked where it was written that the accountability model must be changed and implemented for the 2018-19 school year and when the Department saw the amended language.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that the model did not need to be changed, but the idea expressed by the Board in July was that it wanted to amend the language for the next school year. Mr. Ranney also informed that the Department and the Board received the first draft on November 16th and the second draft which had minor changes to reflect the federal ESSA plan on December 22nd.
 - II. Dr. Yager replied with language from a study that found that Indiana’s ESSA plan had been one of the 10 best in the country and asked why the model would be changed if Indiana was identified as having one of the best models.

- III. Mr. Walker mentioned that the current accountability model did not follow the guidelines put forward for the growth model.
- IV. Ms. Mote further asked how Graduation Pathways would change and affect the current accountability model.
- V. Mr. Ranney responded that the College and Career Readiness indicator would need to be changed to reflect the Graduation Pathways because they require nearly the same measurements.
- x. Dr. Ernest clarified that this process has been very transparent and inclusive of Board members.
- xi. The Board voted to 6-5 to deny Mr. Hendry's motion.
- b. The agenda was approved by a voice vote.

III. **Approval of Minutes**

- a. The minutes from December 6 were approved by a voice vote.

IV. **Statement from the Chair**

- a. Dr. McCormick thanked the Department of Education's staff for their efforts throughout the past year that she has been Superintendent. She also thanked the field for inputting their voices in the past actions.

V. **Board Member Comments and Reports**

- a. Dr. Ernest commended the Board on being mentioned by the Governor in his Address and thanked the Horizon Education Alliance for their efforts to bring all stakeholders together in regards to education.

VI. **Public Comment**

- a. Sue Dillon, president of the Central Time Coalition, offered information regarding the sunlight schedule and its adversity towards students. Ms. Dillon asked the Board members if they had any questions. Dr. Freitas asked if there was any data regarding how the time change would affect economics or have any other adverse impacts. She responded that there is no advantage to working under Eastern Time, but there is a definite disadvantage due to the time difference between Indiana and states in the Western time zone. Mr. Hendry offered his support for this initiative. Dr. Bertram asked if there was any data comparing school safety from the time before implementing Eastern time and Central time. She answered that the accidents happening are happening in the dark and there is not much data backing this.
- b. John O'Neil, representing ISTA, expressed concerns regarding the diminished weight that the proposed accountability rule placed on the growth calculation. Dr. Bertram asked if he saw the growth indicator being used only in regards to standardized testing or if he believed this indicator could be used in other areas. Mr. O'Neil responded ISTA members have long had an issue with the reliance on standardized testing, but want to allow students the opportunity to show they have improved in other areas. Dr. Bertram further asked if this was only pertaining to growth and if this was only a high school issue. Mr. O'Neil responded that growth should be used for all grades.
- c. Mr. Walker stated that he appreciated that the proposed accountability model reduced the weight placed on standardized testing, and asked if he wanted to reduce the weight placed on standardized testing or keep the current weight on growth. Mr. O'Neil responded that they supported the reduction of weight placed on standardized testing, but would like to still see the growth metric used.

VII. **Best Practices - Innovations in Education - Student Successes**

- a. None.
- VIII. **Consent Agenda**
 - a. The Board approved the Consent Agenda by a voice vote.
- IX. **Adjudications**
 - a. None
- X. **New Business – Action**
 - a. Seventh-Day Adventist Freeway Accreditation
 - i. Nicole Matson, Superintendent for Seventh-Day Adventist Christian Academy, asked for immediate granting of freeway accreditation of a brand new school in Evansville, which would serve primarily Hispanic and underprivileged children with a math and science emphasis.
 - ii. Dr. Hendry asked what statutes would be waived in granting the freeway accreditation.
 - I. Alicia Kielmovich, Senior Director of Policy & Legislation for the Indiana State Board of Education, responded that freeway accreditation is a form of state approved accreditation in which schools can be immediately accredited by the Board. Granting this accreditation would waive certain curricular materials. Ms. Kielmovitch further recommended approval of this action item, based on data, history, and values practice that prove that this school, and the network of schools in which it is affiliated, are effective and support student achievement and will most likely yield good results for the students in Evansville. She also said the only concern she had was around the school’s math data in their current voucher schools, which will be changed in the new system to be aligned with Indiana standards.
 - II. Ms. Matson offered that the school system had their own curriculum built into their school and that the school was working to create a new math system. To do this, she was currently gleaning ideas from successful schools and the school had hired someone to align standards with Indiana’s standards, which should occur within the next month. She also expressed that the small size of the schools made weighing test scores very difficult.
 - iii. The Board voted 11- 0 to approve the recommendation for immediate freeway accreditation of Seventh-Day Adventist Christian Academy.
 - iv. Discussion starts at [1:04:12](#).
 - b. Calumet College of St. Joseph Teacher Preparation Program
 - i. Scott Bogan, Higher Education Preparation Specialist, stated that the Department reviews all new teacher licensure programs prior to recommending them to the Board for approval and after this review, the Department has decided to recommend three teacher licensure programs.
 - ii. Dr. Freitas asked if the program met and aligned with Indiana standards. He further asked for more information regarding the school’s clinical experience program and use of case studies.
 - I. Dr. Dawn Greene, Director of Field Experience at Calumet College of St. Joseph, replied that the clinical experience was intended to provide students with an opportunity to get experience in the field as soon as possible. She also informed that students

spend over 400 hours out in the field before they graduate from the program. Dr. Greene expressed the importance of teachers creating relationships with their students in this program.

- iii. Dr. Bertram asked about in-service teachers and their access to this program and if the school kept retention records of their past students.
 - I. Dr. Greene responded this would absolutely be available to in-service teachers and allow them to have the ability to experience clinical hours and that the school does attempt to keep the information on past students.
- iv. The Board voted 11 – 0 to approve the recommendation for accreditation of Calumet College of St. Joseph.
- v. Discussion starts at [1:15:14](#).
- c. Christel House Teacher Preparation Program
 - i. Dr. Freitas asked if this program would be opened to students beyond their particular school.
 - I. Carey Dahncke, Head of Schools at Christel House, responded that students enter into a one year paid agreement with the school to do an apprenticeship and after this they have the option to stay on with the school.
 - ii. Dr. Freitas asked Mr. Bogan if the schools being recommended were required to meet national accreditation standards as well.
 - I. Mr. Bogan responded that the schools would seek national accreditation and while doing so would be reviewed annually by the state to see if they conformed to national standards. He also mentioned this recommendation was for three-year accreditation.
 - II. Dr. Bertram then asked why there was a three-year accreditation recommended for the school and if this model presented risks.
 - III. Mr. Bogan responded that the Department liked to give all new teacher preparation programs three-year accreditation so they can be visited annually. He also informed this model did not provide the same risks for this particular school and that this recommendation would be brought back after the three-year period.
 - iii. Ms. Mote complimented the program on creating an innovative way for people to get into the field.
 - iv. The Board voted 11 – 0 to approve the recommendation for accreditation of Christel House Teacher Preparation Program.
 - v. Discussion begins at [1:21:36](#).
- d. University of Southern Indiana Teacher Preparation Program
 - i. Dr. Freitas asked about the school’s internship program and the required dissertation.
 - I. Dr. Paul Theobald, Professor of Education, responded that the program was 6 months long and that it involved a mentor superintendent acting alongside the intern. He also informed that the dissertation was action-based.
 - ii. Dr. Bertram asked how the students in this program would gain exposure to other superintendents and reiterated the importance of having experience with multiple superintendents.

- I. Dr. Mitchell, Dean of Education, responded that this may be done through introducing guest speakers and incentivizing superintendents from the state to participate.
 - II. Dr. Theobald also mentioned the program encourages students to join organizations and gain exposure in that form.
 - iii. Dr. Yager asked if the superintendent mentors were reimbursed.
 - I. Dr. Mitchell responded that there was typically some sort of reimbursement for superintendents and that there was a small reimbursement for cooperating teachers.
 - iv. The Board voted 11 – 0 to approve the recommendation for accreditation of University of Southern Indiana Teacher Preparation Program.
 - v. Discussion starts at [1:29:47](#).
- e. Resolution Recognizing Beech Grove City Schools
 - i. Dr. Cole thanked the Board for allowing the eight exemplary school districts to be brought before the Board and recognized Beech Grove City Schools for doing exemplary work.
 - ii. Steve Bair, Assistant Superintendent of Beech Grove City Schools, thanked the Board for this recognition and offered his excitement regarding this program and expressed the fidelity with which it has been implemented.
 - iii. Dr. McCormick offered her support and commended the school corporation’s success.
 - iv. The Board voted 11 - 0 to approve the Resolution. Dr. Bertram was not present during this vote.
 - v. Discussion begins at [1:41:17](#).
- f. A-F Appeals
 - i. Booker T. Washington
 - I. Karen Goeller, Deputy Superintendent of Vigo County Schools, gave a presentation appealing the school’s D letter grade based on the fact that the school is serving alternative students.
 - II. Dr. Tammy Rowshandel, Principal, stated that the school currently had 63 students and 5 teachers. She also requested to receive no letter grade for the current school year, as this has been the practice in prior years.
 - III. Mr. Timothy Schultz, General Counsel for the Indiana State Board of Education, offered that this Board approved the appeal in a prior year.
 - IV. Dr. Bertram asked about the type of school this was and how many schools have the same type of student populations. He further asked if a school does not receive a letter grade, how it will be held accountable.
 - I. Dr. McCormick responded that she believed this issue had been addressed by the Attorney General’s Office and there is currently not a lot of flexibility for “special population” schools. If this Board wanted to change the accountability model for these schools they could, but that is not currently the law.

- V. Dr. McCormick asked if this was an exclusively “special population” school.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that the Attorney General did not find this to be an exclusively “special population” school. Dr. McCormick clarified that the schools on the Consent Agenda in the past were found to be exclusively “special population”.
 - VI. Dr. Freitas asked if any other accommodations had been made for “special population” schools. He further asked if the Board had the authority to accept or reject the recommendations made regarding how to proceed in these cases.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded they had done this in the past. He also informed that by law, the Board has the final say on this matter.
 - VII. Dr. Freitas stated that he believed the Board should create a definition or set of criteria for “special population” schools in order to treat all schools fairly. He then asked what the implications would be of delaying this decision until a definition has been created.
 - I. Brian Murphy, Indiana State Board of Education Chief of Staff, recommended following prior precedent for this accountable year, and then continuing to look at this issue going forward.
 - VIII. Dr. Yager expressed concern over the practice, protocol, and procedure being used to hold these schools accountable.
 - IX. Dr. Bertram asked if the school had been informed in the previous appeal that it may receive a letter grade for the next school year.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that legally nothing had changed from the previous year besides the procedure for filing an appeal.
 - X. Dr. Yager asked if the school had received in writing the appeal process after they had been denied by the Attorney General’s office.
 - I. Ms. Goeller responded that the school had only appealed the first time and assumed their first appeal was sufficient.
 - XI. The Board voted 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- ii. McLean Education Center
- I. Karen Goeller, Deputy Superintendent of Vigo County Schools Corporation, offered that McLean is a non-traditional school that provides student’s that have not had academic success due to academic challenges schooling opportunities and asked for a null grade consideration.
 - II. Bruce Lautenschlager, Dean of Students at McLean, offered that the program was a non-traditional program that is adjusted to the student’s needs, which typically means that the students are not in the school long enough to satisfy accountability criteria.

- III. Mr. Schultz offered that this is also a school with a unique student population which the Board considered previously and ultimately determined that the school should receive a null grade.
 - IV. Dr. Bertram asked if the hearing officer could come from other agencies.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that it is not specified who may act as the hearing officer.
 - II. Dr. McCormick then asked what the responsibility of the hearing officer is in these cases.
 - III. Mr. Schultz responded that the hearing officer is working on behalf of the Board to determine what the recommended decision is based off the applicable law.
 - V. The Board voted 10 - 1 to approve the school's appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- iii. Community Baptist Christian School
- I. Principal Jeff VanderKooi asked for the Board to reconsider the school's A-F grade. He offered that the school filed an appeal of their D grade, which was denied and then followed up with an objection. He also shared that the school has gone through turmoil throughout the past year, which led to many students leaving the school. He also mentioned that the school is held accountable in a number of ways and that the school is being harmed due to the lack of students in the tenth grade.
 - II. Dr. McCormick asked if there had been a submittal of data during the hearing officer's process of reviewing the appeal.
 - I. Mr. VanderKooi responded that he was unaware if the data had been considered in the appeal.
 - III. Mr. Schultz informed that the school's points of contention involve the accountability model and how it is being applied to a small school and also the question of additional data being considered. He recommended that the data be allowed to be submitted to the Board for their consideration.
 - IV. Dr. Freitas asked if the argument being used is that there are not enough students for the accountability to be properly calculated and is there was a question regarding a timely submission of materials.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that this was correct and the question has become whether the Board wants to consider this most recently available information.
 - II. Dr. Freitas asked if the most recent data was taken and applied to this school, would the school's grade change.
 - III. Mr. Schultz responded he was unaware, but recommended the Department take this information into account and recalculate the grade.
 - V. Mr. Walker offered that this school clearly does not fit the model created and needs to be addressed on an individual basis. He asked if there was any other type of solution to address the school's problem of receiving a no points for a certain domain.

- I. Mr. Schultz responded that this could also be approached by a new regulation, but currently all the Board could do is grant the school what it has requested.
- VI. The Board voted 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- VII. Dr. Bertram then asked for clarification on the fact that the school does not have enough students to determine a domain score.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that the school does not have enough students in tenth grade for that calculation to be made.
 - II. Mr. Murphy clarified that there is a distinction between not having enough students in the domain size, where in that instance, there would be an aggregation backwards to prior years and if that did not result in a sufficient n-size, then the school would not receive a grade for that indicator.
 - III. Dr. Bertram further asked if the current accountability model fit this school.
 - IV. Mr. Schultz answered legally the school fits within the model.
 - V. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability for the Indiana Department of Education, offered that small schools were taken into consideration through language such as aggregation and adjustment of indicator weights. In this case, there was enough data to calculate an A-F grade and clarified that this was not an uncommon situation.
- VIII. Mr. Walker asked if the Board had any authority to stray beyond the language of the rule, which made schools use aggregation to fit within the rule.
 - I. Mr. Schultz responded that the Board’s authority is to accurately place schools based off of accountability data and other objective factors, meaning the Board has the authority to place a school where it believes is the most accurate placement for that school.
- IX. Ms. Mote asked if the Board was comfortable with giving the previous school a D grade or if they felt they had an obligation to give a remedy to this particular school.
 - I. Mr. Schultz offered that this issue could possibly be remedied within the current rule making.
 - II. Dr. Bertram agreed, believing the issue needed to be fixed, but expressed concern over how this could be applied to schools in similar situations.
- iv. East Noble High School
 - I. Assistant Superintendent Becca Lamon asked the Board for a change in letter grade due to the fact that 6 foreign exchange students were kept in the graduation rate. Exclusion of these students would change the school’s grade from a B to an A and the corporation’s grade from a C to a B.

- II. The Board voted to 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- v. Whites Jr.-Sr. High School
 - I. Principal Troy Friedersdorf thanked the Board for their service and asked for reconsideration of the school’s F grade by following prior precedent and allowing the school to receive a null grade. He also gave information regarding the transient at-risk population of the school and the reasoning given for the previous null grades.
 - II. Senator Andy Zay offered that the students at this school have seen failure throughout their lives and putting a school such as this one within this model is not a solution.
 - III. Mr. Schultz shared that the Board had previously given the school a null grade and that the school’s situation has not changed.
 - IV. The Board voted to 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- vi. Gary Middle College
 - I. Kevin Teasley, founder of Gary Middle College, offered that Gary Middle College had previously been designated as an adult high school and was looking for the same designation this year considering the school served 85% adult students.
 - II. Dr. McCormick asked if the school was asking to not be held accountable for the students who were not adults.
 - I. Mr. Teasley responded that he was asking for the Board to follow the law, which stated that if a majority of the students were over 18, or out of graduation cohort, the school would be held accountable under the adult accountability model.
 - II. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability for the Indiana Department of Education, pointed out that the school’s submitted data indicated that the school had 21.6% under 18 population and 78.4% adult population. She also offered that the funding statute provided separate funding amounts for the school’s adult and under 18 population. Accordingly, the Department calculated accountability differently for the adult students and the under 18 students.
 - III. Mr. Murphy clarified that if the appeal was granted, all students would be held accountable, but under the adult accountability model as opposed to the traditional model.
 - III. The Board voted to 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- vii. Paddock View Residential Center
 - I. Paddock View Residential representatives shared that the school was very similar to the previous schools voted on and that the school has received a null grade up until this point. He also offered that all students in Paddock View had been placed there by the courts, Department of Child Services, or the probation department, with a hope of being integrated back into their previous school system. The school also has a turnover rate of 75% and therefore

- could only be held accountable under the graduation rate indicator. For these reasons, the school requested a null designation.
- II. Dr. Freitas thanked the school for the service they were providing and expressed the need to include schools such as this in creating a definition for “special population” schools.
 - III. The Board voted to 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- viii. TROY Center
- I. A TROY Center representative shared that the school is a very small alternative school serving students from 6th – 12th grade. The representative cited Indiana Code, which indicated that schools that have contracts with local school systems should not be placed within the accountability model. She offered that TROY Center contracts with local schools to take in students who have not done well in the traditional setting with a hope of improving the students and transitioning them back into a traditional school. For those reasons, TROY Center asked for a null grade designation.
 - II. Dr. McCormick encouraged the school to submit signed contracts to avoid this process in the future.
 - III. The Board voted to 10 – 1 to approve the school’s appeal. Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- ix. Discussion starts at [17:38](#).
- g. CSUSA Transition (Dr. Ernest stepped out of the room before conversation began, and did not re-enter until the Board voted.
- i. Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Performance and Transformation, recommended that the Board approve use of an expert consultant to kick start the process of transitioning turnaround academies currently operated by Charter Schools USA out of state intervention.
 - ii. Dr. McCormick asked how this would be funded and why this was being done so far in advance.
 - I. Mr. Sandlin responded that this would be funded through the Board’s budget. He also expressed that it is important to give the children, families, and staff a clear vision of what is going to happen after 2020.
 - II. Mr. Hendry asked if the transition plan was to not have the school be under the Board’s supervision.
 - I. Mr. Sandlin responded the plan was to transition them out of turnaround status.
 - III. Dr. McCormick asked if the contracted person would be exclusively working with these three schools or if they would work with other schools that were in the same situation.
 - I. Mr. Sandlin responded this would be a contract for one year and the person would work exclusively with these three schools. He also informed that these three schools were the only schools being operated by an outside management school.

- IV. Mr. Watts applauded Mr. Sandlin and Charter Schools USA for getting out in front of this issue and allowing teachers to focus on what they need to be focusing on.
- V. Mr. Walker clarified that IPS has indicated that they do not want at least two of these schools to return and asked what the other options were.
 - I. Mr. Sandlin responded that IPS has taken official board action stating that they will shut down two of the schools if they are returned to the corporation. He also expressed that the options were to direct the school to seek charter recognition, to return the school to its original corporation, or to select another option under the original list, only two of which remove it from turnaround.
 - II. Mr. Walker further asked what seeking charter recognition would look like.
 - III. Mr. Sandlin responded he believed the school would then seek a charter just as other schools who seek charter do. He also read the statute, which indicated the school would be directed to apply as a charter school.
- VI. The Board voted 10 – 0 to approve the CSUSA Transition. Dr. Ernest was not present during the vote nor the conversation.
- iii. Discussion starts at [0:02](#).
- h. Proposed Accountability Rule
 - i. Steve Baker, Principal of Bluffton High School, offered his thoughts and concerns regarding the new recommended accountability rule. He was especially concerned about removing the growth indicator from the model.
 - ii. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board of Education, gave a presentation regarding the proposed changes to the accountability rule for the 2018-2019 school year and the timeline that initiated this process.
 - I. The Notice of Intent to Adopt a Rule had been published that morning. Public hearings could be held after this date and Board staff encouraged the Board to hold a number of public hearings to gain as much public comment as possible.
 - II. In July 2017, the Board asked Board staff to begin the rulemaking process. In August, working groups discussed creating a new rule with the anticipation that it would not mirror the ESSA Accountability Rule exactly. From that point on, Board members recommended changes and these changes were incorporated into the drafted proposed rule.
 - III. In November, a draft was circulated to the Board and Board input was incorporated into the rule.
 - iii. Mr. Hendry asked if the Board could begin by adopting language that was consistent with the ESSA Accountability Rule.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that no official action has been taken by the Board at this point and if that was where the Board wanted to begin that they could do so.

- II. Mr. Hendry then explained that he believed starting with the ESSA plan was a better starting point because the additional language has no consensus around it.
 - III. Mr. Walker offered that he disagreed with a number of things in the ESSA plan and that the ESSA plan did not change anything because it was just a plan, not a rule. He also mentioned the importance of the passing of Graduation Pathways and its effect on this rule.
 - IV. Ms. Mote offered the importance of the clearly documented facts and records of the conversations that the Board had previously about this rule.
 - V. Mr. Watts expressed the importance of the thought process in creating this rule and the time for the public to comment.
 - VI. Mr. Hendry expressed a need to have public comment after the rule has been created as opposed to having a final draft without any public comment afterwards.
- iv. Mr. Ranney gave a summary of the general comments made by the Board about what they would like to see in the new rule.
- I. Board members wanted Indiana’s model to comply with ESSA where possible and be in place for the 2018-2019 school year.
 - II. Board members also wanted to add additional Student Quality and Student Success indicators.
 - III. Dr. McCormick asked how this information was solicited from Board members.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that there was no solicitation prior to the additional language. This information was gathered from Board members reaching out on their own or making comments at meetings.
 - IV. The Board also wanted to align the rule with Graduation Pathways and provide relief to schools in regards to the graduation rate and the general diploma.
 - V. Dr. Yager asked why the recommendation created by the Department of Education for the ESSA Accountability system is not the model being used and why has there been a delay since that plan was adopted.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that the ESSA plan was created for federal purposes, but there has not been a recommendation made to the Board in accordance with Indiana law.
 - II. Ms. Mote asked for clarification regarding the differences between ESSA and the Indiana Accountability model.
 - III. Mr. Ranney responded that ESSA was created by a working group in order to comply with federal law, which does not require an A-F grading system.
 - IV. Dr. McCormick responded that there were some differences between ESSA and Indiana’s plan, but that the goal has always been alignment so schools were not confused by having two separate plans. She also mentioned that there is a clear need to change some things in the plan.

- VI. Mr. Hendry offered that if the motion to accept the proposed rule as written failed, he would make a motion to begin the rule making process, but without the additional language.
- VII. Mr. Watts asked if there was a way to keep the additional language, so the field was aware of what the Board was thinking, but to not make it a part of the actual rule at this point.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that he would have to provide the exact language of the intended rule.
 - II. Dr. McCormick clarified that changes made to the proposed rule after it has been submitted must be attached to public comment or Board comments.
 - III. Dr. Freitas responded that he believed that comments from the field were very important and that he wanted to get this process started soon.
 - IV. Dr. McMahon responded that she wanted to start with the baseline rule in order to gain more input and to understand the ramifications of the additional language.
 - V. Mr. Walker clarified that the current ESSA plan does not take into consideration Graduation Pathways and that he believed not letting the public know how the Board intended to implement that change was disingenuous.
- VIII. Dr. Yager asked for clarification regarding when the language must be approved in order to be in place by the 2018-19 school year and why it should be in place by then.
 - I. Mr. Ranney responded that language must be approved within the next 28 days in order to be put in place before the next school year. He also informed that the statutory guidelines to promulgate a rule may be a lengthy process.
 - II. Dr. Yager then asked if there could be immediate feedback regarding the additional language if this was the language approved.
 - III. Dr. Bertram then asked if feedback was received from this language and then given to the Board, if the Board would then make changes based off of the feedback.
 - IV. Mr. Ranney responded there would not be immediate changes regarding the feedback, but the feedback would be given to the Board and then the Board could make decisions from that point.
 - V. Mr. Murphy responded that there was flexibility in this process and that the Board would receive full text of all the feedback, and a matrix would be created for each topic of public comment so the Board could have a more targeted approach.
- IX. Dr. Bertram asked what would have happened if there had been feedback which was in direct opposition of what another Board member had suggested.
 - I. Mr. Murphy responded that in that situation there would have been more discussion, and maybe a vote, around the

feedback, but in this case there was not any conflicting feedback.

- v. The Board voted to 7-4 to approve the recommendation. Superintendent McCormick, Mrs. Whicker, Dr. McMahon, and Dr. Yager voted no.
- vi. Discussion starts at [13:09](#).
- i. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair
 - i. Ms. Mote nominated that Mr. B.J. Watts be elected as the Vice-Chair and that Superintendent McCormick be elected as the Chair.
 - ii. The Board voted 11-0 to approve this recommendation.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [1:27:44](#).

XI. **Discussion and Reports**

- a. Assessment Update
 - i. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Indiana Department of Education, provided an assessment update.
 - I. Currently, the Department was out in the field to facilitate guidance related to the upcoming test administration windows. This has been consolidated into single sessions.
 - II. The WIDA Assessment window began this week and ISTAR is scheduled to begin next week, she said.
 - ii. Dr. Flores also informed that a formal contract has been executed for ILEARN.
 - I. A key element of discussion in moving forward was finding a stable delivery platform.
 - II. Content development will now be licensed out and aligned with Indiana standards.
 - III. Reporting will also be expedited to the field going forward.
 - IV. AIR is the vendor that has been selected for the contract.
 - iii. Discussion starts at [1:28:44](#).

XII. ESSA Update

- i. Patrick McAlister, Director of Policy for the Indiana Department of Education, informed that the Department had received feedback from the original ESSA plan, which included all relatively minor changes and that the Department had sent the changes back.
- ii. Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability for the Indiana Department of Education, gave a summary of the feedback and changes made to the accountability plan under ESSA.
 - I. The participation rate component must consider all students enrolled for at least 162 days during the school year. Accordingly, the denominator of the participation rate calculation for the academic achievement indicator was revised to equal the total number of students enrolled for at least 162 days during the school year.
 - II. The Academic Progress Indicator for High Schools was removed, and growth was incorporated in the Academic Achievement Indicator for high schools. A note was included that the growth metric will likely no longer be included once Indiana switches to the ECA and/or college entrance exam for accountability purposes.

- III. For graduation rate, clarification regarding the five year cohort was given.
- IV. The College and Career College Readiness was revised to include all students in the cohort, not just graduates.
- V. Clarification regarding the A-F system was provided.
- VI. The weight of each indicator must be capped at 100.0 points, which it went above previously.
 - I. Mr. Walker asked if under the current model, if a school earns the total growth points – 175 - could a school potentially have only 25% of students testing as proficient, but still receiving an A at 100.00 points.
 - II. Ms. Paino responded the growth model goes up to 175 points possible, so this was a possibility, but would be rare.
 - III. Dr. Bertram asked what the implications of having growth set at this number would be.
 - IV. Ms. Paino responded that this could counter other categories and other schools that are only being calculated on growth would be affected.
- VII. The practice of aggregation was taken out, but the response to this was that a system needed to be put in place for small schools. Accordingly, a system of calculation a grade for small schools over a period of three years was added.
 - I. Dr. Bertram asked if this would align with the plan for Indiana
 - II. Mr. Ranney responded that this is an area where the Indiana rule will deviate from the ESSA plan because under the Indiana rule, small schools would receive a null grade.
- VIII. Clarification regarding why Schools for the Blind and Deaf are not assigned a letter grade was requested. The Department responded that these schools do not meet the Indiana definition of “school”.
- IX. Further explanation was given as to why the “C” letter grade threshold had been chosen for the exit criteria in regards to comprehensive support and improvement for schools.
- X. Dr. Yager asked what the timeline for the expected responses would be regarding these changes and commended the staff for a job well done.
 - I. Mr. McAlister responded that this would be within the 120 - day submission period.

iii. Discussion starts at [1:32:19](#).

I. **Adjournment**

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