



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

State Board of Education Work Session

July 5, 2016

Work Session 4:00 PM (EDT)

Ball State University

Student Center, 2000 West University Avenue Muncie, IN 47306

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (Chair), Dr. Vince Bertram, Dr. Byron Ernest, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, and Dr. Steven Yager.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Edward Melton, Mr. B.J. Watts, Ms. Cari Whicker, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Mrs. Sarah O'Brien.

- I. CALL TO ORDER
 - a. Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order, the roll was called and the pledge of allegiance was recited.
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
 - a. The agenda was approved by the board by a vote of 6-0.
- III. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS
 - a. Multiple Measures

The DOE presented to the Board regarding multiple measures and other ESSA changes.¹ The presentation included a discussion of changes around graduation rates. The presentation informed that states must set goals for the 4-year adjusted graduation rate, and may choose to set additional goals for an extended grad rate (up to 7 years). Further, changes to regulations under ESSA related to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities would allow them to be included as graduates in the numerator of the graduation rate calculation. However, these students would have to earn an alternate diploma that qualifies under ESSA regulations.

The discussion then turned to long-term goals and interim measures of progress under ESSA. Indiana will be required to develop new long-term goals and interim measures of progress for all students and each subgroup of students.

The DOE also presented regarding the accountability rule. The major components that will need to be added to our model is a measure of school culture/student success (multiple measures) in grade 3-8, and a measure of language proficiency for students identified as English learners.

¹ The presentation can be found at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE_Discussion_on_ESSA_Accountability.pdf.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

There was also discussion of academic achievement; specifically, the legislative language related to students with significant cognitive disabilities who take an approved alternate assessment have changed under ESSA. ESSA removes the 1% proficiency cap; however, it replaces it with a 1% statewide student participation cap for each subject assessed using an alternate assessment.

Meaningful differentiation was another topic of discussion. States are required to ensure that each measure it selects to include as an academic progress or school quality or student success indicator aids in the meaningful differentiation among schools by demonstrating varied results across all schools.

Further, ESSA requires that the following subgroups be included in the annual meaningful differentiation of schools:

- Economically disadvantaged students
- Students from each major racial & ethnic group
- Children with disabilities
- English learners

Moreover, ESSA requires states to include disaggregated data for the following student groups on the state report card, for reporting purposes only:

- Migrant Status
- Homeless Status
- Status as a Child in Foster Care
- Student with a Parent who is a Member of the Armed Forces on Active Duty

The discussion then moved on, and Superintendent Ritz stated she contacted the State Legislature and Governor's Office in a discussion aimed at reconvening the Accountability Panel. Upon request for clarification by Dr. Freitas, Superintendent Ritz explained that the panel is advisory to the SBOE, and that the SBOE will have the final decision on the accountability rule. Superintendent Ritz also expressed that she is working with the Legislature and Governor to establish a memorandum of understanding, as was the case when the panel was initially designed.

Dr. Freitas expressed a desire to ensure that all advisory committees to the SBOE be appointed by the SBOE, but also recognized the uniqueness of this situation. Dr. Yager also expressed support for reconvening the A-F panel, and said that having other entities appoint members should not be a precedent setting approach to advisory committees.

Superintendent Ritz then shared a list of possible multiple measures. She went on to say that at the IDOE ESSA Summit, school leaders expressed a desire to allow schools to select their own measures. Dr. Kwiatkowski pointed out that the measure has to be valid, reliable and comparable; she expressed concern around how locally selected metrics would meet that requirement.

Dr. Freitas stated that creating a valid and reliable metric is very rigorous. He said that he likes the list of metrics, but that he is unsure of how the State will create valid and reliable metrics for some of the indicators on the list, like parent engagement, as one example. He also expressed concerns that whatever measure we select will be fair to all schools, and valid and reliable.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Superintendent Ritz reminded the group that the Board may choose to expand the multiple measure for high schools; however, the State is currently meeting that requirement. She said the challenge the Board faces is identifying a multiple measure for the 3-8 grade levels.

Dr. Bertrum shared thoughts on the tension in the definition of local control. He also shared support for focusing on student outcomes and life-long success in a career.

Dr. Ernest expressed support for the incorporation of measures of culture and climate. In failing schools, no one is watching those things, he stated. Therefore, somehow we need to make that a part of our system to ensure schools are watching that, and that the State is as well, he continued.

Dr. Bertrum articulated the balance between outputs and inputs, and expressed the idea that the accountability system should be focused on outputs and that we should leave the schools to figure out the inputs. If we have to include an input, then it should be significantly connected to outputs, he added.

Superintendent Ritz responded that we have to have a multiple measure, but that we get to choose the weight of the indicator.

Dr. Freitas asked the Board to consider the research behind the connection between inputs and outputs, and suggests that staff should be able to put together some research and correlations. We need to base public policy on research, he reiterated, instead of just grasping at straws. Asks if we can have an output measure of this indicator.

Dr. Bertrum inquired about the degree to which we can rely on teacher observation for these metrics. He suggested that they may be a good way to measure student engagement or culture. Cynthia Roach, Senior Director of Accountability & Assessment for the Board, expressed concerns about comparability on a measure like this, even with a rubric. Administration and inter-rater reliability are issues, she stated. Ms. Roach went on to say that there are surveys to measure these indicators.

Dr. Yager expresses desire to be cautious. Whatever we decide, it needs to be easily measured, easily reported, is it research-based, and is it affordable.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The board voted to adjourn by a vote of 6-0.