



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

February 4, 2015  
9:00 a.m. (EST)

Indiana Government Center South  
Conference Room B  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (Chair), Mr. Troy Albert, Mr. Dan Elsener (Secretary), Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Andrea Neal, Mrs. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. Tony Walker (by phone), Mr. B.J. Watts, and Mrs. Cari Whicker.  
Board Members Absent: None.

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

- Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order, the pledge of allegiance was recited, and roll was called. The roll reflected all members present except Mr. Walker (Mr. Walker joined the meeting by phone not long after it began).

### **II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- Superintendent Ritz stated that she had a request to add two items to the agenda: 1) Assessment Date Change Request, and 2) Possible Extension of Testing Windows.

### **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Mr. Hendry requested that his comments regarding CREDO be expressed in the January 7, 2015 minutes with more detail. The approval of the minutes was delayed until the next meeting so this amendment could be made.

#### **IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR**

- Superintendent Ritz congratulated Kathy Nimmer, in the Tippecanoe County School Corporation, for being one of the top four teachers in the nation for teacher of the year. Superintendent Ritz also commended Kelly Wilber, of Southport Elementary School, and Lorie Davies, of Pine Tree Elementary School for being honored as Milken Educator Award Winners.
- Superintendent Ritz reported that the U.S. citizenship test is being considered by the legislature. She stated that all questions on the test are supported by at least one Indiana standard. She went on to say that she is a big proponent of civics.

#### **V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS**

- Mrs. O'Brien commented that she had concerns about the increase in length of the spring 2015 ISTEP+ ("ISTEP") test. She stated that, based on a memo from the Department to testing coordinators the week before this meeting, she became aware that the amount of time required for students to take the ISTEP test will be more than doubled, and practice times will nearly triple. Mrs. O'Brien added that this does not even take into consideration those students that need special accommodations, including testing time as part of their IEPs. She said as a teacher she is deeply concerned, as a parent she is devastated, and as a member of this Board she is embarrassed. Mrs. O'Brien asked for discussion and that at a minimum the testing windows be adjusted.
- Ms. Neal stated that she has received communications from those in the field about the ISTEP test length. She said that she has concern about the quagmire of requirements from different sources, federal and state, and the recent new standards. She said more money should be put into the classroom, and added that Senate Bill 566 would provide a better and clearer path. Ms. Neal also expressed concern regarding the budget proposal that would cut 25% from the state library in the next biennium. She asked that the public write the legislature supporting full funding for the state library. Superintendent Ritz stated that she agreed with Ms. Neal regarding library funding.
- Mr. Hendry commented that he is for testing. He said he is the father of a daughter who is an IPS student and has a personal interest in ensuring that he knows where she stands as she moves forward with her education. However, he said he is very

- concerned about the increase in the amount of testing. He said his concerns revolve around how the test has been administered and that he believes the test would not be nearly as long if it had been piloted sooner. Mr. Hendry said the quagmire that Ms. Neal spoke of was really brought on by ourselves. He stated that Indiana did not have to change the standards, which require additional preparation and testing.
- Mr. Hendry commented that, with regard to teacher evaluations, he felt that TNTP has done a tremendous job at looking at how the evaluation system can be improved, and recommending regulatory and statutory changes. He said that as Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee he will not be moving for the adoption of any specific percentages concerning objective measures of student growth and achievement at this meeting. He stated that the Board members should continue to deliberate on that issue in the coming months.
  - Dr. Oliver stated that he too had concerns about the ISTEP. He also stated that he did not want to see lawmakers define “significantly inform”. He said the Board should wrestle with that issue, as well as how to make the evaluation system better overall. He added that he appreciated that Mr. Hendry wanted to take more time to deliberate on this issue.
  - Mr. Elsener encouraged people to read a February 3, 2015 New York Times article regarding the achievement gap, and its effect on poverty. He continued that while the goals of education include many other things aside from economics, it’s important to realize how important it is to attack the achievement gap. He said the system must be accountable for this.

**VI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT (public comments on specific agenda items are taken at the time each item is before the Board)**

- Sue Dillon, from the Central Time Coalition (the “Coalition”), was the first speaker. Ms. Dillon commented that the Coalition is concerned about Indiana’s sunlight schedule; specifically, its effects on education and students in Indiana. She recommended that Indiana be restored to the Central Time Zone. She also informed the Board that the Coalition recommends the legislature create a study committee to look at this issue closer.
- Julie Slavens, from the Indiana School Boards Association, had the podium next. Ms. Slavens stated that her association’s position is that the ISTEP extended test length takes time away from instruction and should be shortened.

- Beth Harvey, a concerned parent, commented that she was concerned about the increase in test length. She said taking one week out of student's lives for standardized testing is bad for students and education in Indiana.
- Mary Ann Schlegel Ruegger spoke about abuses in marketing, advertising, and recruitment by charter schools.
- Cathy Fuentes-Rohwer, a concerned parent, commented that the Board is accountable to the Governor and the Superintendent is accountable to her as a voter. Ms. Fuentes-Rohwer said she doesn't want her kids to be just good test-takers. She said test-taking does not mean learning and asked that the Board not tie student performance to teacher salaries.
- Todd Bess, from the Indiana Association of School Principals, stated that the report from TNTP had good recommendations, but that some of the recommendations don't really get to the issue. Mr. Bess stated that he had concerns about teacher evaluation, especially with all of the changes taking place. He also said there needs to be a shared vision.
- Cheryl Ferguson, a concerned pediatrician, commented that she is very concerned about the increase in anxiety children are experiencing. She stated that the increase in the ISTEP length amounts to child abuse. She recommended tabling the ISTEP this year.
- Scott Smith, from Brownsburg Community School Corporation, spoke about Board procedures. He stated that the assessment discussion item should be moved to an action item.
- Phyllis Bush, a concerned grandmother and member of the Northeastern Friends of Public Education, asked why the Board is involved in testing and evaluation, when it should be the Department. She stated that there is an undue pressure to achieve in education. She said her grandson does not enjoy school like he used to. Ms. Bush said she understands the Board is following laws, but encouraged the Board to push back on legislation that contributes to unfair stress on students.
- Eileen Doherty, a concerned parent and member of the Northeast Friends of Public Education, addressed the Board. Ms. Doherty stated that the ISTEP test length increase has caused her heart to sink when she thinks about how it will affect her daughter and other students. She said students can't be expected to have this level of endurance.
- Brandi Vandiver said there should be data to support the current changes to charter schools. Ms. Vandiver added that she is angry that it is ok to have companies make money from testing. She expressed concern about the use of the classroom as a

“laboratory” and stated that students shouldn’t have to sit through lengthy standardized testing. Ms. Vandiver added that standardized testing does not give the whole picture.

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

### A. Accreditation Status Placement; B. Approval of Excellence in Performance Award Grants

- The Board voted 10-0 to approve the consent agenda by voice vote. Mr. Walker had not joined the meeting yet to cast a vote.

## VIII. ADJUDICATIONS

- There were no adjudications to address at this meeting.

## IX. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION

-- Mr. Walker joined the meeting by phone --

### A. Special Education Child Count Verification<sup>1</sup>

- Dr. Oliver moved to approve the child count and Mr. Watts seconded. The Board voted 11-0 to carry the motion.

### B. IPS Transformation Zone/Mass Insight regarding SBOE Intervention

- Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Superintendent of IPS, addressed the Board. Dr. Ferebee followed up from the previous presentation to the Board at the last meeting. He stated that IPS is asking for Board approval to move forward with the readiness assessment by Mass Insight, and implementation of the first phase of the transformation zone, which will include George Washington High School, Northwest High School, and two feeder elementary schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department memo can be found at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Memo\\_to\\_SBOE\\_on\\_unduplicated\\_child\\_count\\_1-26-15.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Memo_to_SBOE_on_unduplicated_child_count_1-26-15.pdf).

- Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to approve phase 1 of the transformation zone involving George Washington and Mass Insight, which is to begin the readiness assessment. Dr. Ferebee clarified that Washington is not in intervention but is on the cusp, so they want to include it to be proactive. He further clarified that the readiness assessment is the first phase, and will take place from March to July. He said that will lead into phase 2 – the implementation for George Washington High School, Northwest High School, and two feeder elementary schools in the 2015-16 school year. Mr. Elsener stated that phase 1 will allow for the Board to proceed forward with a game plan; he said phase 1 doesn't launch the ship completely. Dr. Ferebee added that phase 3 would be to scale up and include two additional high schools and their feeders. Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, Dr. Ferebee agreed to report back to the Board twice a year.
- Mr. Hendry moved to approve phase 1 – the readiness assessment by Mass Insight, and Mrs. O'Brien seconded. The Board voted 11-0 to carry the motion.

#### C. Arlington Transition<sup>2</sup>

- Dr. Ferebee gave an update on the transition of Arlington from Tindley to IPS. Dr. Ferebee stated that IPS is seeking input from stakeholders regarding 1) transition efforts, 2) school leadership, 3) instructional focus, 4) school community engagement, and 5) facilities utilization. Dr. Ferebee also spoke about the creation of learning communities, creation of a dedicated webpage, a potential partnership with Cathedral, and next steps. Mr. Elsener said there needs to be more clarity around this. Robert Guffin, Executive Director of the Board, stated that IPS is working on more details, and that in March or April there will be more detail. He added that Board staff will assist in any way it can to get the plan on paper.
- Ms. Neal asked if any of the student body will remain and Dr. Ferebee responded that they all will remain. Upon further inquiry by Ms. Neal, Dr. Ferebee stated that the law and public policy program is transitioning to Arsenal Technical High School.

#### D. IPS/CSUSA<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The IPS presentation can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Transition\\_-\\_Arlington\\_SBOE\\_Mtg\\_2\\_04\\_15.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Transition_-_Arlington_SBOE_Mtg_2_04_15.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> The CSUSA proposal for Emma Donnan can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/CSUSA\\_Donnan\\_Proposal.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/CSUSA_Donnan_Proposal.pdf).

- Dr. Ferebee spoke next about Emma Donnan. He stated that IPS presented the most recent proposal to its Board of Commissioners as an information item. Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, John Snethen, General Counsel to the Board, stated that the Board could enter into a contract, but recommended not committing to a specific legal solution at this point.
- Jon Hage, President of CSUSA, stated that stability for Emma Donnan is important. He said CSUSA believes a continuation of progress and an expansion of grades is necessary for success. Mr. Hage asked that the process be done in a timely manner because CSUSA will need to begin the collaborative process as soon as possible.
- Dr. Oliver said he liked the concept. He asked if the contract would lay out in detail the roles and responsibilities, and if the Board would be the final arbiter. Mr. Snethen stated that that is what is envisioned at this point. Mr. Elsener liked that this approach was more holistic and stated that he believed this would greatly benefit the students. Dr. Ferebee added that the shift is away from takeover and towards a partnership.
- Mr. Hendry commented that he isn't as concerned about the form of the agreements, but did ask if they would receive a contract to approve at the next meeting. Mr. Hendry added that he would like to see clear details in the contract regarding what the expectations and goals are, and how success is defined. Mr. Albert asked what the Department's role would be. Superintendent Ritz stated that all schools that have Title I dollars have some degree of Department oversight.
- Mr. Hendry asked the parties if any action can be taken today that would be helpful. Mr. Hage said his concern is timeliness. He said he believes they would need to bring the contract back to the Board in final form. Dr. Ferebee stated that if there will be two separate contracts they need to know as soon as possible. Superintendent Ritz commented that the Department will assist any way it can.
- Dr. Freitas moved that the Board enter into two contracts, one with IPS and one with CSUSA, and to have these contracts come back to the Board in March. Dr. Oliver seconded the motion. The Board voted 10-0 to carry the motion; Superintendent Ritz abstained. The Board took a short recess.

-- RECESS --

*E. Teacher Licensure Exams: Cut Score Setting*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> A memorandum by the Department can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Cut\\_scores.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Cut_scores.pdf).

- Superintendent Ritz stated that some teachers who are testing are attempting to add content to their license. Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services for the Department, addressed the Board. Ms. Regnier explained that after reviewing the test-taker data from the previous year, as well as score setting studies, the Department recommends resetting the cut scores in 10 areas. She stated that the Board would be giving preliminary approval, after which the scores are posted online for 30 days to allow for public comment. The Board would then give final approval and the scores would become effective no later than 90 days after final approval, she added.
- Mrs. Whicker commented that there are a lot of young nervous teachers out there trying to master the tests. She thanked Pearson and the Department for the work on the cut scores. Dr. Oliver asked if the Board would need to take any action with respect to people that already took the exam. Ms. Regnier responded that it would be a Board decision; she also said in the past new cut scores have not been retroactive. Ms. Regnier said the Board could consider retroactive scores during final adoption.
- Upon inquiry by Mrs. O'Brien, Superintendent Ritz stated that at the middle school math level, 66 of the 186 candidates were trying to add a content area to their license. Dr. Freitas asked about the discrepancy between Panel A and Panel B. It was explained that the Panel A review process was data free; they did not have the benefit of test-taker information to guide the recommendation. Upon his inquiry, Dr. Freitas was told the tests are valid and reliable. Dr. Freitas commented that the numbers could continue to change as the cohort changes. He stated that the decision to change the cut scores is a political one that will affect future test-takers.
- Superintendent Ritz moved to approve the preliminary cut scores recommended by Panel B. Dr. Oliver seconded the motion. The Board voted 11-0 in favor and the motion carried.

*F. A-F Appeals Process*<sup>5</sup>

- Mr. Snethen explained that this is a two part process, starting with an audit by the Department, and then an appeal to the Board. Maggie Paino, a Staff Attorney with

---

<sup>5</sup> A preliminary resolution outlining the appeals process can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Hearing\\_Procedures\\_-\\_A-F\\_DRAFT.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Hearing_Procedures_-_A-F_DRAFT.pdf) and a presentation from the Department regarding the audit process can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/AF\\_Audit\\_Process.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/AF_Audit_Process.pdf).



the Department, addressed the Board. She explained that two main types of appeals the Department gets are 1) data driven appeals, and 2) appeals dealing with how the rule is applied to a particular school. Ms. Paino said the audits would be focused on the data driven issues. She said this gives a school the opportunity to address issues found in the data.

- Ms. Paino said the first audit would be the graduation rate audit, followed by: the embargoed release of grades, an A-F audit, Department findings and potential appeals to the Board, and then publication of corrected grades.
- Mr. Snethen stated that the goal is to make the appeals process simple and user friendly for schools, and to avoid any procedural traps. Mr. Snethen stated that he would like to amend paragraph 14 to take out the legalese and make it simpler and then bring it back at the next meeting for final approval. He encouraged the Board to send comments or concerns.
- Upon a motion and a second, the Board voted 11-0 to approve the modification to the appeals language and agreed to bring this back for final approval at the next Board meeting.

*G. Strategic Planning Committee: Strategic Plan Recommendations*<sup>6</sup>

- Upon a motion and a second, the Board approved the changes to the strategic plan by a vote of 11-0.

*H. TNTP Presentation Recommendations: TNTP*<sup>7</sup>

- Daniel Brugioni, from Lake Ridge Schools, was the first person to address the Board for public comment on this agenda item. He stated that 50% or more of his class time recently has been devoted to testing. He commented that this is bad for the students and education. Mr. Brugioni said he has never seen evidence that testing this much benefits students.
- John O’Neal, with the Indiana State Teacher’s Association (“ISTA”), commented that he believed The New Teacher Project’s (“TNTP”) recommendations lacked transparency. He said TNTP made its recommendations in a very short timeframe

<sup>6</sup> The memo can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/SPC\\_StratPlanRecs2-4.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/SPC_StratPlanRecs2-4.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> The TNTP memo can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP\\_Board.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Board.pdf) and the Department’s response can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/DOE\\_TNTP.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/DOE_TNTP.pdf).

and not enough teachers got to comment or be involved in the stakeholder meetings. Mr. Hendry asked how many comments were received by members of the public. Ashley Cowger, Chief of Staff for the Board, stated that TNTP has that information for the presentation today. She stated that there were approximately 2,500 commenters. Ms. Cowger added that less than 10 of those were outside of Indiana. Mr. Hendry also stated that the Strategic Planning Committee echoed Mr. O’Neal’s concerns at its last meeting and added an online opportunity for additional comments.

- Mr. O’Neal continued that his concern was more about the process, and not about the survey results necessarily. He also stated that he was happy to hear that the Board was not going to move forward with any specific percentages to define “significantly inform.” He said that ISTA would like to be involved in conversations regarding specific percentages.
- Ryan Russell, from the Metropolitan School District of Warren Township, addressed the Board after Mr. O’Neal. He said “significantly inform” has turned into an ambiguous phrase. He went on to say his district considers 10% to be significant. He said you can’t qualify everything a teacher does to educate students. He also stated that there are factors that affect student learning that are outside the teacher’s control. He commented that poverty has a huge impact on students.
- Scot Czoner, from Blackford County Schools, commented next about defining “significantly inform.” He said the recommended percentages are not supported by anecdotal evidence or public perception. Mr. Czoner said defining the percentages as recommended would have unintended consequences. He also expressed concern about the validity of this year’s ITSTEP test.
- Justin Oakley, from the Indiana Federation of Teachers, had the floor after Mr. Czoner. He commented that testing is causing a stir in Indiana. Mr. Oakley stressed his concern about the negative effects testing is causing. He said it will be very hard to recruit teachers to come to Indiana; he stated that half of teachers quit in the first year.
- Steve Baker, Principal at Bluffton High School, stated that he was part of the TNTP discussions and appreciated the opportunity. He said he liked some of TNTP’s recommendations but had three concerns: 1) local control, 2) setting more metrics regarding student data will not improve anything, and 3) culture. He stated that Indiana is losing good teachers and fewer people are entering the teaching profession. He continued that many states are moving away from student data

because it doesn't correct what it is intended to fix. He finished by saying that culture will improve schools, not data.

- Sandi Cole, from the Indiana Teacher Appraisal Support System ("INTASS"), spoke after Mr. Baker. Dr. Cole stated that TNTP's recommendations regarding teacher and principal training are aligned with INTASS's recent survey. She said INTASS supports teacher training in the new system. Dr. Cole also liked the recommendations regarding compensation for those teachers that need improvement. She said monitoring is important, and the Department has a good process in place. She said INTASS would like to see support for differentiated ratings for districts who are implementing plans with high fidelity. Dr. Cole did say that a range for student data should be set, but she said there has not been a study yet identifying the correct correlation of teacher impact. The board then recessed for lunch.

**-- RECESS --**

- Jessica Conlon, Project Director with TNTP, presented to the Board. She began by giving an overview of the work done to date. She explained that TNTP has done a lot of work in Indiana in the past. Ms. Conlon informed the Board that TNTP used the recent INTASS survey of over 2,000 educators in coming to their recommendations. She added that, in addition to the survey, stakeholder input was gathered through diverse focus groups and an online forum.
- Ms. Conlon emphasized that about 60% of teachers indicated some level of dissatisfaction with the teacher evaluation system. She also stated that 76% of teachers said they understood the purposes of the system. She also informed that TNTP learned that a teacher's perception and satisfaction concerning the evaluation system increase with training on the system. Ms. Conlon said this is one reason training on the system is so important.
- Ms. Conlon then walked through the goals of Indiana's evaluation system: 1) recognizing excellent teaching, 2) supporting educators to improve their practice, 3) encourage the equitable distribution of effective teachers across the state, and 4) ensuring students have effective teachers to increase student learning. She said TNTP's recommendations serve these goals. Ms. Conlon stated that while Indiana has done great work regarding evaluation, there is room for improvement.
- Ms. Conlon informed the Board that TNTP recommended two areas of focus regarding Indiana's evaluation system: 1) accurate evaluations for all teachers, and

- 2) refocus on high-quality implementation. She stated that local control is important but must be balanced with monitoring and support at the state level.
- Ms. Conlon continued by giving an overview of TNTP’s recommendation topic areas:
    - Establish a vision for Indiana’s evaluation system and provide change management leadership
    - Increase the focus on high-quality training for both evaluators and teachers
    - Address lack of clarity, consistency and rigor in the use of objective measures of student performance
    - Ensure educators are engaged in the process of designing locally-created and modified evaluation plans
    - Enhance current practices of monitoring and supporting corporations to design and implement consistent and comparable evaluation plans
    - Make revisions to the State’s model plan – RISE 2.0
    - Strengthening the current policies and practices for performance-based compensation
  
  - Ms. Conlon walked through the following TNTP recommendations to increase the focus on high quality training:
    - Set a vision and theory of action for teacher evaluation
    - Develop a change management and implementation plan to address forthcoming changes
    - Ensure there are high quality communications and resources to support implementation
    - Allocate resources and personnel to ensure implementation aligns with the State’s vision
    - Require corporations to retrain evaluators whenever substantive changes are made to their evaluation plans.
    - Offer “plan agnostic” training for evaluators and trainers of evaluators
    - Leverage ESCs to provide high quality training to school corporations
    - Highlight the mutually reinforcing nature of evaluator evaluation and teacher evaluation
    - Require corporations to train teachers on their evaluation plans
    - Establish standards for teacher training on evaluation plans
    - Ensure there are adequate resources to support corporations who train teachers

- Ms. Conlon then walked through the following TNTP recommendations addressing the lack of clarity, consistency, and rigor in the use of objective measures of student performance:
  - Define “significantly inform” so that all corporations use comparable levels of objective measures of student performance
  - Require SBOE approval of the definition of “negative impact” and the related guidance the IDOE issues
  - Build off current support structures to help corporations revise their local definitions and understand the implications of these changes
  - Leverage IDOE expertise to support SBOE and corporations to understand assessment guidance
  
- Ms. Conlon explained the following recommendations to ensure teachers are engaged in the process of designing locally created and modified evaluation plans:
  - Require districts that wish to use a locally-created or modified plan to engage teachers in the design process
  - Provide guidance to districts on how to create and implement an appropriate teacher engagement process
  
- Ms. Conlon explained the following recommendations to enhance current practices of monitoring and supporting corporations to design and implement consistent and comparable evaluation plans:
  - Require corporations to submit locally-created or modified plans to IDOE for approval
  - Require regular monitoring and reporting of corporations’ plan implementation
  - Support corporation administrators to leverage best practices when designing evaluation plans
  - Institute a regular reporting cycle on the progress of implementation
  
- Ms. Conlon continued with recommendations to address issues with making revisions to the State’s model plan:

- Require SBOE to approve changes to the model plan
  - Streamline the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) and align it to the new state standards
- Ms. Conlon explained the following recommendations to strengthen the current policies and practices for performance-based compensation:
  - Address the perceived impact of preventing compensation increases for teachers rated Improvement Necessary
  - Allocate more funding for grants used to support performance compensation
  - Clarify the IDOE and SBOE’s authority to enforce compliance with compensation model requirements
  - Support corporations by identifying exemplary compensation models when they are published on IDOE’s website
  - Support corporations to plan for sustainable compensation models
- Ms. Conlon explained the recommendations around objective measures of student growth and achievement in more detail. She stated that objective measures are critical in a high quality evaluation system. She also explained that student growth and achievement must “significantly inform” the evaluation. She stated that the assessment is one objective measure, and must be the primary objective measure, but there are other objective measures that should be used with it. To put it another way, the assessment is just one of several objective measures of student growth and achievement that together must “significantly inform” the evaluation, she said.
- Mrs. Whicker commented that a locally made test can be challenging to implement, mainly in terms of time out of the classroom, which leaves the ISTEP test as the only viable test that can be used in many situations.
- Dr. Oliver stated that he would like this issue to be sent back to the strategic planning committee so they could look at “significantly inform” more closely and deliberate on that further.
- Dr. Freitas stated that the TNTP recommended range to define “significantly inform” was based on the MET Project Report study<sup>8</sup> that he found very reliable. He stated that he could not find any studies that had contrary findings. Dr. Freitas stated that,

---

<sup>8</sup> The study can be viewed at

[http://metproject.org/downloads/MET\\_Ensuring\\_Fair\\_and\\_Reliable\\_Measures\\_Practitioner\\_Brief.pdf](http://metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf).

- as a policymaking body, the Board should always be making decisions based on evidence and data. Ms. Conlon added that the study looked at different percentage ranges to determine what the best range is to define “significantly inform”. She said the finding was that the recommended range (33-50% for all objective measures combined) was the most accurate and reliable predictor of student gains. In other words, this range will give the most accurate teacher evaluation ratings, she said.
- Mr. Elsener asked Ms. Conlon to expound upon the concern some people have about teaching in high poverty schools. He also asked about local control. Ms. Conlon responded that, with regard to the poverty question, strong school leadership and the balance of growth versus achievement is vital to alleviate that concern. Regarding local control, Ms. Conlon stated that it is important, but that uniformity is important as well so that the evaluation ratings mean the same thing district to district.
  - Superintendent Ritz then directed the Board’s attention to a report by the Department. She said the Department is not working in silos anymore. She added that the Department has 23 people who monitor teacher evaluation and are highly engaged. Superintendent Ritz also said she helped work on the statutory language and that it was the intent to have local districts define “significantly inform”. She said she believes most teachers in Indiana are effective or highly effective. Upon inquiry by Mrs. Whicker, Superintendent Ritz said there is no federal requirement to define “significantly inform”. Lastly, Superintendent Ritz said that if the Department doesn’t think a district’s evaluation system includes objective measures of student growth and achievement, they reach out and require information showing how the measures do “significantly inform” the evaluation.
  - Mr. Hendry thanked Ms. Conlon for her work. Mr. Hendry then moved to approve TNTP’s recommendations, including those around “significantly inform” except without any specific percentages or ranges. He included in his motion a statement that the legislature consider these recommendations in the current session. He continued that his motion includes a recommendation that the legislature delegate to the Board the responsibility to engage in the process of defining “significantly inform” through rulemaking, after seeking public input and deliberating extensively so that districts have more uniformity. He also added to his motion that the Department is to work with the Board to ensure TNTP recommendations are implemented. Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Mr. Hendry clarified that the strategic planning committee would deliberate on the issue of defining “significantly inform” under Goal 2 of the strategic plan. Mr. Hendry also clarified that the recommendations could be revised later if necessary.

- Superintendent Ritz said she is opposed to many of these recommendations. She said she does not believe the evaluation system should be changed, especially in light of all the additional changes taking place like standards and the assessment. Mr. Hendry responded that research showed that most teachers are not happy with the current evaluation system. Superintendent said the Department is already doing the work with respect to many of the recommendations. Mr. Albert said he is for local control. He said local control aids implementation because there is less rebellion. Mr. Watts added that he liked a lot of TNTP's recommendations. However, he expressed concern over the effect defining the percentage range could have on high poverty schools. He said he is against a defined range. Ms. Neal stated that she felt a yes vote was premature given the current assessment situation.
- The Board voted 7-4 to carry the motion; Mr. Albert, Ms. Neal, Mrs. Whicker and Superintendent Ritz voted no.

*1. Suspend Board Procedures for Material Submission for Public Comment on A-F*

- Brian Murphy, Assistant General Counsel to the Board, stated that the Board has an option to suspend the materials deadline if it wants final rule language by the March 12, 2015 meeting. He added that there are three public hearings taking place from February 25-27, and that may not allow Board staff and the Department to review the comments with enough deliberation by the March 5, 2015 materials deadline. The Board decided it could look at final language at a later meeting after March 12 rather than potentially suspend the procedures for the March meeting.

**X. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES**

- This item was not discussed.

**XI. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS**

*A. SBOE staff update*

- Robert Guffin, Executive Director of the Board, announced that the Board has the following staffing changes: Marc Lotter is the new Director of External Affairs, James Betley is the new Technical Advisor to the Board, and Ashley Cowger is now Chief of Staff.



*B. Charter Authorizer Hearing Pursuant to IC 20-24-2.2 (cont.)*<sup>9</sup>

- Mr. Snethen said the Board will decide what action to take with regard to the authorizer, probably in March. He said today one of the schools, Hoosier Academy, asked to come in and present. He said the Board must determine whether there is substantial justification to keep the schools open. He also informed that the Board has a range of options.
- Brian Ernst, from Hoosier Academy, spoke to the Board. He began by stating that Hoosier Academy serves a 67% mobility group of students. He said the Hoosier Academy is sometimes a short term solution for many students for various reasons, like bullying or the student has fallen behind. He also stated that they have taken a turnaround approach with data driven instruction. Mr. Ernst continued that the Department outreach has done a good job and that they were found proficient in the eight turnaround principles at the last visit. Hoosier Academy provided materials to the Board as well.

*C. Science Standards Adoption*<sup>10</sup>

- Jeremy Eltz, Science Specialist at the Department, addressed the Board. He said the process is just beginning and that he plans on following the process used for the 2014 Indiana standards. He asked the Board for input and questions. Dr. Freitas asked for some pedagogical recommendations in the future.
- Mr. Hendry stated that he was excited about this process and encouraged Mr. Eltz to consult with the National Association of State Boards of Education. He said they have a lot of resources available for this kind of initiative.

*D. Assessment update (part of this agenda item was made an action item at the beginning of this meeting under II. Approval of the Agenda)*<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> A letter from Ball State can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Charter\\_Authorizer\\_Update\\_Ball\\_State\\_Memo\\_SBOE.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Charter_Authorizer_Update_Ball_State_Memo_SBOE.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> A Department memo can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/2016\\_Science\\_Standards\\_Review.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/2016_Science_Standards_Review.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> The Department memo can be viewed at [http://in.gov/sboe/files/Final\\_Assessment.pdf](http://in.gov/sboe/files/Final_Assessment.pdf).

- Superintendent Ritz invited Dr. Michele Walker, Chief Accountability Officer at the Department, to present. She asked for approval to allow Burriss Laboratory School to test eight days in advance. Dr. Freitas asked about test security and Dr. Walker responded that allowing testing eight days in advance will not affect test security. Upon a motion and a second, the Board voted 11-0 to approve the window extension.
- Dr. Walker then moved on to the RFP process. She said vendor presentations were from January 20-29. She stated that 94% of the educators invited did attend the sessions, 76% of board staff and Board members were involved, 79% of the subject matter experts attended, and a higher education person attended. Dr. Walker said they had some questions about cost and other issues that the Department of Administration (“DOA”) is looking at and will have an answer soon hopefully.
- Dr. Oliver asked what the Board received before voting on the recommendation. Dr. Walker responded that more specifics could be provided by DOA. She said she wasn’t sure how much, if any, information the Board will have about the reviewers and the process. Superintendent Ritz added that the RFP is based on multiple components, and that the Department has never done this before with regard to many of the components. Superintendent Ritz said there isn’t clarity yet regarding what portions will be funded, and that many components have not been paid for before. She stated that the budget committee will be reviewing this. She asked for input from the Board on funding.
- Mrs. O’Brien inquired about how much in the RFP the Department believes will be funded. Superintendent Ritz responded that they think things will come in close to what was estimated, but decisions will need to be made. She said \$65,000,000.00 was estimated.
- Mr. Hendry thanked Dr. Walker for the information. He inquired about the difference in cost with the new standards versus if they remained with the old standards. Superintendent Ritz stated that all states have the cost of a new college and career ready assessment. Indiana has always owned its own items, she continued. The process is to select a vendor to provide the test. Superintendent Ritz went on to say appropriations have been built in. Dr. Walker said the cost would be about the same because a college and career ready test would have to be developed even under the old standards.
- Superintendent Ritz spoke about another issue, the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math and English/language arts end of course assessment. Superintendent Ritz said they heard a lot of information from the field. She said this was a plan to phase out this test. Dr.

Walker stated that the people in grade 8 will have the grade 10 graduation test. Dr. Walker said the recommendation is that for all students younger than grade 9, that the Board make the spring end of course assessment optional for districts. Students are required to take the test if they are in the course, she added.

- The Superintendent Ritz and three board members decided to move this issue to an action item. Superintendent Ritz moved to approve the Department's recommendation regarding those students who are below grade 9 currently in enrolled in Algebra I, to enable the end of course assessments to be a local decision. Mr. Hendry seconded and the Board voted 11-0 in favor of the motion.
- The discussion moved to the ISTEP stress test. Superintendent Ritz stated that she is extremely sensitive to testing. She said this test, required by the federal government, requires three things: 1) building a vertical scale, 2) questions must be piloted ahead of time for the next assessment, and 3) operational, on grade level questions and assessments for students to take. Superintendent Ritz said this was not the will of anyone here. She said we wanted to do a transition test that would have occurred more slowly, rather than an operationalized test this year. However, the federal government required an operational test this year.
- Superintendent Ritz stated that Senate Bill 566 says that the formative tests offered are giving us the best information, and so why do we need to give a summative end of the year test like ISTEP if we are already getting information for how kids are doing during the year. She stated she is pleased this debate is taking place across the country at high levels. The federal government does not allow the use of the formative assessment, she said. Superintendent Ritz continued that she believes states should have the right to make these decisions on their own; to determine what type of test is best for students. She encouraged people to contact their Representatives about this issue. Superintendent Ritz said we are here as a result of federal requirements. She stated that she wants a fair test for students.
- Dr. Walker continued that the Department did a statewide readiness test early since they are moving to the cloud. She commented that the Department is testing the machines, and Superintendent Ritz added that students are not even needed. She said the Department is encouraged that students not be involved unless necessary. Superintendent Ritz made it clear that paper is available for everyone for part 1, after the stress test, and for anyone that initially opted into online for part 1 and wanted to change that. Dr. Walker added that site engineers can be provided if needed.

- Dr. Oliver asked instead of a paper/pencil fallback, why can't it be done like years past where there is a download of content and then a re-uploading to CTB. Dr. Walker responded that because of the technology enhanced items so much more power is needed the cloud is necessary for the technology enhanced.
- Todd Whitlock, from North Daviess Community Schools, signed up for public comment regarding the stress test and addressed the Board at this time. Mr. Whitlock stated that he disagreed with the statement by the Department regarding the stress test. He said the test environment was simulated, which required student participation. Superintendent Ritz clarified an exception for one to ones. He also spoke about the loss of instructional resources because of testing and preparation of testing. Mr. Whitlock stated that he expects the stress test to fail based on how it has gone in the past.
- Dr. Walker moved on to present regarding the ISTEP practice test and testing time for part one. Superintendent Ritz stated that they gathered information from the field on this issue, and have information to present to the Board. Dr. Walker spoke about the Acuity Readiness 3 Assessment. She stated that 70% of the students' score comes from part 2 of the test.
- She said the second item was announcing the multiple choice times. Dr. Walker mentioned starting the practice test early. She said districts have permission to start the test as soon as materials arrive within the school corporation.
- Dr. Walker then spoke about opening the applied skills window early. Mrs. O'Brien asked if the items were leased if we would be in the same predicament. Dr. Walker responded that we would be; she added that there must be an opportunity to learn as a result of the new standards. She stated that the pilot could not have been done in the fall because the items were not ready and teachers had not had time to teach the content. Dr. Walker stated that this predicament is caused by the federal requirement.
- Dr. Walker discussed the following options for the Board to decide: 1) adding two or five days to the paper/pencil window and running that for two weeks, 2) adding 5 days to the part 1 online window, 3) adding two days to the online and paper/pencil IREAD-3 tests.
- Dr. Shawn Greiner, Superintendent of the Montgomery Community School Corporation, addressed the Board for public comment. He stated that he supports formative assessments as a tool to drive instruction and to make informed decisions. He stated that people in the field are upset over high stakes testing. Mr. Greiner

added that he hates to see children abused by high stakes testing. He also stated that local control is being infringed upon.

- Steve Weber, Principal at Saint Luke Catholic School, spoke next. He stated that Indiana has put itself in the situation it is in. He said he liked what the Board did today with regard to the ISTEP test. He said the length of the test is abusive. Mr. Weber also spoke about the practice questions being too difficult.
- Dr. Oliver said he appreciated people from the field that came to speak. He said he wished all the speakers could have gone at the beginning of the meeting. Dr. Oliver went on to say he is not sure how he would vote considering the materials were just handed to the Board at this meeting. He said he had to leave the meeting early for work and stated that he hopes the members will be able to find a solution.
- Superintendent Ritz responded that the only thing the Board would be voting on is possibly extending the testing windows and then perhaps guidance on practice questions.

**-- Dr. Oliver left the meeting --**

- Benjamin Moore, a Principal from North Montgomery Community Schools, was next for public comment. Mr. Moore stated that his district uses the RISE model. He said his main concern is that we expect collaboration in education but then we assess students in isolation. He stated that best instructional practices do not align with the ISTEP.
- Brett Higgins, from South Montgomery Schools, had the floor next. He stated that it is becoming challenging to meet the increasing legal, reporting, and assessment requirements with fewer financial and human resources. Mr. Higgins stated that CTB continues to have issues year to year. He said a more reasonable system of assessments should be adopted to more accurately measure students' performance over time. He said testing times are too long.
- Chris Larson, from the South Montgomery Community School Corporation, stated that a summative assessment for 20 hours for elementary students is not only detrimental, but it lacks purpose for the students' education. Ms. Larson stated that a focus on high stakes testing is having a negative effect on student engagement. She encouraged the Board to look at other ways to assess students.
- Robin Mills, from North Montgomery Schools, spoke next. She said the pilot items are not fair to students. Further, she stated that the increased length of the test is unethical. Ms. Mills then commented that students need more time for the

constructive response items. She said that calling time is not a viable option, because some students are out of the classroom because they receive accommodations. Lastly, she stated that she is concerned about why the field did not receive information about the increased length of the test until recently.

- Dr. Colleen Moran, Superintendent at North Montgomery Schools, spoke next. Dr. Moran said that comingling pilot items into the test is ridiculous. She also stated that the test will cut into instructional time substantially. Further, she said that part 2 will have to be done in computer labs and that will be a nightmare for their schools. Finally, she expressed concern about the increase in rigor.
- Ryan Snoddy, Principal from Northwestern School Corporation, commented that testing is making it hard to find enough time in the day to educate students. He also stated that he was concerned about the effect the ISTEP time burden will have on students. He said testing has had a negative effect on the teaching of higher thinking skills.
- Dr. Tracy Caddell, Superintendent of the Eastern Howard School Corporation, spoke next. Dr. Caddell expressed concern over excessive testing, especially as it relates to special needs students. He stated that parents and students are very angry about ISTEP this year. He asked the Board to take a look at the current testing plans, including whether students would be tested at every grade.
- Martha Murphy addressed the Board after Dr. Caddell. Ms. Murphy expressed concern over the length of testing. She commented that she started a Facebook page promoting state educational leaders to sit along students as they take the tests. She said it has received a lot of attention and support. She asked the Board to come up with a more creative solution; to “pilot the pilot” she said.
- Tricia Reed, Western Boone County Schools, addressed the Board concerning the spring ISTEP test. She stated that she believed the test could be modified to relieve students. Ms. Reed also stated that she supported Scott Smith’s seven point plan.
- Scott Smith, from Brownsburg Community School Corporation, spoke next. He stated that progress has been made already. He stated that time after the window is more valuable than time before. Mr. Smith asked the Board to vote on the issue of reducing the content of the test. Regarding the applied skills test, he said the content should be divided and split, so there is an ISTEP and then half of a field test. Mr. Smith also said all the kids at every grade level do not need to take the field test. He said CTB’s statisticians always want more data, but this is not required. He said this plan will save about an hour and a half of time and it will still be a live operational test. He asked that the Board vote on dialing the test back and taking

some of the content off the plate. Mr. Smith also asked why science items are being piloted when the science standards will be changing soon.

**-- Mr. Watts left the meeting --**

- Superintendent Ritz called on Dr. Walker to respond. She stated that, with respect to operational items versus pilot items, they are all field test items and that it's not by section that the operational form will be selected. Further, she stated that the requirements are in the waiver; it is required that an operational field test be administered. Concerning the science items, Dr. Walker commented that the operational test doesn't change until a year after standards are adopted in most cases, except for the situation Indiana is in now. She said the reason Indiana is in the spot it's in, is because of a federal requirement. She stated that the Department wanted to do a college and career ready transition assessment and move into the way we would have done all assessment and that was clearly not acceptable by the U.S. Department of Education. She said we have our marching orders from the federal government and we are trying to do the best we can. She stated the Department does not favor long testing but we don't have any choice.
- Ms. Neal stated that there is an option. Ms. Neal commented that the decision could be made not to give the test. Ms. Neal also asked about the quality of the test. She asked if the test is more rigorous or just more confusing. Dr. Walker spoke about training and webinars that have been conducted regarding the assessment. She said they have tried to give as much notice to the field as possible. She said the Department wants to give a practice test for that reason. Dr. Walker added that all items on the test this year have been approved by teachers.
- Mrs. O'Brien asked at what point the Department realized we were looking at these specific time extensions. Dr. Walker responded that the times set were in late January and that when they sent them is when they nailed them down. Mrs. O'Brien asked what guidance is being given to schools that are being forced out of IEP compliance with minutes. Dr. Walker stated that is one of the reasons the Department is asking for more days, which will give them more flexibility.
- Mrs. O'Brien then asked if the Department has looked at every possible option to cut the time for administration of the test and determined that there is no way to do it. She stated that she needed to know that as a Board member. Dr. Walker said that is accurate. Dr. Walker then stated that if we did cut the time we would have students not finishing.

- Mrs. Whicker inquired about the doubling of the test itself and the release of grades. Dr. Walker said only part 1 is doubled. Dr. Walker then stated that the scores would be released in the early fall.
- Ms. Neal said it's highly likely that legislative action, at the state and federal level, will make these issues moot. She recommended giving a slimmed down portion of the test. Superintendent Ritz responded that legislative changes are not likely to happen with effective dates soon enough to change the current situation.
- Mr. Hendry commented that the public feedback has been helpful. He stated that there is a misunderstanding about roles and responsibilities. He stated he first learned of this issue no more than a week before this meeting. He stated further that the Board was not involved in the length of the test. Mrs. Whicker commented that some groups have been perpetuating false information about the Board's role. Mrs. Whicker said she is not pleased with the ISTEP situation.
- Dr. Walker explained that the content and form of the test start at the Roundtable and then to the Board in general. She said the Board does set the testing windows. Dr. Walker said the Department does research regarding the length of the items and the test. Upon a request for additional clarification by Mr. Hendry, Dr. Walker clarified that the Department builds the test and makes the decisions regarding how the test is administered and the length.
- Superintendent Ritz stated that we weren't able to do the transition assessment as we wanted to this year, which has caused this quagmire. Superintendent Ritz added that she is for less testing. Superintendent Ritz also stated that she didn't know at this point if anything can be done about the actual length of the test.
- Mr. Hendry asked what next year's test will look like. Dr. Walker responded that next year there will be enough items to build the test because of the operationalized pilot this year. Dr. Walker stated that next year they may pilot some items but only back to the book 2 which is a very small group. Dr. Walker explained that next year's test will be dramatically shorter.
- Mrs. O'Brien asked if anyone at the Department reached out to CTB as soon as the Department became aware of the length of the test to see if CTB could shorten the test. Dr. Walker responded that the Department is in conversations with CTB a lot. Dr. Walker said she did reach out to CTB right before the Department released the minutes necessary for the test and asked if the test could be reduced at all. She continued that it was a really good conversation. She stated she already knew the test must have vertical scale built items, and already knew what was needed for part 1. Dr. Walker said it was part 2 that she wondered about cutting. She said there are



very few items extra per standard, and because we report out by standard we had to think in those terms. She stated that that was a really good conversation because she was thinking overall, and she needed to think about it per standard, and the extra items needed per standard, she said.

- Mrs. O'Brien asked if the CTB analysts felt that students taking a test of this length would give valid results for the field test items. Dr. Walker responded that we have no data on these items at all, and when the students take the items, we get the statistics and that gives us the real performance of students and we can see which items are providing information that is defensible information that can be used on the operational form that we select after the test is given.
- Dr. Freitas asked about the misperception that the Board caused this. He asked why the Department had not issued an explanation to the public regarding the test length. He stated this could have saved people a trip to the meeting possibly. Dr. Walker stated that it's fair to say many of the people present today to give public comment were present for the webinars last week. Dr. Freitas asked about a communications plan to correct this. Dr. Walker said she would make it clear that the Department is responsible for the test length.
- Superintendent Ritz referred to a document the Department created that compared the ISTEP length to prior years.
- Dr. Patrick Spray, Superintendent of Clark Pleasant Community Schools, was next for public comment. He commented that there has been a lot of pointing of fingers but at some point someone has to stand up and lead. He said kids can't be tested this long. He also stated that CTB runs Indiana and should not decide the test length.
- Cameron Rains, from Clark Pleasant Community Schools, requested that the Board require test times to be released in September or October each year so there is time for dialogue. He stated that the test times were just received, without enough time for full discussion.
- Mr. Elsener asked if the Superintendent has called CTB; Superintendent Ritz responded that she has not called CTB personally. Mr. Elsener requested that she call CTB given the seriousness of the matter. Mr. Elsener asked when the test dates will come out next year; Dr. Walker responded that the dates are part of the contract process and then they come to the Board. Mr. Elsener also requested that Superintendent Ritz ask the new vendor for more advance notice regarding the test windows. Mr. Albert added that more time would have allowed for more meaningful discussion.

- Superintendent Ritz said she doesn't mind calling CTB; she also stated that the Department has daily contacts with CTB and numerous meetings with educators to develop the items.
- Andrea Redwine-Becker, a concerned parent, took the podium next. She stated the test length is a bad situation. She said no one is doing anything to shorten the test length. She is concerned about students with IEPs especially, she said. Ms. Redwine-Becker said Indiana should fire CTB. She stated that her daughter is talented and intelligent and that these tests are causing her talents to atrophy.
- Rachel Fields, a special education teacher with students that have emotional handicaps, and a parent, addressed the Board. Ms. Fields stated that the tests do not test her students on what they should be tested on. She stated that something must be done to correct this testing problem.
- Terri Roberts, from the Southwest School Corporation, spoke next. She stated that it's not possible to prepare students for the 18 hours of testing. She also expressed concern about the IMAST students that will now be taking the ISTEP test for the first time. Ms. Roberts said at a minimum the windows should be extended. She asked about eliminating the field test items, but said she realized that may not be practical. She also asked if part 1 could be eliminated.
- Ms. Neal asked about eliminating part 1. Dr. Walker responded that part 1 is required by the federal government to measure the full range of standards, except for listening. Ms. Neal said dropping it and asking for forgiveness later might be an option.
- Lacy Hawkins, a teacher of AP world history, had the podium next. She stated that she is concerned about the test, and that it is to evaluate teachers, not to benefit teachers. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is for accountability, but that things need to change.
- Mrs. Whicker stated that more time is needed, especially regarding special needs students. Mrs. Whicker made a motion to extend the testing windows in accordance with Option 2 for the paper/pencil administration of the ISTEP part 1- making the window 13 days (adding 5 to the previous window). Upon a second by Mrs. O'Brien the Board voted 8-1 to approve extending the window by 13 days. Dr. Oliver and Mr. Watts had previously left the meeting, and Mr. Walker voted no.
- Mrs. Whicker made motion to extend the online part 1 administration and to adjust the window to March 2, 2015 to March 20, 2015 and Mrs. O'Brien seconded the motion. Ms. Neal stated that a motion to address the test length may eliminate the need to adjust the windows. Mrs. O'Brien stated that she was dismayed that the test

couldn't be shortened. Mr. Albert clarified that the Board adjusts the window, but the test could be shortened possibly without the Board's involvement since the Department is responsible for administering the test. The board voted 7-2 to carry the motion; Dr. Oliver and Mr. Watts had previously left the meeting, and Mr. Walker and Ms. Neal voted no.

- Mrs. O'Brien moved to extend the IREAD-3 window for online and paper/pencil so it would be March 12, 2015 to March 18, 2015 and the motion was seconded by Mr. Albert. Superintendent Ritz stated that the Board rules regarding IREAD-3 cannot be suspended. She also stated that she was ready to ask CTB if this year's test, with the increase, would actually be able to give a reading score. She said the answer was yes it could give a reading score. She said the IREAD-3 would still be in the way though because of the Board rule. The Board voted 7-2 to carry the motion; Dr. Oliver and Mr. Watts had previously left the meeting, and Mr. Walker and Ms. Neal voted no.

*E. DOE Support for Gary Community School Corporation and Dunbar<sup>12</sup>*

- Superintendent Ritz stated that the Department has given the Board materials regarding this agenda item. She said there may not need to be a discussion on this item at this time given how long the meeting has lasted. Superintendent Ritz added that Superintendent Pruitt has had many things that have been occurring in Gary. She stated that the Board has information regarding what the Department has been doing to support Gary.
- Mrs. O'Brien asked for a response from the letter Dr. Pruitt sent to the Board. Superintendent Ritz said they are working together, and that Dr. Pruitt may have a different view of who takes ownership.

**-- Mrs. Whicker left the meeting --**

- Mr. Walker said his position is to close Dunbar. He said he hasn't heard anything from Gary that they need the seats in Dunbar to serve kids, or that they have the finances to serve that school.
- Mrs. O'Brien stated that her specific concern regarding the letter was the statement from Dr. Pruitt saying she could not support any recommended plan from the

---

<sup>12</sup> A Department memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Gary\\_Support\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Gary_Support_Plan.pdf) and a letter from Gary Community School Corporation Superintendent Cheryl Pruitt can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Dunbar-Pulaski\\_\(2\).pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Dunbar-Pulaski_(2).pdf).

Department for any of Gary's schools. Superintendent Ritz said Dr. Pruitt is responding to the things the Department is doing; that Dr. Pruitt is listing things she is doing. Superintendent Ritz said she believes a concern of Dr. Pruitt's, even though not mentioned in the letter, is that the Department is using some of the funds to put in additional personnel.

- Mr. Elsener read a portion of the letter that said "I am disappointed that the department would seek to over exaggerate the assistance provided to GCSC in the following areas: Director of District Improvement, Special Education Support, Federal Programs Support, Technical Assistance and Professional Development, Long Range Planning." Mr. Elsener then pointed out that Dr. Pruitt stated in the letter than she cannot support any of the recommendations. Mr. Elsener commented that the Department and Gary do not seem to be on the same page with respect to the Department's work in Gary. Superintendent Ritz said the Department's report is simply what has been done.
- Dr. Freitas added that what Dr. Pruitt is saying is very serious, and that it may be a good idea to get everyone in the same room. Superintendent Ritz responded that Department staff is sent to Gary regularly. She said this is a sensitive topic and that she does not want this issue to be public. She stated that would put Gary in a difficult spot.

**-- Mr. Elsener left the meeting --**

- Mr. Guffin said the Board's role is Dunbar. He stated the rest is a discussion between the Department and Gary. Mr. Guffin stated that the Board got involved because the Department's high risk plan includes Dunbar. Mr. Guffin stated that the Board must see where Dunbar fits in the high risk plan in order to decide how it will handle Dunbar. Superintendent Ritz stated that the Department has requested a plan from Gary that involves Dunbar, but that they have not received it yet. Superintendent Ritz stated that she did not see Dr. Pruitt's letter as negative, and that there are still some things in which Gary wants to work with the Department.
- Dr. Freitas expressed concern about how Gary views the money it receives. He stated he would like to see more information about what is going on in Gary. He stated that he feels in the dark on this issue. Dr. Freitas asked if Board staff is involved in these Gary meetings and Superintendent Ritz stated that they have internal meetings discussing these issues. She went on to say that the Department will provide additional information. Mr. Guffin stated that his concern is that Dr.

Pruitt stated she was not well informed; Mr. Guffin suggested updates during the Board meetings.

- Mr. Hendry stated that he is very concerned about Gary. He said Gary seems to have been having problems for a long time. He said he wants to find a solution and take the appropriate action rather than let this continue month to month. Superintendent Ritz said Gary is in a dire financial situation. Mr. Hendry said the letter from Dr. Pruitt makes it seem like the Department and Gary are not aligned and working together. Superintendent Ritz responded that is not the situation.
- Dr. Freitas and Mr. Hendry asked Superintendent Ritz if Department and Board staff could provide regular updates to ease the concerns, and Superintendent Ritz stated they could do that.
- Mr. Walker added that there are a lot of things to continue to be concerned about in Gary, including the Roosevelt situation.

G. *Draft Standards and Benchmarks for Teacher Prep Programs (House Enrolled Act 1388)*

- This item was addressed earlier in the agenda and moved to the next meeting because of time constraints.

J. *Data Sharing (CREDO)*

- This item was addressed earlier in the agenda. Upon inquiry by Mrs. O'Brien, Bernice Corley, General Counsel to the Department, informed the Board that the process is complex and won't be completed by the next Board meeting. Ms. Corley stated they are not on a hold pattern but that the data will not be destroyed by the next meeting. Ms. Corley explained that the data destruction provisions are federal law requirements. Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, Ms. Corley stated that the Department has roughly 16 current data sharing agreements.

H. *Adult Education Rule/A-F Rule Guidance*<sup>13</sup>

- John Ulbright, from the Metropolitan School District of Wayne Township, stated that educators promised an accountability model with low correlation between

---

<sup>13</sup> A memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Adult\\_Education.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Adult_Education.pdf).

- performance and growth measures. He stated that it is his opinion that this promise has not fulfilled. Mr. Ulbright stated that the system multiplies successes and failures. Mr. Ulbright stated that we are sending a cynical message that a teacher cannot bring a student on par with peers and that the growth of one is worth less than the growth of another. He asked the Board to look at the potential abatement of those that want to make a difference in urban schools.
- Heather Schultz, from Stout Field Elementary in Wayne Township, spoke next. She stated that she does not believe in the observed growth model Option D. She said this option does not fairly measure growth. Ms. Schultz stated that the A-F rule should give more credit for great strides made in student growth, especially in high poverty schools. She applauded the efforts her students put forth to achieve this. She stated that the current model denies the opportunity for some of her students to achieve extra credit for growth to achieve a pass plus on the ISTEP. She stated that they aren't given as much credit as other students. She commented further that achievement and growth should be weighted 50\50. Superintendent Ritz added that the chart is not developed completely yet, and will be improved as data comes in. Ms. Schultz stated that she wanted more points for a student who is in a not pass category but then grows to achieve a pass plus grade.
  - Sarah Archer, a fourth grade teacher at Stout Field Elementary in Wayne Township, addressed the Board. Ms. Archer began by stating that her school has a 94% poverty rate. She spoke about the great gains her students have made in her class. She stated that she is sad to see the current model go because it recognizes the growth of urban students and teachers. She stated her students overcome obstacles that most students never dream of. She said the growth and proficiency score should be weighted 50/50.
  - Tim Wickard, Principal at Stout Field in Wayne Township, had the floor next. Mr. Wickard stated that many students they serve move in and out of the school. He stated that the current model does not account for high mobility issues, and the result is unfair. He stated that he is concerned that the model creates an incentive not to teach in urban schools. Mr. Wickard recommended an individual growth measure that has a low correlation to performance. He said, at a minimum, the growth and proficiency weights should be 50/50.
  - Dr. Jeff Butts, Superintendent of Wayne Township Schools, addressed the Board as the final commenter. He stated that the model doesn't reward some amazing strides students make in growth. Dr. Butts said teachers do not have control over the fact that they could have a high number of students entering that do not have high

proficiency; they have control on how much the students improve though, and the model should reward the growth.

*F. NCLB Waiver update*<sup>14</sup>

- This agenda item was rearranged due to time constraints. Superintendent Ritz stated that draft copies will be coming out soon with plenty of time to review. Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey addressed the Board. She stated that they have hosted multiple calls that Board staff has been involved in. She said all of the calls have impacted what will be in the drafts.

*I. Turnaround Academy – TSO Updates*<sup>15</sup>

- This was not addressed because of time constraints.

*K. Legislative Update*<sup>16</sup>

- This item was not addressed due to time constraints.

## **XII. BOARD OPERATIONS**

- The Board operations item was not discussed.

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

- Mr. Hendry commended the Board staff and Department staff in working together to get through a very long and tough meeting in a professional way. He also thanked the other members and the public. Mr. Hendry moved to adjourn and Mrs. O'Brien seconded; Mr. Albert, Dr. Freitas, Mr. Hendry, Ms. Neal, Mrs. O'Brien and Superintendent Ritz voted 6-0 to adjourn the meeting (Mr. Walker could not be heard by phone).

---

<sup>14</sup> A Department waiver memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Indiana\\_Flexibility\\_Waiver\\_February\\_SBOE\\_Update.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Indiana_Flexibility_Waiver_February_SBOE_Update.pdf).

<sup>15</sup> A memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TSO\\_Update\\_\(2\).pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TSO_Update_(2).pdf).

<sup>16</sup> A legislative update can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/2015\\_Legislation\\_01-22-15.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/2015_Legislation_01-22-15.pdf).