



**INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES**

November 8, 2013

Indiana Government Center South – Conference Room C
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (chair), Mr. Troy Albert, Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. Tony Walker, Mr. B.J. Watts, and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Dan Elsener (secretary), Ms. Andrea Neal

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and called roll. Ms. Andrea Neal and Mr. Dan Elsener were absent; all other members present. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Superintendent Ritz introduced an attorney from the Department of Education (Department), who was sitting next to the Superintendent. Mr. Hendry asked for clarification of the Department attorney's role. Superintendent Ritz indicated the attorney was there as a representative of the Department.

II. MINUTES

Superintendent Ritz requested that in light of Board secretary Dan Elsener's absence from the meeting, the approval of the minutes be deferred until the following meeting. Board members agreed with the recommendation to table the minutes until the following meeting.

III. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz introduced Karen Kay Leonard who was present as an observer. Superintendent Ritz stated Ms. Leonard would provide parliamentary guidance to Superintendent Ritz and suggestions for how to better manage meetings during meeting breaks, but was not there to serve as a parliamentarian for the Board. Superintendent Ritz then provided an overview of her recent trip to China, indicating it was her fourth visit but first to this region of China. She indicated she had previously attended with M.S.D. Washington Township, and this time visited as part of a group organized by Global Indiana. She stated eight Indiana school superintendents attended with her.



Superintendent Ritz provided an overview of Indiana's achievement on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessment, which was released on November 7, 2013. She shared that Indiana 4th graders scored highest in the nation for 2012, which was an improvement from the state's ranking as 17th in this area in 2011. Superintendent Ritz noted the need to close the achievement gap for Indiana's Black and Hispanic students, noting these subgroups of students made gains but not significant enough to close the achievement gap. Superintendent Ritz noted the data related to the achievement gap would help guide the review of standards. She noted that NAEP reading scores also improved for Indiana's students. Ms. Ritz thanked the Department staff for putting the information together. Dr. Freitas commented on the dramatic gain for both Black and Hispanic students over the course of one year, and noted Indiana needs to continue focusing on closing the achievement gap. Dr. Freitas thanked Superintendent Ritz for her support to continue the focus of closing the achievement gap, as well as noted past Board members' commitment to putting this into place. He recognized the gains were a credit to the current and former governors and superintendents of public instruction and noted the improvement is evidence of the success of those practices.

Superintendent Ritz shared that she recently visited a school to kick off a new literacy initiative, Books and Boots. She noted that the initiative kicked off with the Hoosier National Guard and Lt. Col. Shawn Gardner. It will officially begin as of Veteran's Day.

IV. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Mr. Watts commented on the overall NAEP scores, and asked Board staff for an analysis of Indiana's progress as compared to other states. Superintendent Ritz indicated she would provide Mr. Watts a link to the Indiana snapshot information on the NAEP website. Mr. Watts noted the progress and achievement by Indiana students is a testimony to work of students and teachers in classrooms every day.

Dr. Oliver shared he appreciated U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan's recent comments, "they knocked it out of the park" in regards to Indiana's achievement on the NAEP assessment. He acknowledged the work of Indiana teachers for this accomplishment. Dr. Oliver also acknowledged the work of the Honeywell Center, which uses national singer/songwriters to infuse music into classrooms, and that they are volunteering their time to help kids fall in love with music. He stated he would like to see this grow into other districts as well, and offered the Board may want to consider this at some point.



Dr. Freitas commended the competition for marching bands at Lucas Oil Stadium over the weekend, and praised the winners from each category. Dr. Freitas asked the Board staff to send a letter commending these bands for their accomplishment on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Hendry shared his desire to have the Board focus on providing K-12 students with high quality academic skills. He recognized the Superintendent's previous email and stated he still holds to his desire of wishing to meet with her 1:1 after the lawsuit matter is closed. Mr. Hendry shared that as the at-large member of the Board he is going around the state to learn more about the current state of education in Indiana. He commented on his recent visit to Emma Donnan Middle School and his positive impression of the hard work of the professionals and students. He stated Indiana's achievement on NAEP reflects great progress in the state, as Indiana is leading the nation, and commented on the praise from USDOE and Secretary Duncan related to the progress. He noted the hard work and full agendas ahead of the Board, and his commitment to working together as a Board to help Hoosier students succeed.

V. PUBLIC GENERAL COMMENT

Superintendent Ritz noted a 3 minute time limit for public comment would be implemented, and asked Department staff member Mr. John Barnes to keep time.

Kelly Faler indicated she prepared for 5 minutes and asked if she should come back another time to make her full comments. Superintendent Ritz asked the will of the Board regarding the request. Mr. Hendry indicated he was willing to hear the full 5 minutes. Ms. Baylor's comments to the Board were in regard to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and closing the achievement gap for students who live in poverty. She commented students in poverty need access to resources, and referenced dyslexia and the success of Orton Gillingham as a resource. She discussed her son and his personal impact with this. She also noted people in prison are not high school graduates and many have a specific learning disability.

Jennifer Jenson is a high school department chair working on her Ph.D. She supports the CCSS as an educator, stating they go deeper into the content area. She stated the previous standards lacked depth and were too broad and stated CCSS are narrower but deeper in content. She encouraged the Board to consider all factors when determining which standards are best.

Kathy Fuentes-Rohwen is a mother of four. She indicated she wanted to address a theme and asked the Board to keep politics out of education. She stated she doesn't like standardized testing determining students' progress. She wants teachers to determine students' progress, and said the new grading system was the will of politicians. She shared her concern that test scores will label



kids and schools and offered support to Superintendent Ritz and said thousands of other parents do too.

Russ Phillips stated he is from a rural district. He commented on the positive impact the temporary superintendent license has had on his community, especially in the case of a rural district where it may be hard to find a licensed superintendent in as timely a manner as the district would like. For his community, this allowed them to put a current staff member in place while they conducted a full search for a new superintendent. He stated this allows the school district and community to make decisions that are good for them locally. He also commented on the A-F grading, stating there are more factors than school achievement at play. He noted his local high school's grade of "D", but even with that grade, many families from other districts are choosing to send their students to this school. He offered that each year the number of out-of-district students enrolling increases, which is a reflection that even with a certain grade, the school is still sought after. He shared that the local community understands its districts and knows the schools best.

Talia Reed is a mother of a 3rd grader. She commented that with ISTEP+ scores being released so late, her student didn't receive the remediation he needed in a timely way. She shared that because the school year was under way, her son's schedule wasn't able to be planned to take into account his need for remediation. In order to receive remediation now he will have to give up band in order to fit remediation into his schedule. She stated that if they knew in a timely way, his schedule could have been planned so that he could do both, instead of having to give up something he loves. She also noted the growth data Indiana provides is important. She shared as a teacher and a parent, she pores over it to make sure she understands the progress students are making. She thanked the Board for what they have done with this. She said it allows her to know as a teacher what she's doing right. She shared she will continue to motivate her students to love learning, even if they have to take a test.

Dr. Vic Smith is a retired educator. He stated he is truly sad that Indiana's system is going to judge schools again. He noted there are four problems: percentage vs. improvement; bonuses for growth are anemic; growth model is based on peer comparison; and current A-F system is badly miscalibrated. Dr. Oliver commented on the research and thanked Dr. Smith for his comments. Dr. Oliver asked that individuals not extrapolate that the Board does not favor modifications to the current system.

Susannah Diller is a Representative from the coalition regarding daylight savings time referenced a recent petition with U.S. Department of Transportation. She discussed data from Indiana regarding challenge with students traveling to school in the dark. She noted that the problem isn't simply



changing start times for schools, but making sure students aren't traveling during darkness. She explained this is a safety concern. Mr. Hendry asked what she wished for the Board to do, to which the reply was to make sure the issue is heard and that people talk to legislators about this, and even come out in support. Dr. Freitas shared that he's been in education over 30 years and has not heard about this. He asked if they have talked to local districts about start times. The response was that could help, but many districts run multiple bus routes, which impacts the time needed for transportation.

Note: Member Tony Walker arrived at this point of the meeting.

Jenny Stevens shared she's served on a lot of committees with her school system. She shared she has three children, one of whom is gifted and one is in special education. She commented that the first child, who is gifted, benefitted from a number of wonderful educational programs and this was prior to No Child Left Behind. She shared when her child in special education entered school, it was after No Child Left Behind started and the same educational programs were not in place for this child. She commented her children are not engaged or encouraged by tests. She commented she hopes the Outreach Coordinators help schools and that the Board will focus on D and F schools. She thanked the A-F Panel for their work, stating she has served on many committees and noted the difficulty of the work.

Phyllis Bush is a retired English teacher who taught 24 years at Southside High School in Fort Wayne. She commented on the reputations schools have always earned within their communities even prior to A-F, just from the actions of students or achievements at the school. She appreciated the work of the A-F Panel but asked everyone to take a pause and change the legislation. She commented on a meeting she was at where Dr. Freitas was present as was an Indiana Senator, and the Senator indicated he did not like A-F and he didn't like the testing.

Donna Roof is a public school teacher who noted she is also a breast cancer survivor. She compared her work as an educator being a cancer survivor and stated being an educator is sometimes more challenging. She stated she is trying to save her students' job of learning and her school's performance. She compared education reform to finding a lump, and expressed education reform has metastasized like cancer. She commented she didn't let cancer define her and she won't let education reform define her either. She stated she holds true to her belief that she is a master teacher. She implored the Board to help restore the love of learning.

VI. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESS

None



VII. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

2012 Accountability/A-F Grades for the 2012-2013 School Year

- Dr. Freitas called for a point of order, noting the Board Meeting Procedures which were approved in May of 2013. He stated the Procedures were approved by Superintendent Ritz and the other members of the Board, and as such he requested the Meeting Procedures be added as an agenda item for today's meeting following the required 10-day notice requirement but noted they were not included on the agenda distributed by Superintendent Ritz. He referenced his conversation with Superintendent Ritz the prior evening and noted his surprise that the requested item was not included as an Action item, as requested. Superintendent Ritz noted the item has been added to the November 13th meeting agenda as a Consent Agenda item. Dr. Freitas reiterated he requested it as an Action item and asked Superintendent Ritz if she would add it as such. Superintendent Ritz stated she is working with others because the Procedures were originally designed by her office and the Governor's office. Superintendent Ritz stated she would talk with the Governor's office. Dr. Freitas stated the Meeting Procedures did not call for negotiation of agenda items. Superintendent Ritz stated she did not want to use meeting time to discuss where the item would be placed on an agenda. Dr. Freitas called for a point of order. He stated if it is not an Action item then the Procedures adopted by the Board are not being followed. Superintendent Ritz stated she was moving on to New Business and the release of letter grades. Mr. Walker stated he would like to respond. He noted the importance of the public knowing the Board is clear on the required operating rules, as the Board has no other recourse for action other than the adopted Procedures. Mr. Walker stated he was "kindly and respectfully" asking Superintendent Ritz to keep to the approved Meeting Procedures rules until they are changed. Superintendent Ritz stated she wished to move on. Mr. Hendry commented on the Board having rules in place, and as such the need to follow the rules. He stated his concern regarding the amount of time spent by Members each month requesting items for the agenda and requested the procedures be followed. Superintendent Ritz stated, "I'll consider your request." Dr. Freitas asked Superintendent Ritz if she was therefore not honoring the Procedures. Superintendent Ritz stated they were on the Consent agenda for the following meeting. Dr. Freitas referenced the Board's governing document and that the actions of the Chair were not in alignment with the Meeting Procedures.
- Superintendent Ritz made a statement regarding delay of A-F grades for 2012-2013 and the misconception that she is delaying them. She stated that is not accurate and further stated that she understands teacher raises are impacted. She called on the Department's attorney to review how information would be released regarding grades.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

- Ms. O'Brien asked about the 55,000 ISTEP+ items in question and if they were test items or actual student tests. Superintendent Ritz stated they were open ended items on the applied skills portion of the test and asked Department staff to provide additional information. Department Director of Assessment Michele Walker clarified that the 55,000 was in reference to test items, and not individual student tests, and as such comprised less than 1.2% of all items administered (slightly more than 55,000 out of more than 5 million test items). Ms. Walker also noted in response to a question from Ms. O'Brien that this was slightly more than the number of test item re-scores from the previous school year.
- Department legal staff outlined the process for release of grades, stating it was based on statute. Mr. Walker asked how the process was different than the previous process, to which the Department attorney indicated that previously the DOE released preliminary grades on an embargoed basis and the schools would be able to appeal the grades. She noted after that process grades would be taken to the Board for placement in categories, but she stated Indiana's code states schools appeal the Board's findings, not the Department's. Dr. Oliver asked for Board counsel to explain the process; Superintendent Ritz acknowledged the request. Michelle McKeown, general counsel for the Board, referenced IC 20-31-8-6 and explained the distinction between the traditional appeals process and the additional round of appeals for schools set forth in 20-31-8-6, which was enacted only recently. She explained the need for the additional process if there are errors discovered after the final grades are released, citing an example from the year previous where a school found an error and it was corrected; however, the revised grade was not publicized in the same manner as final grades because it had taken place after the fact. Ms. McKeown went on to state that this process was to rectify not only the grade, but also to ensure it was publicly posted in the same way as when final grades were released. She cited case law in Pennsylvania related to not providing a full appeals process prior to final grades. In that instance, the Pennsylvania Board of Education was sued given the limited nature of the appeals process, and noted her concern that the Department's recommended process would cause a similar due process issue. Superintendent Ritz then asked questions of both the Department attorney and the Board attorney. During the questions, the process regarding when appeals would take place and when final grades would be released was discussed.
- Dr. Oliver stated that he is hearing from districts that they have been told by the Department how to calculate their own grades. He questioned if that were accurate, and if it were, he questioned why the Department hadn't already released preliminary grades by now. He commented that administrators in the audience were nodding their heads in agreement, and stated again that if it were possible to release preliminary grades via Learning Connection it should be done.



- Superintendent Ritz stated she made a commitment to have LSA run final grades and stated her agreement with following the proposed action as it was discussed. Dr. Oliver again commented on the need to give schools embargoed preliminary grades. Superintendent Ritz commented the delay was due to the rescore window, to which Dr. Oliver stated he respectfully disagreed and commented preliminary grades should be released to schools.
- Board counsel stated her recommendation would be to release preliminary grades in an embargoed manner via Learning Connection; allow for a full bodied appeals process; follow with the Board assigning final categories, and then the Department releasing grades publicly. Superintendent Ritz restated the process, noting a second appeal process. Board counsel clarified the second appeals process was very limited in nature and would occur only if there was an error discovered after the final grades are assigned by the Board. Ms. O'Brien stated she received many communications from the community and takes them seriously, noting she had a concern with the Board endorsing grades without any appeals process first. She recommended releasing preliminary grades under embargo, allowing for appeals, then releasing final grades. Superintendent Ritz stated she wanted the second appeal to come before the Board, and Ms. O'Brien stated her agreement with the suggestion. Counsel for the Board clarified that the "second appeal" was for correction of errors and that bringing the correction of such errors before the Board was required under 20-31-8-6. Dr. Oliver again commented on the fact schools are trying to calculate their own grades and the need to release preliminary grades as quickly as possible. Ms. O'Brien stated it would not be appropriate to vote on schools' preliminary grades.
- Superintendent Ritz then restated the process as she heard it: the Department releases preliminary grades to schools on 11/15/13, which LSA will have also calculated; allow an appeals window to hear from schools regarding concerns; then bring to Board for final grade approval. She asked if it would be the Board's pleasure to approve grades at the December meeting and if there were enough weeks. Department assessment and IT staff noted they didn't believe there would be enough time to run that full process by the December 4 meeting. It was suggested the end of December would be best. Counsel for the Board explained that a full bodied appeals process can take a significant amount of time, and stated the end of December was a realistic timeline. She also recommended grades not come to the Board until the full bodied appeals process is complete. She further explained that a full bodied appeals process means at least two levels of review of each schools appeal. Superintendent Ritz noted she would bring final grades back to the Board in December unless she heard objections. Clarification was provided that the Department, not LSA, would be releasing preliminary grades. Ms. Whicker asked that the Board be kept informed about each step of the process – the embargoed release of grades, the appeals



process, and discrepancies between preliminary grades uncovered during the appeals window. Superintendent Ritz stated her agreement.

- Dr. Freitas asked that the Board hear from Board counsel and the Superintendent to ensure everyone was in agreement. Board counsel restated her concern about a release of preliminary grades to the public if an appeals process were not first provided. She reiterated that preliminary grades should be provided in an embargoed fashion, and a full bodied appeals process must occur prior to the Board approval final grades. Superintendent Ritz restated the process and added that data to calculate preliminary grades would go to LSA later that same day.
- Mr. Walker moved to approve as the Superintendent had just explained the process and Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Upon a question from Mr. Hendry, Superintendent Ritz confirmed the Board would approve final grades in December 2013. Superintendent Ritz noted there was a motion and a second; asked if there were more discussion. Dr. Oliver asked for the motion to be repeated; Superintendent Ritz repeated the process of preliminary grades distributed to schools on 11/15/2013 in embargoed fashion through the Learning Connection, giving a two week period of time to allow schools to make their “soft” appeals to the department; with the quality assurance check provided by LSA, and recommendations for final grades brought to the Board in late December to be approved. Superintendent Ritz stated she would keep the Board apprised when Dr. Oliver asked about anomalies.
- Department counsel stated the Board decides the criteria for appeals, as per the rule. Superintendent Ritz stated that could be addressed at the next meeting and called for Department staff Deb Dailey to comment. Ms. Dailey stated the three areas for an appeal: demographic change, errors, or other significant issues, and the last item is the one where the Board will need to provide input. Superintendent Ritz restated the Board could address that at the November 13 meeting.
- A roll call vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Bonus Points

- Department staff member Debbie Dailey then introduced bonus target points and talked through the handout she had provided. She outlined three options for review: use 2013 bonus targets, use 2012 targets, or split the difference. She noted the Principals’ Association brought the issue to the Department’s attention. Ms. Dailey noted there was an error with the 2012 targets, and as such, if correct targets are implemented this year it will appear as though the data is incorrect, when it is not.
- Superintendent Ritz asked Todd Bess from the Indiana Association of School Principals to address the issue. Mr. Bess provided background on the issue and stated the principals



would work with whatever parameters are decided, but asked for the issue to be addressed.

- Ms. Dailey indicated that while attempting to replicate the numbers for 2012 targets, the Department has not been able to replicate the targets exactly, but it most closely represents the top 75% instead of the top 25% as the rule adopted by the Board actually requires. Mr. Walker asked if the impact to schools would be positive or negative, and which schools would be impacted, if the rule were applied correctly in 2013. Ms. Dailey indicated she did not have a list with her. Superintendent Ritz recommended the Board maintain the 2012 bonus targets. .
- Mr. Bess explained that principals were notified in spring 2013 about the 2013 targets, but because the information came out after students were tested it was difficult to be able to anticipate the direct impact. Board counsel Michelle McKeown clarified the targets were actually set and approved by the Board in December 2012 at a public meeting as required under administrative code. Superintendent Ritz stated the 2012 targets are in rule and Ms. McKeown clarified that the rule actually requires the Board to reset targets each December. Ms. McKeown noted selecting a midpoint between the targets to minimize any negative impact on schools could be an option but noted it had not been vetted publicly, as the 2012 and 2013 targets had been in December 2011 and December 2012.
- Superintendent Ritz clarified with Ms. Dailey that regardless of where the targets are currently, another target would be brought to the Board in December. Ms. Dailey concurred.
- Dr. Oliver moved to maintain the 2012 targets. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whicker. A roll call vote was taken on the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

Note: *Member Troy Albert arrived at this point of the meeting.*

- Ms. Dailey asked for clarification if the motion was about the 10-12th grade targets or the 8-10th grade targets. Dr. Oliver indicated the motion was for 10-12th grades, and Ms. Dailey stated she was asking about 8-10th grades as well. Superintendent Ritz asked if the motion was for math and Dr. Oliver clarified his statement. Superintendent Ritz stated 8-10th is approved. The Board ensured they had approved 10-12th also.
- Board counsel Dr. McKeown clarified to the Board that in December there would be the same issue of a large jump and reiterated her recommendation of an intermediate or midpoint number, to mitigate the impact of implementing the rule correctly for 2014 targets versus utilizing the 2012 targets for 2013 A-F accountability grades.
- A roll call vote was taken on the previously made motion by Dr. Oliver to ensure it was extended to 10th-12th grade targets. Mr. Albert abstained from the vote, noting he had just



arrived at the meeting. All other Members voted in favor of maintaining the 2012 targets for calculating 2013 grades.

Glenwood Leadership Academy

- It was shared with the Board that Dr. Smith, superintendent of Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, preferred December 10 as the date for the public hearing. Upon request by Dr. Freitas, Superintendent Ritz asked Department Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey to provide information related to the hearing procedures. Ms. Shockey stated the Department would use the process previously used for John Marshall High School at IPS and felt that would be a fair process. Ms. Shockey indicated she would send the Board a copy of what that process had been, and noted in the past two Board members and the Superintendent of Public Instruction had attended hearings.
- Ms. O'Brien asked if a Request for Proposal (RFP) had been released for a potential Lead Partner. Ms. Shockey stated it had been put on hold, but was not aware of who put it on hold, other than it was outside of the Department. A staff attorney for the Department stated the RFP was scheduled to close on Tuesday.
- Superintendent Ritz accepted a motion and second to hold the Glenwood hearing on December 10. By roll call vote the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Historical Overview of the Accountability Framework

- Ms. Dailey from the Department and Dr. Molly Chamberlain of The Center for Education and Career Innovation (CECI) provided background information to the Board on the Department's transition from the use of PL221 and AYP to the current A-F school accountability system. Differences were noted between PL221 being a state system of accountability and how it measured school performance, and AYP being a federal system and how schools were held accountable in that structure. Dr. Chamberlain pointed out areas of confusion for schools, such as the 126 day enrollment requirement for one, and 162 day enrollment requirement for the other, as well as other areas that could confuse schools when keeping the two systems straight. Dr. Chamberlain noted the early vision in 2010 for revising the school accountability system was simplicity. She explained that at the time, the original system was exceptionally "rough" on new schools, and as such the option of a growth-only model for new schools was created. She provided background on the early development of the revised system in 2011 and noted the many "moving parts" which were at play. Dr. Chamberlain made a point that the effective implementation of any



accountability framework requires a solid IT, data and policy team that can write code, pull data from a warehouse, write programming, and then take that language and communicate it clearly to the public. She noted this is a critical requirement for the new system, regardless of what components are included, to be implemented effectively.

- Ms. Dailey provided background as to how the A-F system evolved. She commented on the number of “moving parts” from 2011 into 2012. She noted that many were addressed during rulemaking and the rules were refined many times. Ms. Dailey noted the areas of participation and performance that were included, including the improvement growth and penalty for Elementary/Middle school, and commented on the additional pieces of graduation and college and career readiness for the High School model. Ms. Dailey shared many of the key lessons learned during this process.

A-F Panel Report

- Superintendent Ritz and Dr. Yager, Co-Chairs of the School Accountability Review Panel established by MOU in late August 2013, provided information about the A-F Panel’s recommendations. Dr. Yager recognized and thanked the Panel members for their work. He recognized the Panel’s 17 members and shared the group’s origination came out of a meeting he had with Senator Long whereby he shared with Senator Long that educators should be part of the process in designing the new system. Dr. Yager explained the Panel’s framework for values for an accountability system, stating it should be fair, clear, and transparent; have multiple data points; and include both growth and proficiency.
- Superintendent Ritz stated the Panel liked the idea of categorical growth and shared they wanted 5 or more categories in the model. She stated it would be categorical, as well as moving towards proficiency. She explained the slope line and there would be two ways students can show growth in this format. It was also clarified that there is currently no vertical alignment between the elementary/middle school model and the high school model, as the ISTEP+ is not aligned with the ECA assessment.
- Superintendent Ritz explained the slope line would change annually for students. She confirmed to a Member that vertical alignment would be put into place. Dr. Freitas asked about individual growth and Ms. Dailey explained individual student growth would be noted at the school level but would be rolled into overall school growth at the building and district level. Superintendent Ritz outlined the two forms of growth – growth in terms of categories of performance, and also growth towards proficiency.
- Ms. O’Brien noted the Panel’s timeline and asked if it would be possible to extend the work of the Panel so the Board may tap into their expertise. Superintendent Ritz noted there would be a conversation with Speaker Bosma and Senator Long to extend the MOU.
- Mr. Watts asked about other states using this same model being presented by the Panel. Superintendent Ritz noted Indiana currently uses the Colorado model, but the Panel’s



recommendation would take two models and combine them so that growth could be seen two ways. Dr. Yager called this an “Indiana model”. He noted during this comments that the Panel reviewed models from a number of states that had received ESEA flexibility waivers from the USDOE. Dr. Yager said the Panel was thoughtful in reviewing models that were already approved by USDOE since any model adopted by Indiana would require federal approval.

- Ms. Whicker shared her appreciation for the Panel’s work. She stated her concern that the system be fair, and that while simple is helpful, fair is more important. She noted developing this type of school accountability system is in fact not simple, as evidenced by the need for the Panel and experts to help in designing a system.
- Ms. O’Brien brought up the reference to testing for grades 1 and 2 in the Panel’s recommendation. Superintendent Ritz stated the report calls for data points at grades 1, 2, and 9 but the points don’t have to be the same, adding there was not a recommendation at that time. Ms. O’Brien confirmed her understanding from the report that the data point would be an assessment, but that there was not one being discussed currently. Superintendent Ritz indicated that was correct. She stated it was not the charge of the Panel to recommend assessments; recommendations would come, but not from the Panel.
- Superintendent Ritz discussed improvement data that is quantifiable. She discussed school culture and indicated there is not data measuring that now but noted it would be a “great thing”.
- Dr. Oliver noted his concern for additional testing at lower grades, and potential for unintended consequences. Superintendent Ritz explained that there would be more flexibility with the testing for grades 1 and 2, as testing isn’t a federal requirement until grade 3. Dr. Oliver expressed concern over the expansion of testing, noting that he is thoughtful about a perceived culture of testing and noted that any conversation of expanding testing must be sensitive to that sentiment.
- Members discussed the issue of calculating growth if testing were to be added in grades 1 and 2, as per the Panel’s recommendation. It was noted growth can only be calculated after two years of testing, so growth would not be measured until second grade (with 1st grade as a baseline). Members reiterated their appreciation of the Panel’s work.
- Superintendent Ritz stated two years of data would be run to complete a statistical analysis in order to identify any red flags. She shared the model will need to go through a federal peer review process and referenced the Panel reviewing federally approved models to ease that process.
- Discussion continued with the Members regarding significant concern of approving a framework without any statistical data analysis using Indiana data to verify the Panel recommendations.



- Given time constraints and other agenda items not yet addressed, Superintendent Ritz suggested the Board complete its discussion of the Panel's recommended framework at the November 13th meeting so that the Board had additional time to reflect upon the recommendations.

Growth Considerations

- Dr. Damian Betebenner, Senior Associate at The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment in Dover, NH, presented to the Board. Dr. Betebenner shared his background in developing the Colorado growth model and his work related to student growth percentiles. He indicated that when developing a growth model, he always works with states to leverage what people are familiar with in helping to frame considerations. In 2009, Dr. Betebenner assisted Indiana in developing its growth model. He noted he did not advise on how growth data from the growth model would be reflected in the A-F school accountability system.
- Dr. Betebenner stated it's important to frame growth in terms of what you want to know and what you need to measure in order to gather the pertinent information. He framed the differences between what parents want to know about their children (e.g., how their child performed this year, how their child performed compared to last year, and how their child performed compared to other children), what teachers want to know about their students (e.g., how much did students gain over the course of the year and how much their students grew in comparison to students in other classes), and what administrators want to know about their schools/districts (e.g., did the students make a year's worth of growth in a year's time and did the students grow as much as students in other schools/districts). He discussed "typical" growth and the importance of being realistic. He explained that if the majority of students experience "typical" growth, then students who start behind tend to stay behind and students who start ahead tend to stay ahead. Dr. Betebenner stated that "typical" growth for low performing students does not get them to proficiency.
- Dr. Betebenner referenced Indiana's performance and that growth in Indiana is positive for students, especially for students who start out below expected proficiency. He referenced the recent NAEP data and recognized the system is getting good results for students. Dr. Betebenner encouraged the Board to be thoughtful about growth and what is being measured, noting the difference between individual student growth versus growth for groups of students. Dr. Betebenner indicated the greatest challenge in rolling out a revised school accountability model will be to build trust and communicate clearly with multiple stakeholders. He noted the grades are important, but a grade for a school doesn't tell teachers and principals what they need to do differently to support students; it's the individual data that helps in that regard.



- Mr. Walker asked Dr. Betebenner his opinion of the current A-F system. Dr. Betebenner indicated the Panel is rightfully addressing the meaning of growth. He added he believes the current A-F system does not do enough with growth data available through Indiana's Growth Model. He stated the details of the Panel's recommendation must still be fully developed.
- Superintendent Ritz stated she would work with the Board's Technical Advisor Claire Fiddian-Green to see what might be brought forward to address this requirement, and expressed her agreement that detailed changes to the A-F System from the Panel's recommendations were not yet developed.
- Dr. Betebenner commented that Indiana's legislation has allowed the Board to determine what goes into the different categories. He noted uniformity allows for comparison but that can also take away from local nuance. Mr. Walker asked about other states that are successfully using other metrics besides test data. Dr. Betebenner shared information as to the challenge of identifying other metrics that are objective for purposes of school accountability.
- Ms. Fiddian-Green addressed the Board regarding the expert assistance of Dr. Betebenner, and stated the Board had communicated at the October 2 meeting it wanted contracts in place to work with experts such as Dr. Betebenner. Ms. Fiddian-Green stated she had spoken with Department Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey about collaborating on the rest of the work required for the Board to adopt specific changes and rule language arising from the Panel's recommendations. She stated a contract is in place for Dr. Betebenner and recommended that Dr. Betebenner coordinate his assistance with the Department, Board and Panel to ensure effective use of Dr. Betebenner's time and efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Standards Review and Guidance

- Ms. O'Brien noted she has requested this item to be on the Board meeting agenda since the July 19 meeting. She noted the requests have been made in accordance with the Board's Meeting Procedures to be an Action item, but it has only been added as a Discussion item. She stated she appreciated Superintendent Ritz noting on the agenda that the item may be moved for action during the meeting. She also requested an assurance that the November 13 meeting would include her request as an Action item. Superintendent Ritz stated that it was already listed as such.
- Department Assistant Superintendent Amy Horton reviewed the timeline for the standards review process. She explained the committees, College and Career Ready (CCR) panel, and the reviewing and technical and advisory committee work. Dr. Oliver brought up the difference between education practitioners and subject matter experts. He stated his



concern was not about the reviewing of the standards or the crosswalk but rather the research based process to evaluate the standards. Ms. Whicker agreed, stating she was interested in knowing where the agreement/gaps are between different sets of standards as well as what is better about a given standard, and why.

- Dr. Oliver stated his appreciation of what the Department was sharing, but that his request was related the expertise necessary to conduct an evaluation of academic standards. Dr. Oliver stated his intention to work with Board staff to draft a resolution to bring before the Board at the next meeting. He sought the Superintendent's support for this next step as described by Dr. Oliver, which the Superintendent provided. Superintendent Ritz stated the standards review process is included on every upcoming agenda in order to continue to make the Board aware of the work. Dr. Oliver stated to Superintendent Ritz that he believed there to be a different perspective between the Superintendent and the Board in terms of evaluation of standards versus alignment of standards.
- Next, Ms. O'Brien reviewed HEA 1427 and the guidance around CCSS. Ms. O'Brien stated a summary of her concerns regarding the issue and stated she has been requesting this item to be added to the agenda since July. She stated correct guidance should be released by Monday, November 25, approved by the Director of the Board, and released via the DOE Dialogue.
- Superintendent Ritz stated she believed new guidance did not need to be sent. Department Director of Assessment Michele Walker reviewed the indicators and relation of what is taught in second grade to what will be tested in third grade in response to Ms. O'Brien's statement. Superintendent Ritz indicated it was a teaching dilemma and believed there was a misunderstanding by Ms. O'Brien regarding the level of confusion in the field.
- Superintendent Ritz stated the Board could make a motion and could approve it, but in "good conscience" she could not do that. Ms. O'Brien asked the will of the Board, to which Dr. Oliver asked to table the item until the meeting on November 13 out of respect for Superintendent Ritz's non-Board meeting obligation for which she needed to leave. Superintendent Ritz confirmed this would be an Action item for the following agenda.

Gary Community School Corporation (GCSC) and Edison Learning (Edison)

- Superintendent Ritz stated to counsel for GCSC and counsel for Edison that she understood at the October 2 Board meeting, based on statements made by both counsel, there would be a signed agreement within a week of the meeting. Per Superintendent Ritz's request, Department attorney Maggie Paino explained to the Board she had advised the superintendent for GCSC that the Department is not in a position to resolve the issue. Department counsel explained that a contract must be in place for the citation outlined by GCSC counsel to apply. It was explained that the Department has provided a mediator and



attempted to extend services. Department counsel explained that per the mediator, an agreement was reached.

- Counsel for Edison explained that consistent with her statements at the last Board meeting, Edison Learning was prepared to sign the shared services at that time and they are still willing to sign the agreement negotiated by the Department-provided mediator. Counsel for Edison Learning stated the issue is that the signed agreement she received from counsel for GCSC was not the same agreement negotiated with the mediator. In addition to the signed document received from counsel for GCSC being different than that which was negotiated by the mediator, counsel for Edison Learning also expressed concern that the changes made by counsel for GCSC were not provided in a red line copy, as would be protocol for any attorney signing a contractual agreement. It was only when conducting a line-by-line review of the document submitted by GSCS counsel that Edison Learning counsel noted that the version sent by GSCS counsel for signature in fact had material changes inconsistent with the terms agreed upon by both parties previously with the support of the Department-provided mediator.
- Superintendent Ritz indicated the Department has exhausted its resources and it will be the responsibility of the two entities to come to agreement. When counsel for GCSC indicated an agreement would be signed contingent on the lawsuit between the two entities being settled, Superintendent Ritz explained the past issues were not of her concern. She stated the agreement is about moving forward. Superintendent Ritz expressed her disappointment the agreement had not yet been signed and asked to have the issue brought to the Board at the next Board meeting.

Operating Procedures

- Superintendent Ritz stated there was not time to address potential considerations for changes to the Board Meeting Procedures at the meeting. Superintendent Ritz also asked if Board staff updates could wait until the November 13 meeting.
- Dr. Freitas sought confirmation that his request regarding the Meeting Procedures would be an Action item on the next agenda and noted he has requested the item in accordance with the current Meeting Procedures. Superintendent Ritz stated the item would be on the following meeting's Consent agenda, and Dr. Freitas reiterated his request for the item as an Action item. Dr. Freitas noted that there is no Board discussion related to Consent agenda items and as such placing the item he requested in that location on the agenda would not meet his request which was made in accordance with the Board's current Meeting Procedures. Dr. Freitas restated his request to have the item added as an Action item and noted the request was consistent with Meeting Procedures.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

- Superintendent Ritz stated her wish to work with the Governor's office on any changes to the procedures. Ms. Fiddian-Green explained that she had worked with the Department's Chief of Staff on proposed changes to the Meeting Procedures. She clarified that this work was to support Dr. Freitas' request, which was made by Dr. Freitas as a Board member to Board staff. She explained that other operating matters have been discussed with the Department, including Board Director Anne Davis assuming the role of taking minutes. Ms. Fiddian-Green commented that the operating duties, such as the website and taking minutes, agreed upon by both the Department and Board staff need to be incorporated into the Meeting Procedures so that the procedures are an accurate reflection of how the Board in fact is operating. Superintendent Ritz stated she wished to gather clarification from the Governor's Office and asked for a motion to adjourn.
- A motion for adjournment was made by Dr. Oliver and seconded by Mr. Hendry. The motion was approved by unanimous vote and the meeting was adjourned.