INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

March 12, 2014

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

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and called roll. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Superintendent Ritz stated there were several requests for changes to the agenda. First, there was a request to add an action item to extend the testing window for IMAST. Three Board members approved and the action item was added. There was a request to add a second item that Ms. O'Brien raised. She said she wanted to add an action item to discuss help to schools in implementing the new standards; three Board members approved, and it was added. Superintendent Ritz then stated she was going to reorganize the agenda. She stated she was going to have the discussion on REPA III first before possible action on rulemaking. She also said there would be discussion on standards implementation before action. Finally, Superintendent Ritz said she was moving all the standards items in the discussion to the beginning. The agenda was approved upon motion and a second. All members voted aye.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Superintend Ritz invited motions to approve minutes from the January 15, 2014, and the February 6, 2014, Board meetings. Dr. Oliver moved and Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of approving both meeting minutes.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz stated that she wanted to reiterate that the Department of Education ("Department") has requested the release of the monitoring B report so any issues can be addressed in a timely manner. She expressed concern that there may be items we need to work on and schools will soon be out of session. The report was supposed to be received in February.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Not addressed separately.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited members of the public who would not be available to speak later in the meeting to make public comment. Ms. Carole Craig, an education consultant, spoke about social studies standards. She expressed concern that there were not enough descriptors as they pertain to all significant groups who participated in the history of this country. As she went through the standards, she said there is not enough history in the standards with regard to African-Americans. She said only 3% of teachers are not of European descent, which can cause issues relating to minority students. She further expressed concern about teachers having the proper training to teach minority students. Ms. Craig stated that cultural mismatch was a significant factor contributing to low test scores for minority students. No other members of the public wanted to speak at that time.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Superintendent Ritz stated the consent agenda was excellence in performance grants and invited a motion to approve. Ms. Whicker clarified that Indiana has 54 schools receiving the grant money. These schools have a D or and F. She said all Title I schools have teachers working hard and was concerned that, for example, teachers in a school that received a C don't get the same recognition. Superintendent Ritz explained that the grant is limited to focus and priority schools. She then said that there is a school performance awards grant that will apply to all schools. Mr. Elsener asked how many of the highly performing teachers were in the grant pool, and asked how many total teachers there were at each school compared to the numbers of teachers who were rated effective and highly effective. Superintendent Ritz invited Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services for the Department of Education, to respond. Ms. Regnier stated that this information will be available at the April Board meeting. The data had just been submitted. Dr. Freitas then inquired about how many teachers receiving the grant were charter school teachers. All D and F schools were eligible to apply, Ms. Regnier responded. Ms. Regnier did not have information yet on how many were charter schools, but estimated 4 or 5 were charter schools. Dr. Freitas and Mr. Elsener requested additional data be provided on this topic. Ms. O'Brien moved to approve the consent agenda, and Ms. Neal seconded. All members voted to approve.

VIII. ADJUDICATIONS

- Superintendent Ritz announced one adjudication for the meeting, which was oral argument in the matter of *Hamilton Heights School Corporation v. Fayette County School Corporation*. She noted that this was a transfer tuition case and an issue of first impression for the Board and clarified the Board's options: making a decision, taking the matter under advisement, adopting the hearing officer's decision, or remanding the matter back to the hearing officer. Counsel for the Petitioner introduced himself as Andrew Manna representing Hamilton Heights. Robert Rund introduced himself as counsel for Fayette. Mr. Rund then said Dr. Russell Hodges, Superintendent of Fayette School Corporation, would also like to speak during oral argument.
- Superintendent Ritz laid out the procedural history and iterated that there is a preliminary issue to address; namely, the consideration of additional

evidence Fayette would like the Board to consider that was not presented to the hearing officer. Hamilton Heights filed a motion to strike the new evidence and Fayette filed a response to that motion. Both parties were given 5 minutes for argument on the preliminary issue and then 5 minutes to argue the transfer tuition issue.

- Mr. Manna began. He argued that the additional evidence should not be considered as it was not presented to the hearing officer. He stated that it's always been the duty of the administrative law judge to hear the evidence, not the Board's, and this has been past practice. Further, he pointed out that Fayette had adequate opportunity to litigate the facts to the administrative law judge.
- Mr. Rund responded by arguing that the evidence should be considered. He said some of the new evidence is necessary to correct facts in the record and the Board, as the ultimate authority, can consider it. He argued the new evidence would not be prejudicial to Hamilton, rather it would be prejudicial to Fayette not to include the evidence. In rebuttal, Mr. Manna said Mr. Rund knew what witnesses and evidence should have been provided to the hearing officer and it should have been done at the hearing. Mr. Walker moved to grant the motion to strike the new evidence and Dr. Freitas seconded. Mr. Hendry asked if past practice is set by law or codified anywhere. Mr. Manna explained that is just how it has been done in the past. The Board asked Board General Counsel, Dr. Michelle McKeown, to opine and she explained the rules in place for adjudications. All Board members voted to grant Hamilton Height's motion to strike. Mr. Walker then made a motion to exclude anyone other than the attorneys of record from speaking at the hearing so no additional testimony would be considered. Dr. Freitas asked Dr. McKeown if there would be any due process concerns regarding Mr. Walker's motion. Dr. McKeown did not see any due process issues. All members voted in favor.
- Superintendent Ritz then announced the next phase of the hearing, argument of the transfer tuition issue. Mr. Manna had the floor first since he was the petitioner. He stated that the heart of the matter is the calculation of transportation costs of a transfer student. He laid out that a student who lived within Fayette School Corporation transferred to attend a facility within Hamilton Heights School Corporation. He said it was a transfer tuition case not a special education case but that Indiana Code 20-35-8 could provide some guidance. Mr. Manna pointed out that Fayette agrees it should be

responsible for transportation costs, but calculated the amount wrong. Fayette's calculation is based on a State Board of Accounts Form 515. The formula used did not amount to actual cost. Instead, the Administrative Law Judge calculated the cost based on the entire student population at Hamilton. Mr. Manna said the calculation should have been based on the class of school as the Form states. This would have amounted to the actual cost not the lower amount the Administrative Law Judge adopted.

- Mr. Rund responded that the Board must consider whether it wants to take a legislative action. He argued the hearing officer made the right calculation. He pointed out that the transfer tuition statute exclude transportation costs from the calculation of transfer tuition, and that this should be the starting point. Mr. Rund stated that the calculation used was appropriate and is the one used by the State Board of Accounts. He argued that class of school is not to be used because Form 515 uses that language in the transfer tuition section. Also, the school where the child was transported, he said, is not a special school. The student was in a special education program. He argued that if the Board thinks the Form 515 calculation should not be used, legislative action needs to be taken or at least rulemaking. Mr. Manna stated in rebuttal that the instruction manual does use class of school. He said the reason for the $4,000 is that these are ambulatory students.
- Mr. Walker asked the parties regarding application of 20-35-8, which applies to disabled students. Mr. Manna said 20-35-8 could be used for guidance. Mr. Rund said that statute did not apply because the IEP didn't require transfer, and transfer wasn't required for any other reason- it was at the election of the parent. Mr. Rund went on the argue 20-35-8 applies only to situations where the IEP requires it. Dr. Freitas expressed concern over retrying the case. Dr. McKeown said Indian Code 20-26-11 sets up the process in which a hearing officer writes a recommended decision that is reviewed by the Board upon appeal. Dr. McKeown explained no new evidence can be considered, so the case is not to be retried in that sense. Mr. Hendry asked if the Administrative Law Judge made a determination of whether 20-35-8 applied. Dr. McKeown stated that the ALJ's decision, did not cite the statute at all. Mr. Walker moved to take the motion under advisement and have Board Counsel write a draft opinion. Dr. McKeown expressed concern over drafting an opinion for the Board to work from. Mr. Walker clarified that he was requesting that Dr. McKeown provide a memorandum to advise the Board and not draft an actual opinion. Mr.

Walker then specifically requested that Dr. McKeown work with Becky Bowman. Mr. Walker's motion was seconded and all members voted to take this matter under advisement. Superintendent Ritz then announced the Board would be taking a 10 minute break before moving on to new business.

--RECESS--

IX. NEW BUSINESS - ACTION

A. Intervention at Glenwood Leadership Academy

- Superintendent Ritz asked Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey and Dr. McKeown to address this issue. Superintendent Ritz said the Board must first determine if intervention is necessary and will improve the school; the second issue is a recommendation for the way that will happen. She then laid out the Board's options: (1) merge Glenwood with a nearby school that is in a higher PL 221 category, (2) assign a special management team to operate all or part of the school, (3) implement recommendation(s) from the Indiana Department of Education for improving the school, (4) implement other options for school improvement expressed at the public hearing, including closing the school, or (5) revise the school's plan in the areas of school procedures/operations, professional development, or intervention for individual teachers or administrators.
- Ms. Shockey began by stating the joint recommendation that school leadership remain in place and be able to continue in the intervention they are engaged in with strong accountability measures and oversight from the Board. Superintendent Ritz invited a motion that intervention will improve Glenwood and therefore the Board adopt the policy of implementation of school improvement expressed at the public hearing; namely, to continue the use of Mass Insight. Mr. Watts recused himself from the vote and upon motion and second all other members voted yes. Superintendent Ritz then invited a motion to implement the monitoring recommendations set forth by the Department of Education and Board staff. Ms. O'Brien so moved, and Mr. Hendry seconded. All Board members voted yes except Mr. Watts, who abstained.

B. *Approval of final language to amend 511 IAC 7-33 to align with new federal regulations regarding parental consent for the use of public funds or insurance to pay for special education and related services.*

- Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adopt the language amending 511 IAC 7-33, Dr. Freitas moved, and Mr. Hendry seconded. The Board then voted unanimously in favor.

C. *Core Link testing window extension option; D. ISTEP+ multiple choice testing window extension option.*

- Dr. Michele Walker, Director of Assessment for the Department of Education, spoke on these items together. She explained the Board has to make a decision on three extensions. The first request is for the ISTEP multiple choice window which is currently April 28 through May 9, 2014, and April 28 to May 7, 2014 for paper/pencil. There has been a request from the field to extend the windows by two days (May 13, 2014 for the multiple choice and May 9, 2014 for the paper/pencil). She explained that for every day extension in the testing window there is a one day delay in the results, including weekends. The second request is to extend IMAST two days to May 9. There was a request to extend Core Link as well but will not affect results.
- Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to extend Core Link testing window to May 5-23, 2014, Mr. Albert so moved, Mr. Hendry seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor. Superintendent Ritz then asked for a motion to extend ISTEP multiple choice to April 28 through May 13, 2014 for the online and to April 28 through May 9, 2014 for the paper/pencil. Dr. Oliver moved and Ms. Neal seconded. All members voted in favor. Lastly, upon motion and second the Board unanimously voted to extend the IMAST window two days.

E. *Approval of proposed rule language for SEA464.*

Ms. Neal moved to approve the proposed language and Mr. Hendry seconded. All members voted to approve the proposed language.

F. *Board Operating Procedures*

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to approve changes to the Board Operating Procedures, Dr. Freitas moved to approve, and Dr. Oliver seconded. Dr. Oliver commented on the language settled on for the acting chair, saying that Oklahoma was the only other state close to Indiana so that model was followed. Ms. Neal stated that she did not like eliminating general comment and moved to modify the motion to include her suggested language. Superintendent Ritz reiterated that part of what the Board was voting to approve was the process for amending the operating procedures. Dr. Oliver said he would not amend his motion. Ms. Neal stated that she felt like general comment would allow the Board to hear useful comments not necessarily tied to the agenda. Dr. Oliver responded that he doesn't disagree with Ms. Neal, but he just wanted to keep things clear in his motion. He said further that sometimes it's easier for people to email Board members rather than be limited to 3 minutes at the meeting; further, he said there is a concern for the length of Board meetings. Mr. Walker said he agreed with Ms. Neal on the issue of public comment because anything that would allow for more open dialogue and open discourse would be a good thing. The Board voted unanimously in favor of adopting the operating procedures as proposed. Ms. Neal moved an ad hoc committee be created to look into restoring general comment time. All members voted in favor. Superintendent Ritz said she will chair the committee and Ms. Neal will be on it as well. Mr. Hendry stated he liked the rules as drafted. Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, explained some of the reasons behind requiring public comment to relate to an agenda item. She said there was concern about meetings dragging on. She also said other states were surveyed and this kind of restriction is common. Lastly, she pointed out that at any time a Board Member can add an action item, even during a meeting. So if a Board Member gets an email from someone that wants to comment on an issue not on the agenda the Board Member can add it.

G. *Final approval of cut score for the CORE computer education licensure assessment.*

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to approve the panel recommended cut score of 54 for the core computer education licensure assessment. Mr. Walker and Dr. Freitas asked for some clarification on the recommendation. Ms. Regnier stated that once this test has been taken the test data will brought to Board and the Board can decide if it wants to engage in another psychometric study. Mr. Elsener moved to adopt the panel recommendation, and upon a second by Ms. Whicker the Board voted unanimously to approve the cut score of 54.

H. Adoption of Indiana's academic standards for social studies.

- Superintendent Ritz gave Jackie Rhoton the floor. Ms. Rhoton said she was in favor of general comment in the board operating procedures. She went on to say that by the time she heard social studies standards were being changed it had already occurred. She mentioned attending numerous standards meetings and said one member of the evaluations team said in one of the meetings that they got done quickly because they just took the standards as written. She also mentioned going to the CECI office requesting the information the panelists were given; she said she doesn't believe she got all that information quite yet despite receiving an email with some of the information. She said she had trouble understanding the standards. She stated a proper evaluation of standards is not being done. She went on to say she reviewed a textbook from Lebanon middle school. She said there was a section on the 9-11 attack but it was only half a page and that the terrorists were considered freedom fighters in the book. She expressed concern about whether the terminology was politically correct.
- The next speaker was Tom Brogan, a retired teacher from Center Grove. He said it's important to get the facts right when teaching social studies. He said that should be more important than making the topics education friendly.
- Ms. Whicker moved to adopt the standards and Mr. Hendry seconded the motion. Ms. Whicker clarified that the new standards haven't changed significantly and that the review is a routine process that takes place every 6 years. Superintendent Ritz clarified that the process started last year and there was time for public comment in the past summer. Further, the roundtable had several months to review them. Dr. Oliver added that the issue has been discussed in prior meetings and has been ongoing for a while. He mentioned the standards process is fair and sound. Superintendent Ritz added that with regard to social studies standards there were no public hearings because public hearings are not required. She said there is a formal review process. Review of math and language arts is different because the statute required three public hearings.
- Ms. Neal then made a statement, saying Indiana's standards were very good and by messing with them Indiana is messing with success. She said the changes dilute what students should know in social studies and the biggest problem is the elimination of rich content examples. She gave an example of the Monroe

Doctrine being dropped, as well as certain United States Constitutional Amendments and references to the Jazz Age and the Berlin Wall. She also expressed concern over the inconsistency in the standards. She said changes to standards should be to fix weaknesses not to change those standards that are already very good. During her comments she referenced Dr. Jeremy A. Stern, a historian, as a source of some of the specific concerns she had with the standards.

- Superintendent Ritz stated they did reach out to the Indiana Council for History Education and they supported having examples removed because it's too easy for those examples to become the standards taught. She said she appreciated the specific pieces that have to be included. She said those can be found in the resource pieces. Mr. Elsener added that he wondered if there is someone in the state that is working with teachers for continuous improvement and access to resources. Superintendent Ritz responded that Bruce Blomberg, from the Department, is in charge of that, ensuring information is getting out to teachers. Mr. Elsener said continuous improvement is very important and asked for thoughts on how to follow through on that. Ms. Neal suggested the Department look at the South Carolina resource guide if this resolution passes. Mr. Albert said he has heard principals say they want these standards to be locally controlled. He suggested giving educators time to review the standards and then produce the resource guide with the help of experts. Ms. Whicker followed up by pointing out that the standards are living documents. Ms. Neal said changing items on a regular basis will cause problems and without prioritization the core could be lost. Superintendent Ritz expounded that national association standards were looked at and there is very little change in the national approach. Mr. Bruce Blomberg, from the Department, stated that the standards are aligned with national standards. He went on to say the Indiana standards haven't changed much and the benchmarks haven't changed much. Mr. Walker inquired about the difference between standards and curriculum. Mr. Blomberg explained that school districts have room to create curriculum; the standards are not the curriculum, just the framework. Ms. Neal added that there are certain non-negotiable items that should be in the standards. All members voted to adopt the standards except Ms. Neal who voted no. The motion carried 10-1.

I. Rulemaking on REPA III.

Superintendent Ritz stated that this item would addressed after discussion on REPA III and standard implementation would be taken after discussion on standards.

J. Extension of work of the strategic planning committee.

Superintendent Ritz invited Mr. Elsener to comment. He said the committee is doing great work. He explained it is taking a little more time than initially thought and said input from the field is a factor causing the process to take longer. He moved the Board to adopt the resolution extending the work and Mr. Albert seconded the motion. All 11 members voted in favor.

K. Creation of a special committee on assessments.

Superintendent Ritz said she would chair the committee and the other members were Mr. Albert, Ms. O'Brien, Dr. Oliver, and Ms. Whicker. Superintendent Ritz made the motion to create the special committee and Dr. Freitas moved to amend the motion to add Ms. Neal to the committee because he thought she would add value to the process. Mr. Walker seconded Superintendent Ritz's motion and all Board Members voted in favor. Superintendent Ritz then moved to add Ms. Neal to the committee and Dr. Freitas seconded. All board members voted in favor. The Board then recessed for lunch.

--RECESS--

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

Not discussed.

XI. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

Superintendent Ritz announced there would be a change in the order of items addressed and said they would begin with Item F – Standards review update.

F. Standards review update.

- Superintendent Ritz invited Ms. Shockey to take the floor along with Molly Chamberlain, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the Center for Education and Career Innovation. Dr. Chamberlin began by giving a refresher on HEA1427 requiring the Board to review common core standards. She iterated the Board decided to go further in a more elaborate review process of multiple standards. Ms. Shockey explained this is the reason they did not start from scratch. Dr. Chamberlin said the next step would be assessments to match the standards. Ms. Shockey then showed the timeline of the process, reiterating it was not a rushed process. She went on to say they would be ready to bring standards before the Board for adoption in April as a resolution to adopt.
- Ms. Shockey explained where they were with the review panels. She explained the work of the technical and advisory panels and the evaluation team. She explained the review was opened up to include national standards and old Indiana standards. She said the math team reviewed three sets of standards independent of each other for college and career readiness. She iterated the training was conducted by Sujie Shin, Assistant Director of standards implementation with WestEd, who led the reconciliation process on the 13th and 14th of March. What the panelists reviewed were origin free standards by strand and by content so they did not know where the standards came from. They first looked for commonalities she added. They also continued to narrow the bloat by consolidated standards that are essentially saying the same thing for example. Dr. Oliver pointed out each set of standards were reviewed separately and that the structure was not set up first on purpose. The architecture comes later. He went on that this is important to balance interests on both sides. By not setting the architecture first the review was not driven one way or another. Ms. Shockey added that Sujie Shin commented that Indiana's process is the most in depth she has seen and will recommend it to other states.
- Ms. Shockey continued that there were some areas where the panelists didn't like the language in any of the standards they reviewed. In those cases they looked to other states and the option of combining standards. Dr. Chamberlin added that they wanted to get input from national experts on the raw ingredients but theexperts indicated that they would prefer to wait for an articulated version. Ms. Shockey explained the process for public comment online. Mr. Elsener said it was an impressive array of experts. He asked if the reports could be forwarded to the Board. Ms. Shockey said they would forward the raw and summary information. Dr. Chamberlin said the deadline for the articulation teams was the upcoming Friday. When talking about articulation,

she explained they are looking at depth of knowledge as well as the level you would expect that to be taught. They would also be looking at gaps and alignment. That will then be sent on for comment minus the architecture.

- Dr. Chamberlin said architecture is the way it looks when published, the umbrella ideas. She said they are looking to other states that have done this very well. She went on to say architecture helps a lot with implementation. Ms. Shockey said the LSA has the opportunity to review a decision of the Indiana Roundtable. The Roundtable fiscal has been sent to LSA, which has 45 days to review. Ms. Shockey continued by stating they have been in communication with the U.S. Department of Education frequently. USDOE is aware of what Indiana is doing and has indicated that it will require an amendment of the waiver. Dr. Chamberlin then described some of the comments they have heard. She said one common criticism that they had heard was that the teams of experts were not qualified enough. She stated they feel strongly about the expertise of the reviewers and went through some of their qualifications, including the fact that there was 450 years of combined teaching experience, and described some of the educational backgrounds of some of the reviewers. She said there were critical comments that some members are biased towards common core. She explained that while several members did work on the PARCC team, that doesn't mean they are biased. She said some teachers testified against the common core pause but pointed out that if teachers have been teaching the same standards for a while, then changing is difficult. Dr. Freitas asked about whether the new standards are aligned with the SAT and ACT; Dr. Chamberlin said college and career readiness is more of a concern than content. Dr. Freitas pointed out the difference between standards and curriculum and that local districts still have flexibility with curriculum.

G. Standards Implementation.

Amy Horton, Assistant Superintendent for Student Achievement and Improvement at the Department of Education, and Dr. Walker spoke about implementation. Ms. Horton began by stating they will be ready to go in April. The goals are awareness, responsiveness, support and engagement. She then described how those goals would be achieved, starting with awareness. She mentioned educators suffering from standards transition fatigue, making it important to capture their attention and being cognizant of this issue. She then explained some branding ideas that can help improve clarity. She mentioned

providing information by social media to make sure communication is effective. With respect to the second goal of responsiveness, she said they asked the field through a survey what they need to help implement the standards. She also expressed the need to provide support according to the specific needs of the locality. This feedback will be ongoing. In terms of the third goal of support, Dr. Walker stated there would be standards correlation documents that focus on the differences between the new and old standards for clarity. She also said there would be instructional guidance and clarity with regard to accountability and what would be expected of them. In terms of engagement, Ms. Horton laid out that there will be online communities of practice to leverage local expertise to facilitate a free market of ideas. It would be a platform where ideas could be shared among professionals peer to peer. Superintendent Ritz asked if this could count towards teacher licensure points, and Ms. Horton said it could. Dr. Freitas expressed how important this platform is for implementation. Dr. Oliver said it is also important to think about RFPs in the future and developing an assessment system as robust as possible. Mr. Watts added that his concern is with teachers feeling like the new standards are just another moving target. He went on to say it's important we express that these are the standards for Indiana and are here to stay. This is important for buy-in he said. Ms. O'Brien then made the following motion:

> I would like to first state my deep appreciation for all involved with the Standards Adoption Process-- the Department of Education Staff and the State Board Staff who have worked tirelessly to ensure that we have the highest-level academic standards available to all students, and also all those who have provided time and energy through committee work, public hearings, and public commentary. As we approach the final stages of the adoption timeline and navigate through the feedback we have received, I feel strongly that we need to lay the groundwork to best support our school districts across the state as they move into implementation of new standards. As curriculum decisions and textbook adoption in both Math and English/Language Arts were made across the state based upon the previous Board adoption of Common Core State Standards, there will obviously be gaps in

resources within our classrooms. Today, I would like to publicly reassure our schools, teachers, parents, and students that we are committed to working with them to align curriculum and professional development opportunities with the standards that will be adopted next month.

I would like to formally make a motion that this board will work with both staff from the Department of Education and the State Board of Education to create a plan in order to best support schools in their efforts to implement newly adopted State Standards in Math and English/Language Arts. I propose that these options, ranging from professional development to supplemental materials from approved textbook companies, as well as funding options to support such materials be presented at a meeting after the formal standards adoption (in the late Spring/early summer). It is my hope that we can develop a menu of opportunities to ensure full stakeholder confidence in their abilities to effectively ensure mastery of academic standards. I welcome any feedback or additional ideas from my fellow board members.

~~She moved that the plan be presented at a later meeting once the standards are in place~~. Upon a second by Dr. Oliver, the Board voted and all members voted in favor. The board then took a ten minute break.

--RECESS—

B. Monitoring update on Turnaround Academies.

- Tamra Wright, Director of Turnaround Schools at the Office of Education Innovation, provided an update of the turnaround academies. She explained the oversight process includes site visits, data collection, and reporting of the data to stakeholders like the board. She went on to explain the monthly template. She said trends can be seen in the data and the template includes comments from educators as well. Further, the next step is what the school is doing to improve.

She said she wants to know what programs schools have in place for improvement. The template allows the school to analyze data and determine what the next steps are for improvement. She said schools are assessed every quarter to see how they are doing with respect to core questions. She summarized the assessment data on Emma Donnan, Manual, T.C. Howe, and Arlington turnaround schools. She said Emma Donnan is an example of having strong leadership. Manual and Howe have been utilizing data well for improvement and Arlington has done an excellent job by extending the school day for mentoring and tutoring.

- Ms. Wright said that, in terms of growth, community involvement is important. There has also been an improvement in school climate and student engagement in the turnaround schools. Site visits will continue with monthly compliance meetings, and they will continue to work with stakeholders. They have also requested the schools conduct financial audit reports, she said, which is not required. She went on to say that a joint public meeting will take place as required by statute even though it didn't happen last year. Dr. Elsener inquired about how the information sharing is going; Ms. Wright said there have been challenges in getting information but hopes that will dissipate with time. Dr. Oliver inquired about looking at feeder schools and Ms. Wright responded that it is important to look at the feeder schools in addressing the struggles and challenges of the turnaround schools. Mr. Walker asked if the schools are improving when looked at from a higher level. Ms. Wright said they were waiting on acuity data but she believes there has been overall improvement. She also stressed this will take time though. She gave an example that school safety and climate has improved.
- Naomi O. Szekeres, M.Ed., from Pensarus Education Solutions, next addressed the Board. She came in from Washington, D.C., to attend the meeting. Pensarus was the organization that did the external evaluation for the City of Indianapolis. Ms. Szekeres provided some background information of Pensarus. She said it is an organization that works to improve schools through innovation and reform. She described that Pensarus did an independent review of the turnaround academies for a neutral perspective. She said among the core questions, they focused on core question four – which looks at whether a school is providing appropriate conditions for success. They looked at 11 indicators under core question four. She gave examples, stating they looked at curriculum and the implementation of it. They also looked at pedagogy, college and career readiness, data driven instructions, professional learning communities, and use

of research in the schools. They looked at the climate and the mission as well. Ms. Szekeres stated that community engagement is vital. She also said the focus was to aggregate information.

- Ms. Szekeres said some limitations included time constraints and getting data from the operators. She then outlined the numerous positive improvements in the schools. She said they were impressed with where the schools were and the progress made, even though further improvement is needed. She added that as classroom practices are implemented overall improvement will be seen. She stated a lot of the basics were in place, but some of the finer points need to be implemented. She said Emma Donnan had a great vision and an improved climate. They were also very structured and had great leadership. Pedagogy was a weakness, and community outreach were areas that could be improved. Ms. Szekeres stated Manual had great leadership and career oriented programming and implementation of new ideas. Climate and community involvement were both positive . Pedagogy was an issue for improvement. She continued by pointing out that Howe had great ideas but was struggling with implementation of those ideas. Community engagement was also robust. A concern was structure. Arlington, she said, had a strong structure, though there were some conflicts there. In addition, there are some communication issues that could use improvement. They had a really strong curriculum. They also had a diverse staff with a lot of experience and a disciplined work environment. They need to work on mission refinement and team building she said. Superintendent Ritz asked if what they did played into the templates; Ms. Szekeres said it plays into core question four.

C. Roosevelt High School update.

- Daniel Brundage, an outreach coordinator for the Department of Education in region six, spoke on this issue. He explained he has a lot of hands-on experience with what's going on in the building. He mentioned they had been in the school seven or eight times this year for walkthroughs. He discussed the core questions and goals. The first core question is whether the program is a success. He listed some statistics including student and staff attendance rates, 92% and 90%, respectively. The second core question Mr. Brundage addressed was whether the school is providing the appropriate conditions for success. He said this is an issue for Roosevelt and listed some enrollment statistics. He went on to say the numbers aren't consistent

because of all of the transfers taking place. He then moved on to core question three – whether the organization is effective and well run. He said there has been consistent staff in the building and attendance has been pretty good. Core question four is whether the school is in sound fiscal health. He pointed out the school is staying close to 600 students.

- Mr. Brundage listed some on site observations including strengths in climate and positive relationships between teachers and students. The environment was safe and orderly, he said. He continued that there were areas for improvement, including the rigor of lesson plans and improving student achievement. Mr. Brundage concluded that the next steps are to continue monitoring and open discussions regarding improvement in areas of weakness. Mr. Walker commented that they are doing a wonderful job with Roosevelt. Mr. Walker also asked about projects based learning and Mr. Brundage responded that right now. it's not implemented; he added that they do implement a blended learning model for seventh through ninth grade online learning. He said that is a conversation they have started though. Dr. Oliver asked about community involvement and Mr. Brundage responded that is an area they are working towards improving. Mr. Walker commented that the Board needs to think about what the end game is once the contract is up at Roosevelt. Mr. Brundage said that was one of the main concerns at the parent meeting. Mr. Walker said the school needs to know by this summer to start planning. Superintendent Ritz commented on literacy issues that are a challenge.
- Superintendent Ritz then gave an update on the maintenance issues at Roosevelt, saying that students were attending class in safe areas of the school although there are still repair issues that will have to be addressed. Mr. Hendry mentioned the leadership of the Mayor of Gary in the initiative to help alleviate some of the financial issues. Superintendent Ritz mentioned her meeting with the Mayor and agreed. Dr. McKeown was asked to give a quick update on the condition of Gary; she mentioned there are mold issues, and that Board staff are working with the Indiana Department of Administration to get estimates to address Roosevelt's maintenance issues.

D. REPA III discussion (and action).

- Superintendent Ritz introduced Jill Shedd, Executive Secretary of the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, to make public comment. Ms.

Shedd stated that there are three main concerns her organization has with REPA III. The first is the creation of an adjunct teacher's license. The second are changes to criteria for building and district level administrators. Lastly, she expressed concern about the adding of content areas to a license by taking a test only. She stated these changes reflect a lowering of standards as a whole.

- Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. McKeown and Ms. Regnier to discuss REPA III. Ms. Regnier gave a brief history of REPA I provisions and mentioned that REPA II was never finalized or implemented. For that reason REPA II would not be discussed. Ms. Regnier gave a brief overview of REPA I, the existing licensure rules in effect now. She iterated there are three types of licenses currently: a two-year initial practitioner license, a five-year proficient practice license and a 10-year accomplished practitioner license. She also discussed administrator licenses and alternative pathways. Another point Ms. Regnier made is that REPA III will be under the administrative title of the SBOE rather than under the administrative title of the now defunct Professional Standards Board, which is where REPA I is currently placed. Ms. Regnier discussed some recent legislative changes that affect teacher licensure and hiring of school employees, including the charter school license and local flexibility in the hiring of a superintendent without requiring them to hold a superintendent's license.
- Dr. McKeown described the adjunct teacher license which is a proposed addition in REPA III. Mr. Walker mentioned he is in favor of terminating the REPA III rulemaking process but in the event that fails is against the adjunct permit. Dr. Oliver asked if there was a way to limit adjunct permits to STEM areas. Dr. Freitas asked about adjunct permits in other shortage areas. Dr. Oliver said he did not like the idea of the adjunct permit as proposed. He went on to mention there is a shortage of staff in dual credit situations. Mr. Watts said he doesn't see a need for 5,000 adjunct licenses. He said he would limit it to STEM areas. He also proposed shortening it from five years to two years. Superintendent Ritz stated she was not in favor of the adjunct license. Dr. Freitas said he would include areas of shortage. Dr. Freitas also mentioned that he would like to see a list of what the criteria are for providers. He went on to say he would like to see a requirement of pedagogical training before they begin, as well as constant evaluation. Mr. Hendry said he didn't think the adjunct adds much given the alternative pathways already in place. Ms. Regnier responded that the alternative routes

lead to full licensure. Superintendent Ritz said there has not been an outcry from the field for an adjunct permit. Ms. Neal spoke in support of the adjunct, specifically with a high school limitation, because subject matter mastery is very important in high school grades. She said she didn't see the harm in giving principals the flexibility to go find great teachers. Mr. Elsener stated he agreed that if adjunct gives a flexibility to add talent it could be a good thing, and for that reason, he did not want to be too quick to delete it.. Mr. Hendry said he is conceptually supportive of the adjunct license if limited to STEM etc. He also agreed it could be an opportunity to bring in good talent.

- The next topic of discussion was license format. The REPA III language eliminates the initial two-year license and makes the license five years. It also eliminates the 10-year license. Licenses would only be available in five year spans. Superintendent Ritz opined that the reason she obtained national certification was because it would give her a 10-year license. Superintendent Ritz said she saw value in the 10-year license. A 10-year license requires two years of experience and a master's degree, Ms. Regnier clarified. Superintendent Ritz said the incentive to get a master's degree is an important incentive. Ms. Whicker mentioned that the 10-year license is beneficial because it frees teacher of the paperwork of renewal. Mr. Watts said as long as there is a professional development requirement he didn't care if it was a life license. Dr. Freitas said he would like to see two issues on the list. First, he suggested discussion on retaining the two, five and 10-year licensure scheme. Second, he said there should be a mechanism to grant additional time for a teacher that gets board certified. He mentioned linking licensure to highly effective teachers. Dr. Oliver said he would like to see it stay at two, five and 10. Other board members agreed.
- The next piece for discussion was the addition of content areas. One specific issue is that fine arts could be added as a content area just through testing according to the REPA III proposed language. Ms. Neal said that the argument that teachers in the fine arts areas need to demonstrate ability with the art is support for the adjunct license because the adjunct would provide a pathway to allow schools to hire artists and people with theatre backgrounds. Dr. Oliver said he wasn't comfortable with allowing Fine Arts to be added by testing alone and preferred leaving it the way it is currently. Dr. Freitas clarified that there are other areas that can be added to a license by just taking a test. Ms. Regnier responded that most content areas can be. Dr.

Freitas recommended a portfolio assessment. He did not feel comfortable with a written test for an artist.

- Health and PE was next on the list to discuss. REPA III proposes to combine the two as one content area; REPA I has them separate. The consensus of the board was to leave them separate.
- The board discussed dyslexia next. Ms. Regnier explained that several years ago the training for reading specialist was taken out, although there is a reading content area. Superintendent Ritz said she saw a strong need for reading specialist license and other board members agreed.
- The board then moved to administrative licenses. REPA III lowered the requirements for building administrator from a master's degree to a bachelor's degree. Ms. Whicker said it's important that building administrators have the background to be able to evaluate teachers. Dr. Oliver agreed that a bachelor's degree is not enough. Ms. Neal said she would like the flexibility to hire someone with another form of management experience. Superintendent Ritz expressed that she was for more rigor and keeping the way it was in REPA I. She went on to say two years is not enough. Dr. Oliver clarified the master's degree does not have to be in education. Dr. Freitas stated he supports REPA I provisions with regard to administrative licenses. With regard to the district level administrator license, Dr. Oliver said his concern was dropping the requirement down to a master's. He went on to say he didn't want to see the Ed.S. removed but he wanted to look into a temporary permit where after a certain number of years of successful leadership it would then convert to a superintendent's license. He said the ability to lead a district is the exception not the norm. He pointed out under the current rule there is no way to convert the temporary to a regular superintendent's license. Dr. Freitas wanted a broader discussion of requiring a master's degree or higher as proposed in REPA III. Mr. Hendry said he agreed with Dr. Freitas.
- The board then looked at virtual instruction as a new content area. Dr. McKeown said the public comments were generally favorable but comments sought more clarification. Superintendent Ritz recommended the board review these comments for later discussion. Reciprocity was the next piece. Ms. Regnier said currently Indiana does except other states' teacher license programs but does not accept their exams. The concern was duplication of exams. Superintendent Ritz stated this is a shame for nationally certified teachers. Mr. Albert said each states' exams are different and expressed the

importance of the requirement. Concerning visiting teachers, Ms. Regnier recommended allowing licensure in native languages by testing of oral proficiency in their native languages for added flexibility. In terms of early childhood, Dr. McKeown said there were public comments suggesting aligning the content requirements with the National Association for the Education of Young Children, but stated she believed it was currently aligned. Dr. McKeown state there were comments that to teach dual credit there should be a requirement of a having a master's degree. Mr. Albert said current guidelines require the teacher to meet the criteria of the partner school and he suggested leaving it like that so the board does not have to monitor it. Dr. Oliver said requiring a master's degree helps the universities to be able to come behind the high school teacher and recognize them as an adjunct.

- Mr. Walker asked if the Department wants to continue in rulemaking. Superintendent Ritz responded that the Department wanted to continue the rulemaking so that it would be under the board's administrative rule title and not the Professional Standards Board.

E. HEA1005 update.

Ms. Shockey explained 45,000 students have taken Accuplacer and the Department is working on getting guidance to schools. She went on to say they are also working on a survey to find out how the pilot went. Ms. Shockey also explained that some of the other parts of HEA1005 will be brought before the board soon.

H. Accountability systems review panel update.

Deborah Daily, Director of Accountability for the Department, spoke on this topic. Ms. Dailey explained that the panel convened on February 27, 2014. She stated they continued to refine the recommendations. Both experts were present, Dr. Derek Briggs and Dr. Damian Betebenner. The panel felt that the B definition of categorical improvement (in the memo provided) best reflects what they were trying to accomplish with categorical improvement. Ms. Dailey summarized weighing growth and performance and expressed that it was a policy driven decision. Further, the experts gave

overall feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses. She stressed that once they have a few years of data this will have to be assessed again.

A. SBOE staff updates.

Ms. Fiddian-Green stated the Governor asked her to work with Superintendent Ritz in moving the date in April to approve the college and career ready standards on account of all the public comments and the national evaluators. She said the proposed date is the April 25th after the Roundtable meeting on April 21. Dr. Oliver said he could not attend because of graduation, and Ms. Fiddian Green responded that since Ms. Neal had a conflict the following week she would follow up by email to get a date. Mr. Hendry expressed that he would be out of town the Thursday and Friday at the end of April. Ms. Fiddian-Green and Superintendent Ritz agreed that the board would not be voting on the standards at the April 9th, 2014 meeting.

XII. BOARD OPERATIONS

Discussed as Action Item – F in New Business.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Elsener moved to adjourn and Dr. Oliver seconded; all members voted to adjourn.