INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

August 6, 2014

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

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

Mr. Tony Walker attended by phone.

Board Members Absent: none.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and called the roll. The roll reflected all members present in person or by phone except Mr. B.J. Watts. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Superintendent Ritz announced, per Board staff, action item J. Initiating Rulemaking on Accountability, would be removed from today's agenda. Further there were two discussion items that would be added to today's agenda; a waiver update and school performance awards. Also, there was removal of a few other items from the action;

action item H, action item D, action item K, action item L, and action item M. There will be discussion items moved to accommodate presenters. Action item A and Discussion item B were moved to the end of the action item agenda. The Board voted 11-0 to approve the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board voted 11-0 to approve minutes from the July 9, 2014 meeting.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz stated she is proud of MSD Washington Township. It is one of six schools across the world in which every school is International Baccalaureate recognized. Superintendent Ritz noted the congressional delegation sent letters to Secretary Duncan, but there had not been an update to the waiver approval timeline. She also stated ISTEP scores indicated there is an upward trend in all subject areas throughout the state. There are now bus driver training videos posted on the Department website. Due to the length of the agenda, the Superintendent asked for the public's patience, respectful discourse, and reminded the Board, Department staff and Board staff to refrain from cell phone use and sidebar conversations.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

- Dr. Oliver went to the United Kingdom and Ireland with a group of educators through the Passport to Education Program. Provides educators an opportunity to look at education from a global view. Indiana students posted modest gains in assessment. Educators counting on the board to address many key issues. A shared

understanding of what education is across the state. A collective effort from several different agencies across the state. Leadership is the key focus of the board on this.

- Dr. Freitas thanked educators across the state for their hard work and praised them for the ISTEP scores. He would like subgroup scores for ISTEP. He is concerned about the achievement gap in Indiana. Dr. Michele Walker indicated DOE is working on collecting subgroup data, and will get it to the board when it is available. Superintendent Ritz addressed the achievement gap by focusing on annual measurable objectives that are set up by NCLB waiver. Specific goals are set up to address achievement gaps. Dr. Freitas asked how this would be reported back to the State Board. Ms. Deb Dailey discussed AMO's. There is not a clear role of the board defined for reporting purposes. Currently, schools report to the department and the department keeps track of that data and makes it available. Dr. Freitas asked that this information be presented to the Board.
- Mr. Elsener reinforced that in order to work strategic plan and the scorecard, they need accurate data and need to know strategic goals of schools that are both succeeding and struggling. The data of priority schools needs to be available and organized so the strategic plan can be fully developed and school progress can be charted. He also asked Superintendent Ritz for her initial thoughts on the ISTEP data.
- Superintendent Ritz commented that there was an increase in math and ELA scores, and said that they are looking at the data of the priority schools carefully. There is current review of the disaggregate data by the outreach coordinators in their assigned regions.
- Mr. Hendry mentioned he and Dr. Freitas went to a conference discussing educational best practices across the country over a 3 day period. Looked forward to continued participation by the Board in the National Association of State Boards of Education.
- Ms. Neal discussed opportunities that the Indiana Bicentennial offers k-12 schools to teach students about state heritage. There is a state-approved high school elective, "Indiana Studies" but only a half dozen schools offer this course. In process of surveying schools that have offered the class, and preliminary review shows that budget, improper curriculum, and no incentive because of subjects assessed for accountability purposes are reasons the course is not more widely taught. She then

introduced members of the Indiana Historical Society and an Indiana high school social studies teacher to discuss best practices.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Mr. Michael Chisley, a retired educator and former President of the Indianapolis Alliance of Black School Educators, addressed concerns on equitable policies on expulsions and suspensions. He mentioned that disproportionate number of minority students have been suspended. He talked about cultural responsiveness, and would like to see this incorporated in curriculum and instruction. He is concerned about school safety. Accountability should be based on effective data. Mr. Elsener said he would like to have further discussions after all the data from previous school year has been gathered.
- Ms. Erika Haskins, represents teacher advisory board formed by the Institute of Quality Education. She said would like for the teacher advisory board to be part of positive outreach program to discuss strategic plan that was adopted July 9th. Educator ambassador program will build momentum toward increasing rigor and help build retention structure. Their goal is to begin dialogue on what teachers do when they are at their best. The advisory board will serve under the guidance of the Institute of Quality Education. This is an opportunity to connect teachers to each other and to the Board. Dr. Oliver sees benefit to having something similar to this, and would like to look at this further. He commented that it does help to have educators involved in the process of strategic planning. Dr. Freitas said he would like to help spearhead the effort. Mr. Elsener asked what the advisory board would need, and said that the board needs to find ways to help.
- Mr. Anthony Beverly with Stop the Violence addressed issues with turnaround schools and TSOs. He mentioned they have not had significant increases in student achievement. He recommended that the following elements become part of managing contract for TSOs: Equitable Policies, he stated that kids have been pushed out for petty issues; Cultural Responsiveness, he'd like to see more opportunities for minorities to learn about history and themselves; Community Involvement; these are areas where TSOs are lacking.

- Ms. Patricia Payne is an educational consultant on cultural competency training. She expressed concern on lack of public accountability for TSOs. Urges that TSOs should be transparent about policies and performance data. The following components should be included in contracts: Discipline policies that are fair and do not interrupt time in the classroom and disaggregated discipline data; Culturally Responsive Beliefs and personnel that can accurately address academic and behavioral performance; Realistic Annual Performance Goals; Early Warning and Intervention Systems that use research-based practices.
- Ms. Elizabeth Gore is the education chairperson for the Concerned Clergy. She mentioned that while there has been some gain in turnaround schools, it has not been significant. The process embarked upon in turnaround is not showing evidence that it is working. She believes that TSOs have weak accountability. She asks that these elements be placed in turnaround contracts: equitable policies; cultural responsiveness; instruction assessment; professional development; teacher evaluation; leadership evaluation; high annual performance goals; extensive integrated community services and engagement; and public accountability.
- Dr. Khaula Murtadha represents Education Council of the National Council of Negro Women. They have found that the community is increasingly concerned about turnaround schools. Annual reports need to be made public. She mentioned that determining the success of turnaround schools is more complex than what is on the surface. She had many questions for the Board about monitoring of turnaround schools. She recommends that an impact assessment for accountability purposes be done and shared with the public.
- Ms. Pat Rogan serves as Executive Associate Dean of the School of Education at IUPUI. She mentioned that the school of education focuses on urban education research. They promote full service community schools. She asks that their work be part of the emphasis on quality education across central Indiana. She highlighted national data on turnaround schools. She noted that takeovers have yet to produce substantial positive growth in turnaround schools.
- Ms. Carol Craig she is a retired school administrator and represents the Greater Indianapolis NAACP. She spoke about concern for the current turnaround process and questioned if it achieved the required results. She spoke on suspension and expulsion rates, and the results at the turnaround schools compared to other

schools within the Indianapolis area. She asked that points brought up by other speakers be listened to by turnaround committee. She shared some information with the Board.

- Mr. Hendry mentioned that the Board needs to give turnaround schools time after many years of failure, and must be mindful of previous results and look at what is happening currently. He said that some of these issues would be looked at by the turnaround committee.
- Mr. Elsener put turnaround schools in some historical context. Mentioned that there is a moral obligation and the historical record showed that many turnaround schools received support throughout the years before takeover occurred. Encouraged people to recognize that after schools continue to decrease after years of support, something needs to occur.
- Mr. Tony Walker suggested that student behavior issues will not be solved if addressed at school only. He went on to say it was unfair to set an expectation that teachers and school administrators were going to fix this issue when it may not be resolved in the student's household. He felt that training or support should be provided to parents to help put discipline structure in place.

--Recess--

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. ADJUDICATIONS

none

IX. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION

G. Assessment update (discussion item)

- Superintendent Ritz moved this item up from discussion because there were several guest speakers on the topic. An update on the RFP process, the CTB settlement, and the procurement process.
- Dr. Michele Walker shared that there were educators reviewing new items for the spring 2015 assessment in both math and ELA. Acuity will be redesigned based upon the new standards for grades 3 – 8. Any school that has not signed up for Acuity, can now sign up through October. There will be three readiness windows starting in September. The blueprint will be the same as ISTEP. Professional development is forthcoming in September centered on open-ended items and what it will look like for students to provide evidence. There will be another component focused on technology enhanced items.
- Mr. Hendry asked for clarification on settlement agreement and timeline. Dr. Walker shared information on pieces that are part of the agreement. The agreement is in regard to the products and services agreed upon after the interruption of services during ISTEP testing in the previous year. Some components include in-kind services and a dollar amount near $1.5 million in services for this year, specific reports data, and an art project program sponsored by CTB. Mr. Elsener asked Superintendent Ritz for clarification on the signage of the contract for the 2014-2015 school year. The contract was extended as-is to meet the deadline before the current contract expired. This allowed ISTEP to remain in its current form because new Indiana standards were not in place at the time. Then there began an amendment process so ISTEP could adhere to the new Indiana Standards. Currently, there is currently no binding contract, but a good faith contract with CTB for ISTEP development in 2014-2015 school year. Ms. O'Brien asked about the number of interruptions that took place and how the settlement was considered to be fair. She was concerned about the art project not reaching all students affected. Brad asked for clarification on whether or not the agreement was signed or not. Superintendent Ritz clarified that this was not an agreement, but an amendment to the existing CTB contract. Dr. Oliver expressed concern about the lack of a collaborative effort and lack of dialogue between the Board and IDOE on the amendment process. He stated, "Kids benefit across the state when the policy-setting body is working collaboratively with the policy-enforcement body." Superintendent Ritz stated that the settlement was an amendment to a contract that is not yet finalized. Mr. Hendry then asked about the criteria that was used to arrive at the penalty amount. Dr. Michele Walker

said that there is a formula to assess liquidated damages to determine the total amount, then they looked at what would be needed for future development.

- Mr. Hendry clarified that it was a settlement agreement, not just an amendment. Dr. Michelle McKeown clarified that the contract originally signed is no longer valid. The settlement agreement was originally an exhibit in the new contract. Dr. McKeown stated that the settlement agreement will be a part of the new contract, and not an exhibit attachment. Dr. Oliver asked Dr. McKeown if the State Board had authority over contract issues. Dr. McKeown said that the board is the final authorizer in these type of agreements. Mr. Tony Walker questioned if the contract agreement is legally binding and asked about options on opening the process back up since the proper authorities were not involved in the original settlement agreement. Dr. McKeown said that it would be something that the Attorney General's office would have to look at. Superintendent Ritz said that IDOE hired someone from the Attorney General's office to work on this, and questioned whether or not that was sufficient. Dr. McKeown clarified that there were legal flaws to the document as a settlement agreement. Dr. Freitas asked for clarification on the hiring of someone from the Attorney General's office and what the arrangement was. It was clarified that this was not a paid position. Mr. Freitas then asked Dr. McKeown for additional clarification on the Board's role in the process and what kind of oversight the board can have. Dr. McKeown suggested that the statute can authorize the Board to ask for specific authorization responsibilities in the statewide assessment system and that the Board needs to define what their role would be. Dr. Freitas asked for a resolution to what exactly the Board's authority is in regard to such matters.

  Superintendent Ritz clarified that they were moving forward with the contract with CTB and would have her legal team look into the board's role in such decisions. Dr. McKeown clarified that any resolution does not undermine the ability to be proficient in developing assessments for 2014-2015 and even the 2015-2016 school year. Dr. Oliver suggested that we maintain a system of transparency because everyone wants what is best for students. Mr. Elsener gave historical reference on assessment under previous administrations and board involvement throughout the process. He again asked for clarification on the art project. Dr. Michele Walker clarified the art project in a little more detail. Mr. Hendry asked about the schedule moving forward and getting contract signed in 2014-2015. Dr. Michele Walker said they received approval from the special procurement group. Mr. Moore explained

that someone from the Attorney General's office can step in on pre-litigation settlements. He also said the attorney from the Attorney General's office expressed that the settlement was a good deal.

- Ellen Haley, President of CTB spoke on what the test design would look like for the 2014-2015 school year. There will be one test, but two different testing windows. Ms. Hailey clarified it was a settlement agreement that was entered into in October, and the damages were more than allotted in the contract. Craig Mills, Vice President of Research and Sally Valenzuela, Vice President of Content Development also spoke. Ms. Hailey spoke about the design options of the test and alignment to the new Indiana standards.
- Craig Mills discussed field testing. He assured the Board that any question involved in a student's score was a good test questions. Mr. Mills discussed the different Field test design options. He discussed psychometricians that were asked to weigh in on the design options, and they agreed that operationalized field testing was a sound design model. After he discussed the process for evaluating the soundness of an operationalized field test, Mr. Mills stated, "In summary, operationalized field testing is a psychometrically sound model. The model you are going down will give you a reliable, valid, defensible exam." Mr. Mills then discussed exactly what the test would look like for students.
- Sally Valenzuela discussed how CTB was assuring the items were aligned to the standards. She discussed that through the assessment item development process the items would go through an evidence based design process and how the standards helped drive the items developed. Ms. Valenzuela said that all item writers go through extensive training on specifications designed for ISTEP. She then assured that all items developed went through an extensive review process from CTB. Ms. Valenzuela then assured the items are reviewed by IDOE content specialists and then are reviewed by educators. She provided statistics on previous development and the approval rates on field test items and stated there was over a 90% approval rate on the items that had been developed by CTB.
- Mr. B.J. Watts asked what the process was for science and social studies. Dr. Michelle Walker clarified that the process is a little different since the standards those assessments are written to are not new. Dr. Oliver asked about bridging the gap and vertical scale of the items. Ms. Hailey said that there is a way to ensure that

growth can be shown even when using new standards. CTB will work on the vertical scaling of the items, but CTB does not use the scale to show growth. Another company will work on growth. Dr. Michele Walker is currently working on that contract. Mr. Mills said that there will be difficulties in comparing growth from last year to this year. He clarified that it can be done. The vertical scale created will carry forward. Cari Whicker asked for clarification that the data will be valid and reliable.

Mr. Mills assured that data would be valid and reliable. Ms. Neal asked for explanation on how the 2015 test will provide longitudinal data. Mr. Mills said there were models that could be used for this. Andrea asked how Indiana items would differ from items used throughout the country aligned to Common Core. Dr. Michele Walker clarified that 100% of the items are specific to Indiana standards. Andrea asked if CTB could provide a cross-walk of items and how they compared to Common Core assessment items. Dr. Freitas asked about validity and reliability and asked for suggestions on how stakeholders could see that the items developed really are valid and reliable. Ms. Hailey suggested that it starts with the standards and getting parents to understand that the standard itself is what is going to be assessed and that makes the test valid. Dr. Oliver asked how much longer the test would be this year. Dr. Michelle Walker said that this is something that they are still looking at in conjunction with CTB and since the items are still being reviewed, there is no way to know just yet.

- Dr. Michele Walker introduced MR. Stan Judson, strategic sourcing analyst, from the Department of Administration Procurement Division. Mr. Judson handed out documentation to Board members. Stan said that the RFP has been building since the RFI. Mr. Judson said they developed a proposed timeline built from previous solicitation, previous oral presentations by respondents, and the components of the

  RFP. The timeline the DOA has developed is the best guess at what can be expected. Ms. Whicker asked Mr. Judson to give dates since the Board received the documentation and the date was not actually discussed. Mr. Judson stated that the expected date for the contract to be awarded was March 15, 2015. He said this is not best case or worst case scenario, but somewhere in the middle. The complexity of the scope of services played a role in the timeline. Mrs. O'Brien stated she had concern about administering a new assessment for the 2015-2016 school year. She also asked about the possibility of eliminating some potential vendors because of the timeline. Dr. Michele Walker addressed this concern by assuring there will be

enough items from the 2014-2015 school year to develop a form for the 2015-2016 school year. Ms. O'Brien asked for a realistic timeline from the time the contract began to develop an operational assessment. Dr. Walker stated that we could develop an operationalized field test in approximately 8 months. She also said that each vendor would have a timeline in their proposal.

- Ms. Neal asked if there was a way to simplify the RFP. She stated that the complexity of the RFP may suggest that the assessment is complicated. Superintendent Ritz clarified that it was not just ISTEP, but the entire assessment system throughout the state of Indiana. Dr. Walker also clarified the individual components of the RFP, and the need for the complexity of the RFP.
- Dr. Oliver asked how comfortable the DOA was with the March 15th date and the appeals process after the RFP is awarded. The March 15th date is the day that the RFP would be awarded, then the 5 day protest period would begin, and no contracts can be signed. However, verbal negotiations could occur. IDOA would handle the protest process if it were to occur. He noted that this could impact the timeline on the assessment development process. Mr. Judson also noted that there is also an allowable contract negotiation timeline that could also affect the development timeline.
- Dr. Freitas asked how different vendors could be awarded. Mr. Judson clarified that there is an evaluation team and an Indiana preference section. There is scoring from multiple agencies, which are added together for each of the components. Mr. Judson stated that the first sector is more qualitative instead of quantitative.
- Mr. Albert asked when he RFP would be made public. Mr. Judson said they were hopeful that it would occur August 15, 2014.

--RECESS--

C. <u>Approval of CORE content licensure tests and cut scores</u>

- Risa Regnier spoke to the board about the number of new teacher licensure tests and cut scores. She mentioned that there are now licensure tests for three new areas, PE, health, and virtual instruction. Ms. Regnier said that the score setting

panels met a few weeks ago, and now they need preliminary approval of the test blueprints and cut scores so they can post them for public comment. She indicated that each board member should have the test blueprint and a summary of the panel-based cut scores. Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to preliminarily accept the panel-based cut scores. Mr. Albert and Mr. Watts move to preliminary accept the panel-based cut scores. Dr. Freitas discussed that there is an international organization that looks at virtual instruction and asked if the recommended standards aligned to those standards. Nancy Hahn from Pearson addressed the question. Pearson worked with a national e-learning organization. Dr. Freitas raised some concerns with the virtual instruction standards, and said he would like to see some more time to look at the virtual instruction standards. Lisa indicated that the timeline on tests and scores could not be applied to candidates for 6 months. Lisa said that they were going to recommend making the virtual instruction assessment optional for a brief time period. Dr. Freitas recommended pulling the virtual instruction test from the licensure test so it will provide opportunities for more input from school leaders before the 30 day public comment. Superintendent Ritz asked for clarification on the development of the standards. Ms. Regnier said that the standards were developed with a number of higher education officials, a national organization, and some e-learning experts. Ms. Hahn mentioned that the standards began development in 2012. Ms. O'Brien asked for clarification on what they were doing today. Ms. Regnier reiterated that this was just preliminary approval for these standards to go forward for public comment. Dr. Freitas said he now had a better understanding of what they were asking the Board to do. Ms. O'Brien asked for more information regarding the panel of reviewers. Ms. Hahn stated that she could provide the Board with names of those individuals. Ms. Hahn said that they asked for input from teachers in health and PE and instructors of those educators.

- Superintendent Ritz asked for clarification of what will be posted for public comment. Ms. Regnier said that the test blueprint and the preliminary cut scores will be posted. She clarifies that the standards have already been approved.
- Dr. Oliver brought up INOKL, the international organization for k-12 learning. He said that he would like Ms. Rene and Ms. Hahn to go back and ensure the standards were in some alignment with the national standards presented by INOKL.

- Dr. Freitas questioned the last page with all the cut score data and whether or not the public will understand the data. Ms. Regnier said that they would provide some explanation before the cut scores became available for public comment.
- Mr. Elsener asked who in particular needed the virtual instruction certification. Ms. Regnier said that the virtual instruction licensure may be optional for a period of time, but it is in the language for REPA III.
- Mr. Elsener said he would like to separate the virtual instruction piece as well. Superintendent Ritz clarified that the licensure in virtual instruction is mentioned within REPA III. Ms. Regnier reiterated that what is on the table is not the virtual instruction licensure, but the test for virtual instruction. Ms. Regnier stated that at the time of review for REPA III it may be helpful to look at public comment on the virtual instruction part of the licensure.
- Mr. Watts and Mr. Albert withdrew their move to bring the motion to a vote. Superintendent Ritz withdrew her original motion. She then asked if there was a motion to preliminarily approve the content test for physical education and health and their respected panel-based passing scores. Mr. Elsener seconded the motion. The board voted 10 – 0 to approve the content test for physical education and health and their respected panel-based passing scores.

E. Strategic Planning Committee resolution

- Superintendent Ritz asks if there was a motion to move to adopt the resolution on the strategic planning committee meeting. Brad Oliver moved to adopt the resolution and Mr. Elsener seconded.
- Ms. Andrea Neal had a caution with the resolution. The strategic planning committee will be to move to adopt a plan aligned to career council among others. The strategic plan of the career council is to align job demands with what is going on in our schools, but it calls for a close relationship with schools. This education system may reduce student choice, she said. She read strategy 2.2 which called for a career strategy developed in kindergarten. This may cause schools to eliminate worthwhile activities with career curriculum. She would like to object to a strategic plan being aligned to other strategic plans.

- Mr. Dan Elsener commented that he would like to challenge Ms. Neal's thought. He said he spoke with many business leaders about needing more liberal arts-educated students entering the workforce.
- Ms. O'Brien clarified that as an educator in the primary grades she sees the career council strategic piece as developing career-mindedness at a developmentally appropriate level instead of preparing students for a particular career at an early grade.
- Mr. Hendry said he would like to echo Mr. Elsener's point that the Board needs to keep its eye on the prize and understand that companies are continually stating current students are not prepared to enter the workforce. The resolution passed by a vote of 9 – 1, with Ms. Neal voting no.

F. Approval of rule language 135-60 (Special Education related services by choice schools)

- Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to approve final language. Mr. Albert moved and Dr. Oliver seconded the motion. The language passed by a vote of 10 – 0.

G. Approval of rule language 13-561 (Requirements for the education and special education and related services of children who are placed in a facility under the written order of a physician).

- Heather Willey spoke on behalf of Universal Health Services. She wanted to thank legislative team for two years' worth of work. Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to approve final language. Dr. Oliver moved to approve language and Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion. The language passed by a vote of 10 – 0.

H. Resolution of Petition for Adverse Action – Edison Learning/GCSC

- Removed from agenda

I. Dissolution of Assessment Subcommittee

- Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to move to dissolve the assessment subcommittee.
- Dr. Oliver asked for clarification that dissolving the subcommittee does not dissolve the resolution. He said he believed the full board needed to be involved moving forward. He moved to dissolve the subcommittee, but that the resolutions put forth by the subcommittee remain. Dr. Freitas seconded the motion.
- Mr. Albert discussed the work done by the subcommittee and wanted the Board to understand the work done by the subcommittee contributed to the RFP that was presented earlier. He stated that the subcommittee and the Board did work together on that work, and urged that he did not want to see more Board involvement result in a delay in the process. The Assessment Subcommittee was dissolved by a vote of 10-0.

J. *Initiate Rule Making on Pre-K Accreditation*

- Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to initiate rule-making to amend 511 IAC 6.1-111. Dr. Oliver moved and Mr. Watts seconded. The board voted 10-0 to initiate rule-making on Pre-K Accreditation.

K. *A-F Bonuses 2014-2015*

- Dr. McKeown discussed a memo that was presented to the Board at the last meeting. She outlined a collaborative effort between State Board staff and IDOE staff on an emergency rule regarding A-F bonuses and A-F configuration of atypical schools.
- The staffs of IDOE and the State Board of Education had joint recommendations. One such recommendation, regarding the weight of College and Career Readiness, was to strike language on Bonus and Penalty language. And lastly there was a joint recommendation to address unusual school configurations.

- Superintendent Ritz called Todd Best, executive director Principals Association to speak. He said that supported the recommendations from IDOE and State Board Staff.
- Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to amend emergency rule-making on rule 511 IAC 6.2-6-5.3 that deducts points by eliminating preliminary scores. Mr. Hendry moved to amend rule-making and Dr. Oliver seconded. Mr. Albert asked the Superintendent whether or not this would have any effect on the waiver. Superintendent Ritz clarified that it would not. The amendment passed 10-0.

L. A-F Configurations 2013-2014

- Dr. Michelle McKeown addressed configuration of atypical school types. She stated that a school's data profile does not necessarily align to the school's configuration.
- Heather Willey spoke on school configurations as a board member at Christel House Academy. She wanted to discuss unusual configurations under the A-F model. She was concerned about the unintended consequences of the rule as it is currently written. She questioned whether or not high schools with an incomplete data set can are really being given accurate accountability grades. There were scenarios that were presented on what some accountability grades would look like for a school with incomplete data.
- Superintendent Ritz asked Ms. Deb Dailey, Director of Accountability at DOE to comment on what the department is doing to address the issue. Currently, the school would have been given one overall grade, but the school would have separate components that make up that final grade. The recommendation was to put in combined models.
- Dr. Oliver asked if the proposed language would help mitigate the situation put forth by Heather Willey. Dr. McKeown explained to the Board how the rule change would affect schools with atypical configurations. She said that the data that is available would be brought to the Board so they could make a decision on appropriate models to apply to the accountability of the school so no unintended consequences would be applied.

- Ms. Neal asked if the model that could be used would be the one that results in the most favorable score instead of bringing the data to the Board. Dr. McKeown said that language could be built in for that instead of how it is done. Superintendent Ritz wanted clarification on why the procedure provided the prior year could not be used. Dr. McKeown said that ideally the situation would have been resolved the previous school year. She stated that using the model from the year before may not yield the same results this year as another model, and that is why it is important for the Board to look at the data before making a decision on the model to use. Dr. Freitas said that this was really about fairness and unintended consequences. Mr. Elsener stated that the A-F model was still on training wheels. The Board knew they would have to make decisions on some schools, and he thought this was something which needed to be done.
- Dr. Oliver asked for clarification, because he thought they were running the school data against what favored the school the most. Ms. Dailey stated that they were running the models consistently for all schools that fell under each category, not different models for all the schools. Superintendent Ritz questioned whether or not running different models from year to year would raise any questions about the year-to-year scores. Mr. Albert clarified that there is an appeals process that the schools can go through already. Ms. Whicker said that even though there is an appeals process it is hard for a school to overcome a grade that has already been published.
- Mr. Albert asked if we there was a reason why grades could not be pushed back from October until December and use the most recent data instead of using data in arrears. Dr. McKeown recommended that if this was something the board wanted to do, there would have to be a year where two sets of data was used. Superintendent Ritz asked if there would be any legislative action that would need to take place in order for that to happen. Dr. McKeown said that as long as the accountability model used was after September 30th then it would not be any issue.
- Superintendent Ritz asked if there is a motion to accept the emergency rule making by adding language for schools with atypical configurations. Dr. Freitas moved to accept the emergency rule and Mr. Elsener seconded. The emergency rule passed with a vote of 10-0.

M. A-F Rules

- Removed from agenda.

N. MOU regarding funds received for CTE under Perkins Act

- Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to authorize the State Board of Education's Executive Director a memorandum on behalf of the State Board to allocate Perkins funds to the State Department of Education. Mr. Albert moved to authorize the memorandum and Mr. Watts seconded. The motion to authorize the allocation of funds passed with a vote of 10-0.

O. *Assessment System and Issuance of Request for Proposals*

- Removed from agenda.

--RECESS--

D. Turnaround School Operator Updates (Discussion Item)

- Ms. Tamra Wright provided an update on the oversight of the turnaround school operators. The mayor's office has provided feedback to the turnaround school operators on some of the community concerns discussed during public comment. She did say that the mayor's office does not have much authority to act on some of the concerns because the turnaround school operators are abiding by federal laws. She said that for oversight, they look at four key questions, and provide the State Board of Education a monthly template looking at key areas, and require the schools to provide proper documentation for these reports. The turnaround performance framework has now been individualized for each school. The Office of Education Innovation is also now receiving School Improvement Grant applications from the Department of Education so that they can monitor that aspect of each school as well. She said that the progress that has been seen at the schools is encouraging, but

there is still a long way to go. She said looking at a Mass Insight study on school turnaround that turnaround can take from 3 – 5 years, and currently the turnaround operators have only completed year two. Mr. Elsener asked a clarifying question based on the enrollment numbers brought up during public comment. He asked if there was evidence that the turnaround operators had in any way seemingly forced low performing students out of their schools to help raise their test scores. Ms. Wright said that there was actually evidence to the contrary. Ms. Wright showed evidence that the population of students on free and reduced lunch have increased in each of the turnaround schools. There may have been a slight dip for one year, but now that population has increased to more than it was before the TSO began work at each of the schools. Mr. Elsener then commented that the progress that is being made is even more remarkable. Ms. Wright showed the board evidence that each of the schools operated by Charter Schools USA have shown gains in both ELA and math. She said that the Office of Education Innovation is taking steps to help improve the monitoring of the turnaround schools. Mr. Albert asked if Ms. Wright could bring back evidence that some of the professional development being provided at the turnaround schools is working. Superintendent Ritz asked if the data being presented in the quarter 4 report was just that, a quarter 4 report or data for the entire schools year. Ms. Wright clarified that it was just a quarter 4 report, and they would put together an entire year summary after they received all of the year end testing data. She did say that by looking at each of the quarterly reports, one can see trends in how the schools are performing.

- Ms. Teresa Brown the Regional Director for Charter Schools USA spoke to the board about her role since Charter Schools USA began operating in Indianapolis. She said that turning around a school is truly a community effort, and they would like to be community partners. Ms. Brown said that one of the main goals is to improve attendance rates and find out the key motivation for their students. She said that they are not satisfied with the progress and will not be until all students are performing at grade level. Ms. Neal referenced public comment on TSO discipline policies and asked Ms. Brown to discuss the data in regard to discipline and the transparency of that data. Ms. Brown said that they do report the data to everyone that they need to. She said they are trying to create a cultural change and they do look for alternative routes to keep students in school before suspension nor expulsion occurs. Ms. Brown said she is going to seek out community members and

have a dialogue about what they need to see from Charter Schools USA in regard to Charter Schools USA's discipline policy and discipline data. Ms. Wright said that she did have the expulsion data. Earlier it had been reported that there was a 24% expulsion rate amongst the turnarounds, and she clarified that there were only 38 expulsions across the four turnaround schools in Indianapolis in 2012-2013 school year, and they will provide the 2013-2014 data as well. Dr. Freitas expressed his appreciation toward the work that the mayor's office has done in their work in conjunction with the turnaround operators.

- Ms. Teresa Brown, Assistant Superintendent of Outreach for IDOE, provided an update on Edison Learning. She said Edison Learning and Gary Community Schools have committed to working in partnership together. Dr. Pruitt, Superintendent of Gary School Corporation, and Tom Jackson, President and CEO of Edison Learning believe their organizations are linked together and will work together on school turnaround. They have together resolved a number of their issues. The protocol for oversight remains the same as the last time Ms. Brown spoke to the board. She added that were 10 goal questions IDOE has asked Edison Learning to address to help monitor their progress. Ms. Brown then provided data on the progress being made at Theodore Roosevelt. She went through areas of progress and areas that still needed to be worked upon. She said that the department has had a conversation with Edison Learning about things they needed to continue to work on. Ms. Neal asked if there was data as to why the attendance rates for 9th, 10th, and 11th graders were not attending school. Ms. Brown did not have data to report on that.

A. <u>Ad Hoc Committee recommendation on Board Procedures</u>

- Superintendent Ritz said the committee met and had recommendations on meetings and special meetings. She said the committee had some different ideas about recommendations to discuss with the board. Mr. Albert said he was concerned about adding items to the agenda outside the framework of how the agenda is developed. He recommends striking the language to add action items outside of that framework to allow board members the proper amount of time to look into an item. Mr. Albert said that within the framework if an emergency does come up, a special meeting can be called to discuss the item. Superintendent Ritz said that in an emergency situation perhaps items can be added to the agenda before the day of the board meeting, but not the day of. Ms. Whicker asked if this concerned Action items or Discussion items. Superintendent Ritz clarified that it was just Action items.

Dr. Oliver asked if the committee discussed situations in which an action item was on the agenda within the 7 day window, but they do not get material in time to review them before the meeting. Mr. Albert said the committee recommended that the material to properly evaluate things will be ready at least 72 hours in advance. Superintendent Ritz said the responsibility to provide materials in advance is a joint responsibility by IDOE and State Board of Education staff. She did clarify that there may be instances such as the emergency A-F rule discussed at the meeting where some items are being worked on up until the night of the meeting.

- Mr. Hendry said that the 7 day rule could remain because there is a relief valve in an emergency situation. However, he is concerned about the language requiring 3 board members and the board chair to agree upon adding the item. He stated that he felt the rule gave special powers to the chair. Superintendent Ritz stated that Mr. Albert is recommending the deletion of the exception all together. Mr. Hendry stated he believed there may be a time when they need to add something to the agenda. Ms. Neal stated the Ad Hoc committee felt there was little reason to ever add an action item to the agenda at the last minute, but there can be a special meeting after the board meeting. Mr. Albert said that perhaps there could be a situation where a 2/3 vote would garner the necessary support to add an action item at the last minute. Mr. Hendry noted that the public law did not prohibit the agenda to change the day of the meeting. Superintendent Ritz stated that disputes amongst board members have stemmed from action items getting added at the last minute. Dr. Oliver stated that many resolutions have not been placed on the agenda at the last minute. Mr. Elsener said that there may be an over discussion of this topic. Ms. O'Brien stated that it is a rarity that something gets added at the last minute, and a clear concise guideline would on how to add something to the agenda at the last minute is beneficial. Ms. Whicker said that if 3 or 4 people want to talk about an item that it would be beneficial to listen to it.
- Superintendent Ritz said the Ad Hoc Committee has taken notes on what has been discussed and moved to discuss the dispute on board procedures. Ms. Neal has looked at many board practices and found that board members can suggest changes to meeting procedures as they see fit. Therefore, she suggested that they do not have any revisions to meeting procedures.

- Superintendent Ritz the discussed different ways in which a committee be formed and how they deal with the issues that the committee will discuss. She asked the board for their view on board procedures and the formation of committees.
- Ms. O'Brien asked for clarity on the goal of the Ad Hoc Committee, and stated that the conversation is a continuation of previous conversations and would like to find a way to operate effectively and efficiently without having a procedural conversation each meeting.
- Dr. Freitas said that he would like to move to action. Superintendent Ritz said that it is not time yet to move to action.
- Mr. Hendry asked to discuss the parliamentarian procedures. He believes that it may be beneficial to the board to have an impartial arbiter. He recommends the board staff look at two options: 1) See if someone from the Attorney General's office; or 2) Look to see if an outside parliamentarian can sit in and provide guidance on board procedures. He stated that he felt there is some ambiguity in board rules that may not speak to all situations that arise in a board meeting. Mr. Hendry said that he would like to there to be a default clause to move to Robert's Rules when such situations arise.
- Superintendent Ritz said the committee wanted to speak to the board so they could gather input on language that the Ad Hoc Committee agreed upon. Superintendent Ritz stated that they may not have the final version of the language and asked for Laura Bernice. She stated there is an action item concerning board operating procedures on regular meetings and special meetings. Superintendent Ritz asked if there was a motion to approve the language on the procedures of scheduling regular and special meetings. Ms. Neal moved to take action on board operating procedures and Mr. Albert seconded. Dr. Oliver stated that the language within the special meeting language could elevate the chair above all other members. Ms. Whicker agreed. Ms. Neal stated that there is a system of checks and balances and the board does need to ensure that the board chair is available. Ms. O'Brien presented a solution that a special meeting needed to be held within a given timeframe and could not be put off indefinitely. Ms. Claire Fiddian-Greene stated that a meeting called for special circumstances needs to happen within a given timeline. Ms. Neal proposed amending the language to include, "Special meetings will be held within 7

business days of the request at a date and time convenient to the members, and scheduled by board staff."

- Mr. Hendry would like to make a motion to amend the amendment. He asked that 2 business days be changed to 48 hours and 7 business days be changed to within 7 calendar days. The vote on approving the language on scheduling of meetings and special meeting procedures passed 9 – 2 with Dr. Freitas and Dr. Walker voting no.

B. Operating Procedures

- Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. Freitas if he had a motion in regard to board operating procedures. Dr. Freitas said that he was impressed by the procedures in the July 9th meeting. He moved that the board adopt the July 9th operating procedures. He felt that the language presented was something that he could support. Mr. Hendry clarified that Dr. Freitas wanted to look at operating procedures other than the meeting and special meeting scheduling procedures. Mr. Watts seconded the motion. Superintendent Ritz clarified that this would dissolve the Ad Hoc Committee. Dr. Freitas is hoping this is not the end, but the beginning of an evolutionary process on meeting procedures. The motion passed 8-3 with Mr. Albert Ms. Neal, and Superintendent Ritz voting no.

-- RECESS--

X. BEST PRACTICES

- Mr. John Herpst and Ms. Becky Schlomann from the Indiana Historical Society discussed opportunities the Historical Society offers that allow schools to gain more understanding of Indiana History. "Hoosiers and the American Story," a new program the Indiana Historical Society is going to give 33,000 copies to schools across the state as a supplement to American History currently taught. Becky Schlomann discussed 16 regional teacher workshops to help teachers across the state gain a better understanding of how to incorporate Indiana's role in American history. The workshop will provide teachers that attend a copy of the book, and give them information to use "Destination Indiana" a digitized slide show of themes put together by the Indiana Historical society. This will soon be made available online.

They hope to reach at least 1500 teachers across the state. The target audience is 8 – 12 American History teachers. There will be a follow-up with the teachers after the workshop, so their participation in this professional development is ongoing. Participation will be free for teachers, and the Indiana Historical Society will pay for substitute teachers if necessary. The funding is provided by a grant made by the Lily Endowment. Adam Williamson, Mississinewa, teaches "Indiana Studies." There was not much information available to him. Comprehensive sources were few and far between and often dated. Used lack of curriculum to be able to give his students opportunities to travel across the state. Few college bound or honors students take this course. With the increasing emphasis on STEM courses, enrollment in social studies courses is declining.

XI. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

A. SBOE Staff Update

- Mr. Bob Guffin, Executive Director of the State Board of Education, discussed the planning calendar that will be sent to the board. This will include actions that need to be taken. He also talked about the National Association of State Boards of Education. He wanted to know if the board wanted to spend the money to rejoin that organization. Dr. Oliver asked that Mr. Guffin keep the board updated on whether to continue membership in that organization. Superintendent Ritz asked for clarification on the charter school authorizer update at the next board meeting. Mr. Guffin informed her that there were more authorizers than those present at the meeting, and this would be a yearly occurrence Mr. Guffin then encouraged the board to attend the Gary Dunbar hearing on August 11th.
- Ms. Claire Fiddian-Green wanted to let the board know that they will be extending the contract of Dr. Damien Betebenner' to help in the support of the final changes in A-F accountability model.

B. 2013 Annual AP Report

- Not Discussed.

C. *Charter Authorizer Updates*

- Mr. Nick Leroy, Executive Director of Indiana Charter School Board, discussed the overview of the Indiana Charter School Board. He also discussed the budget of the ICSB. The mission of the ICSB is to authorize and hold accountable high performing charter schools. He discussed the accomplishments of the ICSB and how they are one of the top charter school authorizers across the country, and the ICSB is recognized for following all 12 best practices for charter school authorizing as deemed by NACSA. He said they have looked at 41 applications and have opened 9 charter schools across the state and stated that 4 more schools will be opening next school year. The ICSB has not had to shut down a school, but some schools that they have granted charters to, but have not been able to open. The majority of those has been due to a lack of location.
- Joy Patterson from Calumet College of St. Joseph's spoke about their charter school authorizing status. Their standards align to what other charter school authorizers are doing. They have monthly meetings with their school board. She discussed the dashboard that they present to the board each month to show the board how they are performing. She also discussed progress that is being made. The amount of time for improvement is going to take more time than the year they have been opened.
- Brandon Brown, Charter Schools Director for the mayor's office, spoke about the charter schools authorized by the mayor's office. He discussed how the mayor's office approves and accesses school performance. There will be 5 new schools that will open this year, and that one school closed.
- Bob Marra, Executive Director of the Office of Charter Schools Ball State, shared the vision and mission of Ball State as a charter school authorizer. He discussed the locations of their schools across the state. He also discussed demographics and configurations of some of the schools that are involved with them as an authorizer. He discussed the data and performance of their schools. He said they are working

with the mayor's office so all authorizers across the state are looking at the same principles when evaluating schools.

D. *Turnaround School Operator Updates*

- Item already discussed.

E. *Board Operating Procedures*

- Parliamentarian – This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

F. *CTE Update*

- This item was not discussed.

G. *Assessment Update*

- This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

H. *Accountability Update*

- This item was not discussed.

Superintendent Ritz asked the board to contact the department if they had any questions regarding any discussion items that were not discussed at the meeting.

XII. BOARD OPERATIONS

- This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

- Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn and Board voted to adjourn the meeting.