**INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

143 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

December 20, 2013

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

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

## I. CALL TO ORDER

- Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and called roll. The roll reflected the absence of Ms. Andrea Neal at the beginning of the meeting. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Superintendent Ritz began the meeting with a *New Business-Action* item – new Board Operating Procedures. She invited a motion for approval of the operating procedures provided by the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). Dr. Oliver moved to approve the consensus draft document and asked for continued discussion of the "parking lot" issues. Mr. Elsener seconded the motion. Dr. Oliver expressed his appreciation of the collaboration and work of Superintendent Ritz and her staff with Board staff regarding the new operating procedures and of the help NASBE provided. Superintendent Ritz echoed Dr. Oliver's comments and stated that the group had a robust discussion of the new operating procedures and the new procedures reflected improved clarity.
- Mr. Walker asked if the Board was going to continue to address the parking lot issues and Dr. Oliver expressed that that was part of his motion. Mr. Walker stated that he wanted to add to the parking lot issues that the Board adopt a parliamentary rule set to follow for the meetings. The Board voted on Dr. Oliver's motion and all 9 members present voted yes to the motion.
- Superintendent Ritz passed out a new agenda comporting with the operating procedures just adopted and asked for discussion regarding any proposed reports or discussion items to be added. Superintendent Ritz also inquired as to whether there were any emergencies

or special circumstances requiring approval by the chair and three other members of the Board and whether there was any request for re-ordering of the agenda. Ms. O'Brien requested discussion item F be moved in light of the fact that she had to leave early on account of school obligations. Superintendent Ritz approved Ms. O'Brien's request. Mr. Walker moved to approve the new agenda, seconded by Mr. Elsener and all 9 members voted aye by voice vote.

## II. MINUTES

Superintendent Ritz stated that Board members were given minutes for October 2, November 8 and November 13 of 2013. Superintendent Ritz first invited a motion to approve the minutes from October 2. Dr. Freitas so moved and Mr. Albert seconded the motion. All 9 members present voted aye by voice vote. Ms. O'Brien moved to approve the November 8 minutes and B.J. Watts seconded. The Board voted by voice resulting in 9 aye votes. Superintendent Ritz requested the vote on approval of the November 13 minutes be tabled because she was unable to express her proposed changes to the Board in time. There was a motion, a second and the Board voted by voice 9-0 to table the November 13 minutes.

## III. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz stated she is a proud grandmother of a granddaughter born December 19, 2013. Additionally, Superintendent Ritz said over 1000 students participated in the Hoosier Family of Readers' holiday tree where they shared their favorite books. Further, Superintendent Ritz worked with Girl Scout troop 119 from Shelbyville to send Christmas cards to wounded veterans in Fort Knox in Kentucky. Lastly, Superintendent Ritz mentioned that the Glenwood hearing in Evansville was very well conducted and thanked Troy Albert and B.J. Watts for attending. Board Director Ms. Anne Davis said transcripts of that hearing would be provided soon.

## IV. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Dr. Oliver stated he enjoyed his trip to meet with the Richmond Community Schools Board of Trustees. Dr. Oliver said it's important for Board members to have meetings like this. Superintendent Ritz mentioned she also enjoyed a trip there to meet with the trustees. Mr. Elsener wanted to recognize the State Board members and said he has never seen a more committed, talented and ethical Board. Mr. Elsener also mentioned a scurrilous comment made by a Department of Education employee on a social network site directed at him by name. Mr.

Elsener stated that he has notified Superintendent Ritz of the issue and asked for further review and discussion of the matter.

**V. PUBLIC GENERAL COMMENT**

- Superintendent Ritz noted that the new operating procedures dictated that public comment must relate to an actual item on the agenda. Superintendent Ritz further said there will be no public comment on adjudications because that is exempt. However, she said since the public was not informed of the change in procedures prior to the meeting, Rick Muir would be allowed to make general comment.

- Rick Muir was advised by Superintendent Ritz that he had 5 minutes. He expressed concern about Board behavior in meetings. Mr. Muir asked the Board to work with the Superintendent and allow her to do what she was elected to do. He also said Superintendent Ritz has his trust and the trust of others. As president of AFT Indiana he stated he travels around Indiana and noticed the perception is that there has been an attempt to stifle the efforts of the Superintendent and change the rules. He asked the Board to work together to reclaim the promise of education in Indiana.

- Jackie Rhoton stated she is a concerned citizen and does not represent any group; she said she had the opposite viewpoint of the person that spoke before her. Ms. Rotun said she has been paying attention to what's been happening with the Board. She said the Board has been more than acceptable in her view, although some divisiveness has concerned her. She expressed the importance of working together to benefit children in Indiana. Ms. Rotun concluded by presenting a handout regarding the Common Core standards.

**VI. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCAITON – STUDENT SUCCESS**

No discussion

**VII. CONSENT AGENDA**

The items on the consent agenda were presented to the Board. A motion was made to approve by Dr. Oliver and seconded by Mr. Albert. The vote was 9-0 to approve.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION**

<u>Board Operating Procedures</u>

This was addressed at the beginning of the meeting.

Approval of Final Placement of Schools into Categories of School Accountability

- Superintendent Ritz announced the only speaker signed up for public comment on this issue, Todd Whitlock. Mr. Whitlock is with North Daviess Community Schools and wanted to bring some issues to the Board's attention regarding the grade categories the Board is to vote on during this meeting and the appeals process. He stated that North Daviess had completed two appeals; one appeal concerned the 1% and 2% exception regarding special needs children which was approved and the other was the graduation rate of their high school and the grade assigned with it. North Daviess had not yet received response on the second appeal. They were told by Superintendent Ritz that information had been updated and if the appeal had been granted their embargoed data would have been changed on the Learning Connection. Mr. Whitlock stated that the grade had not been changed and that is all the information Daviess was able to obtain. He said other schools are in the dark as well. Some schools were told their grades were going to change as a result of computer problems with ISTEP+ but there were no changes as of the morning of this meeting. Mr. Whitlock said if one less student graduates, it would have a profound effect on the school's graduation rate because they are a small school. He said schools want transparency and want to know their information is being reviewed. He asked the Board to consider background information when calculating grades, like Amish students who typically drop out around the 8th grade counting against the school's graduation rate for example.
- Superintendent Ritz requested Deb Dailey, from the Department of Education (the Department), speak about the approval process. Ms. Dailey first discussed how the Department vetted each appeal. She explained it started with an initial review to make sure the appeal had been filed property (e.g. proper signatures on documents, documents filed in a timely manner, etc.). Following that there was a review conducted by two independent reviewers. Ms. Dailey explained that these appeals were done separately followed by a meeting to see if a consensus could be reached between the two reviewers. Ms. Dailey said if no consensus could be reached it went to a technical reviewer who engaged in the conversation as well. In addition, there was an independent review process after group consensus was reached. Further, Ms. Dailey talked about how the Department conducted appeals related to ISTEP+ interruptions and invalid data using a six person review panel in a group.
- Superintendent Ritz asked Ms. Dailey to discuss the process in the past, how the appeals process is communicated and why the Department waits until final approval to finalize the appeal piece. Ms. Dailey explained that in 2012 each appeal was reviewed by two

independent reviewers followed by review by the Department's Accountability Chief for final approval. The legal team was also involved in the appeals process to ensure consistency. Ms. Dailey stated this process ran right up to the Board meeting (wrapping up a day or two before the Board meeting) and notification of the appeal outcomes to schools was held until the Board meeting. This year schools were notified of their A-F data updates via the Learning Connection prior to the Board meeting so they could recreate calculations. The updates became available at 5:00 p.m. the night before this meeting. Official outcome letters will go to schools after the grades are approved by the Board at this meeting.

- Superintendent Ritz said the first order of action concerned two school appeals that challenged the accountability model applied to them by the Department (the small high school model). The Department found the model applied was inappropriate but that there was not a current model that fit the profile of these schools. Before beginning the discussion of the Department's recommendations, Superintendent Ritz pointed out that neither of the two model options presented by the Department would affect the grade of these schools, just the calculation. She asked Ms. Dailey to comment further on the issue.
- Ms. Dailey expounded that the high school model uses English/language arts, math, graduation and college and career readiness data points and includes grades 9-12. She further explained there must be at least 30 students available for English/language arts and math. She stated the small high school model only uses the English/language arts and math data points and does not require 30 students be available. If 30 students are not available, previous year data is used to get to 30 students to be able to use English/language arts and math scores. The small high school model states the school cannot have a grade 12 and will only use English/language arts and math scores. The two schools that appealed did not meet the 30 student requirement but had a grade 12. Both schools appealed so that the high school model would be applied.
- Ms. Dailey continued to explain the two options proposed by the Department. The first option is to use the high school model without requiring the availability of 30 students; causing their English/language arts and math scores to drop off. She went on to say the second option, which is what the Department recommends, is an amalgamation of models that uses multiple years of data to get to the 30 students, but also allows the graduation and college and career readiness information to be included in the calculation. Superintendent Ritz explained that the Department's recommendation is to use the regular high school model but the data will be aggregated to reach 30 students for 10th grade cohort when calculating the ECA scores.
- Mr. Walker expressed concern about other schools with the same issue that did not appeal. Mr. Walker recommended that if the Board changes the calculation for the two schools that appealed, the change should be made for all schools in a similar position. Dr. Oliver

asked General Counsel for the Board, Dr. Michelle McKeown, to opine and Dr. McKeown stated she recommended the second option, as did the Department. As far as the other similarly situated schools, Dr. McKeown suggested checking to see if the alternate model would improve the grade of those schools so they can be notified if it would, allowing them to appeal. Dr. Oliver asked for clarification regarding the appeals process. Dr. McKeown explained there is a second appeal after the grades are public but it is limited to the identification of an error and not comprehensive like the full appeal process that occurs before the grades are public. Mr. Walker asked if the similarly situated schools would be allowed to appeal under the appeals process to correct the model used this year. Dr. McKeown explained that it would be an appeal to fix a mistake and should be allowed under the second limited appeal process. Superintendent Ritz agreed. Mr. Albert said the Board should only deal with the two schools at hand and let the others follow due process as provided by law.

- Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to apply the Option 2 model to the two schools at issue. Mr. Hendry so moved and Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Mr. Walker said he wanted this model applied to all similarly situated schools in the 2012 calculation. Superintended Ritz responded that the Department will take it one step further and actually contact these schools and let them know of the change and the right of appeal. The Board voted 9-0 to approve application of the second model as recommended by the Department and Dr. McKeown.
- Superintendent Ritz said the next item of business with regard to the A-F grades was the approval of placement of categories of all public schools. Superintendent Ritz invited the motion, Dr. Oliver so moved and Ms. O'Brien seconded. Mr. Elsener asked for clarification about what information the schools had and when. Ms. Dailey explained that they had the data, including preliminary letter grade, the day before this meeting at 5:00 p.m. She further explained that the schools wouldn't receive the final grades and information on whether their appeals were approved or denied until the Board approved the final grades. Mr. Elsener responded by asking if the schools could get more information sooner. Ms. Dailey stated the appeals were completed the Friday before this meeting so the Department was able to give the Board the grades at that time. Ms. Dailey said the Department felt that it was appropriate to notify the schools of the outcome of their appeals after Board approval. Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. McKeown if this is the way it occurred last year. Dr. McKeown said last year the Department provided the letters the day before by necessity and not by design. Dr. McKeown stated that it is important to try and get the information to the schools as soon as possible. Mr. Elsener asked for the Department shoot for an earlier target.

- Superintendent Ritz stated that the Learning Connection was updated the day before this meeting and she asked if the letters would go out today. Ms. Dailey asked Maggie Paino, from the Department of Education, to address that issue. Ms. Paino clarified that the Department was weary of releasing the grades before the Board approved them because they were not official. She said embargoed data was provided the day before this meeting. Ms. Paino also expressed that the Department would be happy to work with the Board on the process of getting embargoed data to schools next year. Dr. Oliver said it's important the embargoed data get to schools as soon as possible because the schools will notice anomalies not noticed at the state level. He said he was happy the Department decided to release the embargoed data to the schools before final approval by the Board.
- Ms. O'Brien inquired about when schools are notified and not notified of the result of their appeals. Ms. Paino said there is a separate special education appeals process based on federal regulations and those are the special education appeals districts that have received notice of already. Schools appealing general A-F issues have not received notification yet. Ms. Dailey added that the appeals the districts have received information about are the 1% and 2% alternate assessment caps and whether or not the district can receive an exemption to those caps. She said this is a federal flexibility done by the special education department to determine which school corporations should take students out of the proficiency grouping if they have exceeded their IMAST or ISTAR caps. She iterated that this is a separate process that has been completed and notice has been sent out. Schools have not received notice regarding appeal of the placement grades.
- Dr. Oliver mentioned that some schools, teachers and parents are concerned as to whether they can trust the grades. He asked about having multiple entities review the grades. Ms. Dailey responded that the Department has done parallel calculations with LSA and the Department and LSA came to consensus on all grades.

**Note:** Member Andrea Neal arrived at this point in the meeting.

- Mr. Elsener asked if any of the reversals of grades were based on the ISTEP+ test interruptions. Dr. Michele Walker, from the Department of Education, stated that the Department did analyze all appeals due to ISTEP+ interruptions. She said the Department looked to see if the names were part of Dr. Hill's study and then to the longitudinal data analysis conducted to track at progress over time. Per Dr. Walker, none of these requests were approved. Ms. Neal asked about situations where a school misreports its data and what recourse they have if they don't find out until after the Board votes today; for example, if a school reported the wrong graduation rate. Ms. Dailey responded that the Department used the 2012 graduation rate and college and career readiness information

for the 2013 grades. The Department allowed schools to update the data last January to ensure accuracy in the 2012 graduation rate. Superintendent Ritz added that the Department has processes in place to ensure accurate data. Ms. Dailey went on to say that as of now the data is final.

- Superintendent Ritz clarified that the Board would be taking 3 separate votes with regard to final placement of schools into categories for school accountability. She said the first vote is grades for the public schools. The Board took roll call and 9 members voted yes and Andrea Neal voted no. Superintendent Ritz explained the second vote was for approval of placement of all non-public and choice schools. Upon Superintendent Ritz's invitation there was a motion and a second. 9 members voted yes and Andrea Neal voted no.
- Superintendent Ritz moved on to the next item which was public placement for freeway accredited schools. Superintendent Ritz explained this was an issue that came before the Department at the request of a school. She said the non-public freeway accredited schools are held to a different accountability metric and the accreditation type is different than traditional accreditation. Ms. Paino was asked to explain what a freeway accredited school is and some of the accompanying issues. Ms. Paino first stated that Indiana statutes suggest freeway accreditation is separated from traditional accreditation because it's governed by the contract specific to freeway schools. Ms. Paino said the freeway contracts contain different metrics for accountability. She further said the Department had concerns about public placement in categories because neither the Indiana Code nor the specific contracts mentioned public A-F placement. Ms. Paino said the Department did calculate the A-F grades to keep in house so they can monitor these schools and additionally the schools could appeal their grades.
- Dr. Oliver stated he believed this was an issue for the General Assembly to address. He said if the statutes say the Board must go by the contract he wasn't comfortable superseding a contract. Mr. Elsener said over the years when the Board has accepted freeway schools nothing exempted them from ultimate accountability. He said he wanted to keep the grades to make sure everyone is accountable. Ms. O'Brien asked if the contracts were the same in this regard. Ms. Paino explained all freeway schools are the same with regard to the metric for monitoring that is applied, which is different than A-F. Superintendent Ritz invited a vote on the matter. Ms. O'Brien inquired about the Board's other option if the grades are not publicly released. Ms. Paino responded that the Board would review freeway schools' accountability and monitoring in accordance with the metric they utilize. Upon a question from Ms. Neal, Ms. Paino explained that the freeway accredited schools are not subject to A-F by statute in her view but that the schools have received grades in the past. Mr. Elsener said all accredited schools should be treated the same and said he wanted the grades released publicly.

- Mr. Walker moved to have the freeway accredited school grades released publicly, Ms. Neal seconded and all 10 members present voted yes. Superintendent Ritz then invited a vote on approval of placement into categories of the freeway accredited schools. Ms. Neal made comments expressing her concern of the A-F accountability system. Her concerns are the accuracy of the grades, whether the grades accurately reflect the quality or character of a school building and if the grades reflect values Hoosiers feel are important or just bureaucratic definitions of college and career readiness. She said schools have concern about the accuracy and transparency of the grades as well. She asserted the A-F system is a one size fits all assessment that doesn't take into account achievements in music, art, drama and foreign language programs. She said the A-F system discourages the liberal and classical education our children deserve. Superintendent Ritz commented that she shared Ms. Neal's sentiment and commented the Board has taken a good step in that direction with the new A-F model and will continue dialogue on the matter. A vote was taken and 9 members voted yes and Ms. Neal voted no. Ms. Paino invited the Board's advice in the future regarding A-F and thanked the Department for all the hard work concerning the appeals.

<u>A-F Targets and Weights for 2013-14 School Year</u>

- Superintendent Ritz called Ms. Deb Dailey to address the next order of business – A-F targets and weights for the 2013-14 school year. Ms. Dailey explained bonus high school targets and weights are to be reviewed annually for 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 by law. With regard to the bonus targets, she stated the recommendation of the Department was to leave the targets as they currently were defined in the administrative code. She stated that for improvement grade 8-10, English/language arts would remain 10.3 and math would remain at 17.1. For improvement grades 10-12, English/language arts would be 59.3 and math would be 62.8. Dr. Oliver moved to approve the targets as recommended by the Department, Mr. Watts seconded the motion; a vote was taken and 9 members voted yes and Ms. Neal voted no.
- Ms. Dailey then explained the Department's recommendation that the college and career readiness weight increase by 5% and that the English/language arts and math rates decrease by 2.5% each. She said the rules require at least a 5% increase in the college and career readiness weight per year and that math and English/language arts be decreased by 2.5% each to offset the increase. 5% was the amount increased last year so she said they continued with the same amount. Mr. Walker explained that when the Board first addressed the A-F model a few years ago they believed it shouldn't be based solely on standardized programs, but that more weight should be given to industry certified

programs and dual credit curriculum. He explained it was compromised at the time to incrementally increase 5% per year. Upon motion and second the Board voted 9-1 (Ms. Neal voted no) to approve the Department's recommendation.

Resolution Regarding National Assessment of Educational Progress

Superintendent Ritz invited Mr. Watts to make a motion since he requested the resolution. He formally recognized those working hard every single day in schools and moved for approval of the resolution, Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Mr. Elsener also recognized the hard work and continuous improvement by Indiana's schools. He said this was a major accomplishment. The resolution was approved by all 10 members present.

Proposed Revisions to State-Approved Course Titles That Go Into Effect for 2014-2015 School Year

Superintendent Ritz moved to the next issue which was proposed revisions to state-approved course titles that go into effect for the 2014-2015 school year. Upon motion and second the Board voted 10-0 to approve the revisions to course titles.

2014-15 ISTEP+ and IREAD-3 Testing Dates (including 2013-14 information as well)

- Superintendent Ritz invited Dr. Michele Walker from the Department to address the Board on this issue. Dr. Walker stated there were two items to discuss; transitioning to career and college readiness assessments and approval of dates. Regarding the transition, Dr. Walker expressed the need to begin to prepare students for college and college readiness assessments while continuing to adhere to the requirement to administer the ISTEP+ test. She said this spring schools will participate in the CoreLink skills item bank; the Department will then be able to utilize test bank items along with ISTEP+ items to create an operational test next year. Mr. Tony Walker asked what percentage of the ISTEP+ assessment currently reflects Common Core standards. Dr. Walker replied that she didn't have the specific numbers in front of her but that it's only a small percentage of current items are not related to college and career readiness. Superintendent Ritz added that when the crosswalk was done between previous Indiana standards and Common Core standards, there was an overlap.
- Mr. Tony Walker asked if there had been any collaboration with ACT or College Board and if there was anything being done to make sure students taking the ISTEP+ are on track to take the ACT and SAT, which he understood to be aligning with the Common Core standards. Dr. Walker responded that the Department conducted a study a year and a half ago with ACT

and SAT and found they were not actually aligned with the Common Core so the Department is considering what those assessments might look like moving forward. Mr. Tony Walker then asked where Indiana is in finding a post ISTEP+ test. Dr. Walker said the next ISTEP+ test will include a pilot of college and career readiness items that can be used in the future. She went on to say that in the spring of 2015 Indiana will be required to administer ISTEP+ which will have a dual purpose; to measure ISTEP+ in terms of current standards and to measure career and college readiness standards. Dr. Walker went on to say that in spring of 2016 college and career ready assessments will be fully implemented and as soon as we know what standards are going to be adopted we can enter into an RFP to look for an assessment.

- Dr. Walker then moved onto dates. She pointed out that some dates had been approved for 2013-1014 but had additional dates regarding college and career readiness items from CoreLink. She explained one was an additional week, starting the window on May 5. Also, she said the Board establishes the summer dates for IREAD-3 at this time for 2013-2014. Dr. Oliver asked when the Board approved CoreLink as an expansion of the ISTEP+ test. Dr. Walker stated that CoreLink adds items not currently present in our ISTEP+ items bank. Superintendent Ritz commented that it is not a new test but rather it's a question bank. Superintendent Ritz said this is a way to help students transition and be prepared for testing in 2015 and 2016. Dr. Oliver asked if there would be a vote on CoreLink and expressed concern whether this fits with what the Board passed the previous year. Dr. Walker stated that she could not answer the legal aspect of that question but mentioned that the Department wanted to bring dates to the Board even though the Department could add dates. She said the Department is asking the Board to approve the dates for the CoreLink window and IREAD-3.
- Superintend Ritz clarified that she asked for this item be on the agenda. She stated she wants transparency so everyone was aware the Department would be adding questions. Dr. McKeown was asked to opine and she said on one hand the language of HEA 1427 is specific that Indiana has to administer the ISTEP+ assessment, but at the same time Indiana is transitioning. Dr. McKeown said the most reasonable interpretation is to allow additional CoreLink college and career readiness questions to the test for the transition. She pointed out that it would still be the ISTEP+ test being administered and not a different test altogether like a Smarter Balanced or PARCC test; as such she believed it to be the most reasonable interpretation of the law. Dr. Walker explained the 2014-2015 windows are comparable to what schools have been doing for the past 6 years. Mr. Elsener moved to approve the dates and Mr. Hendry seconded the motion. Ms. Neal asked why the Department is bothering with CoreLink. Dr. Walker said the Department wants students to experience technology enhanced items that are currently not part of Indiana's ISTEP+

assessment. The board voted 8-2 to approve the dates with Andrea Neal and Troy Albert voting no.

Approval of Proposed Rule Language for HEA 1003

Superintendent Ritz moved on to the next business item which was approval of rule language for HEA 1003 and invited Dr. McKeown to speak on the matter. Dr. McKeown said in the past September an emergency rule was adopted regarding choice scholarships, which is the special education piece. She said the Board needs to decide whether to adopt permanent language which is very close to the language in the emergency rule. Dr. McKeown further stated that all stakeholders agree with the language of the proposed permanent rule. Upon motion and second the Board voted 10-0 to approve the rule language.

Resolution Regarding Adoption of Academic Standards

- Superintendent Ritz stated the next item of business was the resolution regarding the adoption of academic standards. She first introduced members of the public who signed up to speak during public comment regarding Common Core, starting with Mary Black. Mary Black expressed her concerns about common core. Namely, she believes common core violates three federal statutes, the teaching methods in Common Core are robotic, the standards are not appropriate for early childhood and there was no public scrutiny of these standards before implementation.
- The second speaker was Valerie Swack. She has 3 children of school age. She said she is not in favor of Common Core. Her specific concerns are that Common Core has not been publicly vetted, that Common Core is not what America is about because it's one size fits all, it lowers Indiana standards and is a high stakes gamble because it has not been adequately tried before.
- Michelle Peters spoke next, also expressing her dislike of Common Core. She said she is a mother of 3 children of school age. She said she noticed the confusing homework her kids were bringing home as a result of Common Core, described as fuzzy math papers and soulless paragraphs. John Sherby, father of 4, was the final speaker. He opined that Common Core is mediocre at best. He says he noticed a decline in the quality of education since Common Core has been adopted. He recommended rejecting Common Core and adopting Indiana's own standards.
- Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent for the Department, spoke about Indiana college and career ready standards. She said she was happy to work alongside Dr. Oliver, CECI and Department staff in what was a collaborative effort. She started with the steps the

Department has already taken. Ms. Shockey explained there have been levels of teams assembled. The first is the Technical Review Committee, consisting of English/language arts and math educators and curriculum directors. This committee has reviewed current academic standards in Indiana which is the Common Core and reviewed 2008-2009 academic standards of math and language arts, which in some cases were consumed in the Common Core and in some cases left as "danglers" for teachers to teach for alignment to assessment. The second phase in progress is the Advisory Committee level, consisting of educators, higher education and representatives from the community. The Advisory Committee is reviewing the same things as the Technical Committee along with comments from the Technical Committee. The third level of review consists of the College and Career Ready Panel, consisting of higher education, career and business. They will be reviewing the same assessments as the previous committees as well as the previous committee comments.

- Ms. Shockey continued with the presentation by stating that there are few options for a proposed Phase 4. Option 1 is after public comment to take the body of standards and comments to a national board of experts for review. Option 2 is to take the body of standards and comments to a final review panel, consisting of a combination of members of all three committees together along with national experts. This group would consider current Indiana Common Core, 2008-2009 math and language arts as well as the standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the National Council of Teachers of English to rate the layers and reach a final conclusion with respect to Indiana career and college readiness standards. Public comment and Board hearings in February and March would follow. The end goal is to take everything to the Education Roundtable and the Board for final approval.
- Dr. Oliver commented that the genesis of this whole process explained by Ms. Shockey is the language of House Enrolled Act 1427, which says that the Board may take no further action to implement standards nor direct the Department to implement Common Core standards developed by the Common Core State Standards initiative until the Board completes a thorough evaluation of the Common Core standards. Dr. Oliver said this process will allow Indiana to adopt its own sovereign college and career readiness standards through reconciliation and collaboration. Ms. Shockey added that the federal waiver requires an Indiana college and career ready team deem that students are ready for college and/or career without remediation. The Phase 3 College and Career Ready Committee would meet this federal requirement. Superintendent invited a motion to adopt this resolution. Dr. Oliver made the motion and the motion was seconded. Mr. Walker commented that the standards before common core had not resulted in the outcomes the

state wanted. When Common Core was adopted in 2010 remediation was an ongoing problem and continues to be. The Board voted 10-0 to adopt the resolution.

Staff Job Descriptions

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion and Mr. Walker moved to approve amended job descriptions for Board staff; Mr. Hendry seconded the motion. Dr. Oliver stated he thought it was prudent to address this issue in light of the Attorney General Opinion and the recently adopted resolution. The Board voted 9-1 in favor with Superintendent Ritz voting no.

Release of Attorney General Opinion

Dr. Oliver moved to release the Opinion of the Attorney General and after a motion and second the Board voted 10-0 in favor of releasing it.

Item of Discussion – Common Core Guidance (addressed early at the request of Ms. O'Brien at the beginning of this meeting)

Superintendent Ritz introduced the first item of discussion as common core guidance. Ms. O'Brien expressed concern over the change in policy related guidance concerning standards and assessment. She asked why Board input was not considered first and how it can be avoided in the future. Superintendent Ritz responded that the guidance documents were revised to adhere to the actions in HEA1427 and the decision was made with regard to grade 2 because of the assessment delay. Superintendent Ritz said she would welcome further guidance on the issue regarding the second grade teachers. Mr. Elsener said he appreciated and agreed with the comments Ms. O'Brien made.

## IX. ADJUDICATIONS

Gary Community School Corporation

The Board next conducted an adjudications regarding state tuition support withheld from Gary Community School Corporation. Superintendent Ritz recused herself and appointed Mr. Elsener to act as chair. Mr. Elsener stated this proceeding pertained to the amount of tuition support to be withheld from Gary School Corporation for the period of January 1 to June 30, 2014 for turnaround academies. Mr. Elsener stated that Dr. Cheryl Pruitt, Superintendent of Gary School Corporation, concurred with the recommendation of the Department. Melissa Ambre, from the

Department of Education, was sworn in to present the Department's recommendation. She stated the recommendation is for the period of January 1 to June 30, 2014 to withhold from tuition support to be distributed to Gary School Corporation $2,478,372.22 for the turnaround school Theodore Roosevelt Career Academy. Upon motion and second the Board voted 8-0 to approve the amount recommended by the Department.

Indianapolis Public Schools

Mr. Elsener said the next adjudication was for tuition support funds to be withheld from Indianapolis Public Schools for the turnaround academies for January 1 to June 30, 2014. Mr. Elsener stated that Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Superintendent for Indianapolis Public Schools, concurred with the recommendation provided by the Department. Ms. Ambre was asked by Mr. Elsener to speak in behalf of the Department. She stated the recommendation of the Department is to withhold the following amounts from January 1 to June 30, 2014 from Indianapolis Public Schools in favor of the turnaround academies: $1,356,298.67 for Emma Donnan Middle School, $1,741,426.52 for Arlington Community High School, $2,222,652.33 for Emmerich Manual High School and $2,503,291.40 for Thomas Carr Howe High School. Upon motion by Mr. Walker and second by B.J. Watts the Board conducted a voice vote and all present voted in favor; thereby approving the resolution. Superintendent Ritz returned to preside over the meeting after this final adjudication and called for a recess.

**-- RECESS—**

## X. DISCUSSION

State Board of Education Staff Updates

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order after the close of the recess and requested that Anne Davis, Director of the Board, speak about the Board's calendar. Ms. Davis said the Glenwood Leadership academy hearing went well and that it is scheduled to come before the Board in January as an action item. Ms. Davis pointed out the next strategic planning meeting would be on January 15. Ms. Davis also mentioned the REPA III hearings coming up in January, stating the hearing in northern Indiana will take place January 13, the hearing in central Indiana will take place January 14, and the hearing in southern Indiana will take place January 16.

Update on Career and Works Councils

- Jaclyn Dowd, Special Assistant to the Governor for Career Innovation, addressed the Board at this time at the invitation of Superintendent Ritz. Ms. Dowd spoke about the Indiana Career Council and Works Councils, both of which she oversees. She said the Career Council aligns education and training activities in Indiana. The council is also in charge of providing training and education reports and a strategic plan to the General Assembly. Ms. Neal expressed concern over too much emphasis on job training and technical type courses over traditional liberal arts courses. Ms. Dowd explained an emphasis on job preparation isn't at the exclusion of other areas. She said further it's about helping each student find the pathway to employment that is best for them; it's not about job training over liberal arts or vice versa. Mr. Elsener said he believes the two enhance each other. Ms. Dowd explained the composition of the Career Council and instructed the Board on where to obtain a progress report and information concerning Career Council meetings. (www.in.gov/icc/index/htm)
- Ms. Dowd then spoke about the Works Councils. The regional Works Councils represent 11 regions in Indiana. The councils evaluate job and technical education at the secondary level, looking at the connectivity to career. Ms. Dowd explained the composition of the Works Councils and provided information about their meetings. Ms. Dowd listed the 5 most common issues gleaned from the evaluations, the need to: (1) reach out to employers to better determine desired skill sets, (2) develop more awareness for career training opportunities, (3) ensure employability skills are accounted for, (4) make sure there is flexibility in the curriculum for students, and (5) look at innovative curriculum to implement or improve curriculum already in place. Ms. Dowd stated she wants the Board to work together with the Career Council and invited the Board to engage regional Works Councils.

Reading Rule Discussion

- Superintendent Ritz stated the question before the Board is whether it wants to go forward with a reading rule now or wait until later to discuss potential revisions as part of a larger dialogue on reading. Upon inquiry from Ms. Neal, Superintendent Ritz explained that there is nothing in current state assessment that can give a reading data point. She went on to say that if a new assessment can provide that data point in the future, Indiana would no longer need a separate reading assessment. Mr. Walker stated he likes aspects of the reading rule like data tracking and assessment. Mr. Watts said acting now may provide a moving target and frustration to teachers in terms of requirements and accountability.
- John Wolfe, from the Department of Education, said the Department has some data on reading performance but nothing longitudinally. Ms. Neal asked if the Board could obtain data on the effect IREAD-3 has on 4th grade ISTEP+ scores. Superintendent Ritz said if

Indiana had part of its assessment gathering reading information, then that could be done, but reading information from ISTEP+ is not collected. Superintendent Ritz said she hopes this information will be available going forward with a new assessment. Dr. McKeown added that there are data points available for the analysis. She specified that the data points from the IREAD and ISTEP+ tests could be used for a correlation analysis but not a causal analysis. Mr. Elsener brought up the idea of rulemaking to lead Indiana into a comprehensive standards and assessment system. Superintendent recommended leaving things as they are and begin to collect data and wait to discuss the issue.

HEA1005 Update

Ms. Shockey from the Department addressed the Board with an update. She advised that there should be more dialogue regarding student identification and training options. Specifically, she said some students were identified for remediation that should not have been. Ms. Shockey said there were things she would like to bring back to the Board in January and asked that this issue be added to the January agenda.

Rise 2.5 Discussion

Dr. Oliver asked for clarity regarding items that must come to the Board first prior to action by the Department. Superintendent Ritz said there is ambiguity concerning what comes to the Board first in situations like this. Dr. Oliver requested that before any further policy related items are changed he would like them to come to the Board prior to the Department taking action. Superintendent Ritz responded that she had no changes to RISE 2.0.

Strategic Planning Update

Mr. Elsener said the previous strategic planning meeting was a success on December 3, 2013. He stated strategic planning will be a roadmap for how the Board will operate. He went on to say the Board will measure results and continue to improve the strategic plan. Mr. Elsener also said upon adoption of the strategic plan by the Board, Board members would conduct regional presentations in the field and gather input from educators.

School Accountability Review Panel Updates

Superintendent Ritz introduced Ms. Deb Dailey from the Department and Molly Chamberlin, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the Center for Education and Career

Innovation, to provide updates. Ms. Dailey began by giving an update on the accountability panel which continues to evaluate and give recommendations concerning the new A-F model. She went on to provide more information about the panel meetings, including review of performance only data and use of growth data in the accountability model. Ms. Chamberlin expounded on the growth data in the accountability model. She also discussed the creation of a value table. Dr. Oliver asked whether there could be some flexibility in the model to allow for a local indicator. Ms. Chamberlin responded that this has not been implemented yet but discussions of the matter have occurred and will continue. Dr. Oliver also asked if the Board could engage with the panel and Ms. Chamberlain said they would continue to incorporate the Board. Ms. Neal recommended more of a variety of indicators and Ms. Chamberlin responded they will be looking to other states and if there are ways to incorporate additional indicators.

## XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

There were no listed items for board operations.

Superintendent Ritz asked for a motion to adjourn. After a motion and second, a vote to adjourn was unanimous by all members present.