



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 10, 2014

Indiana Government Center South – Conference Room 12
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Brad Oliver, Daniel Elsener.

Others Present for Part or All of the Meeting: Claire Fiddian-Green, Dr. Michelle McKeown, Danielle Shockey, Lisa Acobert, David Galvin, Shane Hatchett, Molly Chamberlain, Chris Craig and Rick Rozzelle.

Mr. Elsener welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mr. Elsener invited a motion to approve the minutes; Dr. Freitas moved and Dr. Oliver seconded. The subcommittee approved the minutes from the prior meeting on February 6, 2014.

Mr. Craig explained that a report was put together from the session and explained some things to take away from the session. He said the stakeholders were happy and gratified that there was a strategic plan underway and appreciated being brought in to give input. However, he said there was concern about two-way communication with the Board in the past. He further iterated that PR for the plan is an important part; making everyone in Indiana aware of the plan. Mr. Craig pointed out that the business people were most enthusiastic about the process while the higher education and community groups were less pleased with the process. Mr. Craig said overall it was a very positive engagement. Ms. Fiddian-Green pointed out, and Mr. Craig agreed, about the goals being broader and objectives more specific. This helped explain some of the frustration with the perceived generality of some of the goals by some of the stakeholders. Mr. Craig said the mission and vision was very well received. The subcommittee further discussed some specific stakeholder comments, including diversity and use of the word “innovation”. The subcommittee also discussed advice from experts, the

dashboard and alignment of resources for implementation. Mr. Elsener emphasized clarity and the importance of providing information to stakeholders and others.

The subcommittee decided not to break into groups on account of the fact that some subcommittee members were not present. The group discussed objectives for goal one. They also talked about looking at some other strategic plans to aid in alignment and the creation of the Board's strategic plan. Dr. Oliver expressed the importance of the Board's strategic plan being its own as well as the consideration of others. The subcommittee discussed having the stakeholders groups coming together to align with the Board's plan. The subcommittee agreed alignment is important. There was discussion of improvement of all achievement as an objective for goal one; Mr. Rozzelle expressed the need for more specifics in this and other objectives, including learning. He said there will be several objectives per goal, and then the objectives are to be broken down into one or two strategies, which are more detailed and explain the "how". Mr. Elsener said his objective would revolve around being a national leader in literacy. Mr. Craig mentioned if "national leader" is used there would need to be ways to measure the objective for input. Dr. Freitas said he preferred to bring to CELT some policy issues and then have them come back with some objectives. Mr. Craig said he thinks CELT should be cut out of the picture to a degree. Mr. Rozzelle said they don't want to build up a dependent on CELT, but that CELT will help refine.

Superintendent Ritz said when goals are made, they must be viable to the people we want to do it. Kids and parents must understand it; specific things kids are going to do. The results can be measured but the actual words must be clear for everyone to understand. Dr. Oliver said direction is needed because if there are gaps districts could fill them in with more assessments. He expressed concern over the dominant concern turning into test prep rather than learning. Mr. Craig then reiterated the difference between goals, objectives and strategies, as well as how the balanced score card is supposed to look. The subcommittee then discussed objectives as they pertain to the goal of student achievement, including assessments and standards. Mr. Craig responded those would be strategies. The group continued to discuss goals, objectives, and strategies in a broader sense, including that objectives must be measurable. They discussed literacy, STEM, and the graduation rate as possible objectives. Superintendent Ritz suggested CTE as a broader concept to address rather than STEM specifically since STEM is one of the pathways. Dr. Oliver suggested college and career readiness as a possible objective. Mr. Elsener said STEM could be a separate objective from college and career readiness. Mr. Craig said they can set objectives without current measures and then engage experts in the field to help develop metrics. Mr. Rozzelle state Indiana standards could be a strategy, and character standards could be built in. Dr. Oliver said he

wanted to start with the strategies and then let that drive the discussion. Mr. Elsener said character, citizenship, and traits should be emphasized even if not easy to measure.

Superintendent Ritz suggested an objective that all students will engage in college and career pathways to develop character and knowledge to be successful in post-secondary work. She within that there are many strategies. She emphasized specifying what all students will do. She went on to propose requiring all kids to read at their grade level as a strategy.

Superintendent Ritz said she wanted it to be student driven. Dr. Freitas expressed the importance of multiple indicators on the dashboard. Dr. Oliver said being data driven is important, and from that look at the leading and lagging indicators. Mr. Craig stated that lagging indicators are summative and the leading indicators are tied to the strategies. Dr. Oliver suggested asking the stakeholder groups to help define the strategies that will achieve objectives, including appropriate metrics. The group summarized the objectives: CTE, STEM, character and citizenship, graduation rate, and literacy. The subcommittee then took a break.

-- RECESS --

The subcommittee reconvened and the floor was opened for suggestions regarding goal two. Mr. Elsener suggested making the education and formation of top notch innovative leaders for the K-12 system a top priority; he said this includes superintendents, principals, boards, and teachers. Dr. Oliver suggested looking at strategies on the teacher preparation track; how to attract the best and brightest talent. Dr. Oliver suggested separating teachers and leaders. The subcommittee discussed four buckets: teachers, superintendents, principals, and boards. The subcommittee then talked about some metrics to measure successes.

Superintendent Ritz said a support system in place for teacher success is important. Dr. Freitas said leaders should include teachers rather than separating it out so as not to send the wrong message. Superintendent Ritz said she liked the wording “recruiting, developing, and retaining talent.” She also added that she would like to see national board certification somewhere in there. Dr. Oliver suggested that as a strategy. Dr. Oliver also stated evaluation and improvement plans are important in a professional environment. The subcommittee considered the recruit, develop, and retain language and then discussed breaking those down into the four categories (teachers, principals, superintendents, and boards). The subcommittee then engaged in a discussion about the role of technology in the identification of strategies. The subcommittee then discussed the importance of being careful with the language used so stakeholders understand these objectives are positive; they pondered a preamble to help achieve this. The subcommittee agreed to modify the language of goal two to “maximize the potential of human talent.” The subcommittee then recessed for lunch.

-- RECESS --

Upon reassembling, the committee introduced goal sponsors and moved to a discussion of goal three. Mr. Craig explained the subcommittee's mission and vision statements. He then explained goals in general and the goals of the subcommittee. He went on to say the next step is to create objectives that are measurable and obtainable. Mr. Craig explained lagging indicators and that input from stakeholders will help define those. He then moved on to outline what needs to occur at the meeting the day after this one, including implementation and outcome indicators. The discussion proceeded to objectives for goal three (increasing the involvement and support of stakeholders). Mr. Elsener said parental involvement is the most important stakeholder group and would like a clear objective to reflect that. Superintendent Ritz suggested broadening that to include caring adults. Dr. Oliver suggested innovative partnerships with businesses, higher education, and others. Dr. Freitas opined that the second objective could be community. The subcommittee discussed local flexibility with regard to these objectives. The discussion then turned to how to foster relationships with stakeholders. The subcommittee also discussed using "family involvement" in place of parental involvement. Mr. Craig said he was hearing the first objective as increasing family involvement and the metrics would be in research. The subcommittee then discussed a second objective of local partnerships with schools. Mr. Elsener said a lot of the objectives can be tied to school improvement.

The subcommittee spoke about the expectations of the goal teams. Mr. Rozzelle laid out the agenda for the meeting the day after this one; outlining what will be presented and discussed. He said we look to the goal teams to bring their expertise to the table and establish some specifics. Mr. Craig explained strategies lay out the "hows", the specificity to explain how objectives are to be accomplished. The group then talked about what kind of strategies make sense for the objectives discussed. Mr. Rozzelle explained he would like the goal teams to work independently if possible, and further expounded on the process of the next day's meeting. Mr. Elsener expressed the importance of marketing and execution.

Mr. Elsener adjourned the meeting without objection.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 19, 2014

Indiana Government Center South – Conference Room 14
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Brad Oliver, Daniel Elsener, Sarah O'Brien and B.J. Watts. Additionally, Chris Craig and Rick Rozzelle from CELT and Claire Fiddian-Green were present.

Mr. Elsener welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mr. Elsener invited a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Watts moved and Dr. Freitas seconded. The subcommittee approved the minutes from the prior meeting on March 10, 2014.

Mr. Craig began by giving an overview of the format of the balanced scorecard to the subcommittee. Dr. Freitas inquired about structure. He said he envisioned it as a living document and items could be plugged in as data is collected. Mr. Rozzelle said that is correct, that leading and lagging indicators are an example. He said there should be one person tasked with keeping the document current. Dr. Freitas asked about taking remedial actions if a milestone goal is being missed. Mr. Rozzelle said that brought him to the first topic of discussion, which is what do you do with this thing. He stated that the Board will have to look at leading indicators on a regular basis to determine if corrective action is necessary. Mr. Rozzelle said today he wanted to walk through the document in depth. Mr. Rozzelle said it's important to whittle it down to what's important, leaving out the tactical or operational things. Mr. Elsener mentioned the waiver and said it's important for the US Department to see we have clear goals. Mr. Rozzelle passed out two examples from other states to look at where they have rolled out a lot of measures into a few. He said the goal today is to come up with something similar.

Mr. Rozzelle moved on to a discussion of goal one. He said he wanted to go through the measures to determine if they can be whittled down or moved to leading indicators. Mr. Rozzelle started with literacy. He said North Carolina had one question, where they ask what

percent of students are performing at grade level. Mr. Rozzelle said it was a good example of rolling measures into one and suggested looking at it overall rather than by grade level separately. Ms. O'Brien inquired about how the detailed data would be included on the scorecard if rolled together. Mr. Rozzelle said the detailed data would come separately. On the scorecard, the information would be an average. Dr. Freitas expressed the importance of the availability of detailed data, and if that's the case he would be ok with broader strokes. Mr. Watts inquired about the use of the IREAD-3 and ECAs as lagging indicators; he asked if those should be combined. Mr. Rozzelle responded he recommended combining as much as they could. The subcommittee began to list key measures for goal one. The committee discussed the percentage of students performing at grade level for IREAD-3, ISTEP, ECA and graduation rates without waivers, and also the percentage gap between the general population and the socioeconomically disadvantaged. They discussed the fact that the plan is living, so new assessments can be added in later. Mr. Rozzelle suggested moving some other things to strategies, like CTE and STEM. Dr. Oliver said he was concerned about the language of objective 1.1. He proposed amending it and the subcommittee agreed. Mr. Rozzelle stated that character and citizenship should be moved to goal three. Ms. O'Brien said it should stay in goal one and three. Dr. Freitas agreed with Ms. O'Brien. The subcommittee then discussed suspensions and expulsions as a way to measure character.

Mr. Elsener asked about measuring character and citizenship other than expulsion and suspension. Superintendent Ritz expressed concerns over schools withholding suspensions and expulsions if that measure is put into place. Mr. Rozzelle said this is the reason there should be a balancing measure. Dr. Freitas said character goes beyond behavior. Dr. Oliver stated reliability is important, but that there may not be good measures for it; he expressed concern over self-reported data. Ms. O'Brien said it should be in goal one but maybe as a strategy for student success. Dr. Oliver pointed out that if a metric emerges it could be moved back as a measure. Mr. Craig added that a measure requires reliable information from every district in the state. The subcommittee took a short break.

-- BREAK --

The subcommittee returned from break and talked about the strategies for goal one. Mr. Rozzelle explained 1.1 strategies will take them to meeting objective 1.1. Dr. Oliver said strategies should be above and beyond what the Board is already supposed to be doing. With regard to monitoring, he suggested a strategy for creating a system to monitor rather than just stating that monitoring should take place. Dr. Freitas mentioned that the procedural strategies should be left to someone else since the Board is a policy Board. Dr. Oliver responded that goes to his point about systems for monitoring. Dr. Oliver then stated his comments in the form of a

strategy for goal one: create an effective monitoring system that evaluates the teacher evaluation systems of each school district and assure its compliance with the established guidelines issued by the Board with respect to RISE 2.0. Dr. Freitas said he would support ongoing assessment in the dashboard. Mr. Elsener recommended a strategy where the Board will ask the Department to bring forth to the Board process, calendar, timelines, and accountability resources for communicating and delivering education support for the new standards for professional evaluation that are consistent. Mr. Elsener said timelines and monitoring implementation are important. Dr. Oliver expressed that the strategy should revolve around systems in place.

The subcommittee then moved to the turnaround principal strategies. Dr. Oliver stated the system is in place but the question is how to monitor that. He said maybe getting the dashboard up and running is enough. Mr. Rozzelle agreed to collapse the turnaround strategies around a monitoring system. Dr. Oliver and Superintendent Ritz articulated the strategy as follows: operationalize and expand the scope of the current monitoring systems to monitor focus and priority school improvement. The subcommittee then discussed technology integration coordinated statewide as a future strategy and a current strategy that addresses a pilot program. The subcommittee also discussed a task force to this end. The group agreed to leave the strategy involving technology to remain worded as it is in the draft. Mr. Rozzelle asked if there should also be a taskforce for character education. Dr. Oliver agreed with Ms. O'Brien that if it is not in there the concept could get lost. Mr. Rozzelle then asked about STEM; Dr. Oliver responded that the real issue is going to be in goal two in whether there will be enough secondary level content specialists. They agreed to move STEM to goal two. Lastly, Mr. Rozzelle asked about CTE; the subcommittee responded it should stay in objective one. The subcommittee also expressed that some of the listed strategies were too specific or better left to the local level rather than in a state-level balanced scorecard.

The subcommittee then moved to goal two. Mr. Rozzelle suggested two measures: school grades and teacher ratings. He said the numbers in goal one will signify how well goal two is being accomplished. Dr. Oliver commented that other metrics should also be looked at, giving diversity as an example. He commented on the lack of a metric for the ongoing professional development of a teacher. The subcommittee had to move on so the issue was tabled. The group then moved to the goal two strategies. Mr. Rozzelle said they needed to lift out the important ones. Dr. Freitas suggested a strategy around collecting teacher, superintendent and principal data. He said they could look at the data and then determine if more data is needed. The group discussed that many of the listed strategies are existing duties. Superintendent Ritz recommended, and the group agreed, to change the "top-notch" language to "highly effective" in objective two. Mr. Watts mentioned the importance of ensuring that student teachers are learning from the right teachers.

Mr. Rozzelle then recapped the strategies discussed: 1) collecting the data on the evaluation system as it is and assess the effectiveness of its implementation, 2) identify best practices and research on the recruitment, training, and retention of talented teachers, 3) consider the use of centers for educational leadership, 4) research, design, and recommend a template for the ongoing professional development of Indiana teachers, including linking incoming teachers to high effective mentor-teachers. The subcommittee discussed removing or rewording number 3; Dr. Oliver suggested phrasing it in terms of finding innovative ways to improve teacher preparation. The subcommittee then took a recess.

-- RECESS --

The subcommittee returned to discuss goal three. Mr. Rozzelle discussed the two lagging indicators they came up with: percentage of at-risk students and the percentage of students on track to graduate. He said the latter could be a leading or lagging indicator. Superintendent Ritz expressed concern over whether the lagging indicators would be useful for the objective. Mr. Elsener said when there is family involvement students tend to do better. Mr. Rozzelle stated, and Superintendent Ritz agree, that there are limitations in the data to for these indicators. Superintendent Ritz mentioned studies that show it's about the support system in the home. Ms. O'Brien commented that a community survey could be useful. Dr. Oliver said the relationships of teachers to their students and students to their homes are even more important factors. Superintendent Ritz said AdvancEd has a good survey that could be used here and that the Department is already working with AdvancEd. The subcommittee decided to strike the lagging indicators in the draft tied to 3.1 and 3.2.

Mr. Rozzelle recapped that they have surveys for objectives 3.1 and 3.2, and certified education partners for 3.3. The group then went through the goal three strategies on the draft strategic plan. The group discussed helping parents assist their children, including discussion of a parent university. Ms. O'Brien talked about an outreach program implemented through outreach coordinators to help parents.

The subcommittee moved on to next steps. Mr. Rozzelle said CELT will take the input and amend the balanced scorecard. He said they will then begin to develop projects from the strategies. After that there will be an opportunity for feedback and then it will be ready for presentation to the Board on June 4. Upon inquiry from Dr. Freitas, Mr. Rozzelle discussed how the plan will be operationalized. He mentioned that each project will have to be taken in turn, there must be funding and monitoring. He stated each project must be launched in sequence as resources become available. He said things will be need to be added to the plan and the plan will need to be changed. Mr. Rozzelle stated that the final version of this strategic plan and scorecard is just the beginning. Lastly, he said the Board must determine on its own how many

projects will be undertaken at once, probably between eight and ten, and each project gets one project manager.

Mr. Elsener adjourned the meeting without objection.