



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 13, 2014

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room 18
402 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
9:00 p.m. (EST)

Committee Members Present: Gordon Hendry (Chair), Dr. David Freitas, and B.J. Watts (by phone).

Board Members Absent: Dr. Brad Oliver was absent for the beginning of the meeting.

I. Call to Order/ Meeting Minutes Approval

The Chair Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order. Mr. Hendry announced that Dr. Oliver would be absent. There were no minutes to approve. Mr. Hendry thanked Board staff and Department staff for being present. He also thanked the presenters who would be addressing the committee at this meeting.

II. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC)

Mr. Hendry commented that data from 2013-2014 is being gathered to populate the scorecard. He asked for an update from the Department on the progress of this work. Kristen Reed, Policy and Research Coordinator for the Department, addressed the committee. She stated that the Department is waiting on information regarding board certified teachers, compensation model data, and information on enrollment and completion for the AP, IB and CTE. Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, stated that information will still need to be gathered for goal 1. Ms. Reed responded that the Department will be getting that information together. Ms. Reed said she expected there to be a populated scorecard soon, but that data for some parts of the scorecard is not available. Ms. Fiddian-Green said Board staff is also working on this and that the entire scorecard would be presented as a whole once populated. Dr. Freitas asked about information that is not available,

and Ms. Reed stated that there needs to be more conversation around that. Ms. Reed said the Department will have a list of the items in the scorecard that do not have data so the committee can address those issues. Mr. Hendry commented on the importance of having a scorecard that is as populated as possible. The committee discussed having the committee members review the scorecard first and then present it to the full Board.

Mr. Hendry then moved on to discuss scorecard priority metrics. He said the committee must choose three to five high level targets that can easily be tracked and targeted. The committee decided to defer this issue until the scorecard is populated. The committee decided to discuss this at the December committee meeting and in the meantime have staff put together a recommendation to make to the full Board. Ms. Fiddian-Green expressed the importance of having the committee deliberate and chose the targets.

III. Priority Initiatives: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems and Stakeholder Engagement

Robert Guffin, Executive Director to the Board, addressed the committee. He stated that Board staff recommends that the Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana School Boards Association, the Superintendents Association, and the Ambassador Teacher Group be included. Mr. Guffin clarified that this list is not an exhaustive list. Dr. Freitas recommended including business leaders and community groups as well.

Mr. Guffin introduced representatives Erika Haskins and Susan Whitten from the Ambassador Teacher Group to address the committee. Erika Haskins spoke first. She began by giving an overview of the teacher stakeholder group they created. She commented that they formed a list of about 30 educators to engage in the process across elementary and secondary education. Ms. Haskins said they are proud of the distribution but that there is room for improvement in terms of increasing the diversity of the group. She said special education and career and technical education are two areas that could use more representation within the group.

Ms. Haskins stated that they are looking for guidance from the committee regarding areas where feedback is desired. She said they will form smaller groups to facilitate conversations on specific topics. Susan Whitten then addressed the committee. She commented that putting teachers at the forefront is important right now. She said the group will be helpful in any way possible. Dr. Freitas commented that this is a great step forward because it allows the Board to hear directly from teachers. He went on to recommend that the group also come up with their own issues that need to be addressed by the Board.

Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey informed the committee that the Department has formed its own stakeholder group pursuant to the waiver and that they are meeting to

discuss possibly some of the same issues. She said this is a collaborative effort and wanted to make sure the same teachers aren't tasked twice. Dr. Freitas stated that the more input the better and asked that Board staff be involved with the Department's stakeholder group; Ms. Shockey said Board staff involvement would be fine. Mr. Hendry added that the more communication the better so that there is not an overlap in the work that is being done. Sarah Pies, Evaluation Specialist with the Department, explained the agenda for their first stakeholder meeting. She said they will be doing introductions and then looking to gather information from other states. Dr. Freitas clarified that he wasn't asking that the groups be combined, but requested that the committee stay well informed so there is no duplication. Dr. Freitas asked that agendas be provided to the committee in advance so committee members can attend those meetings if desired.

Todd Bess, Executive Director of the Indiana Association of School Principals ("ISP"), spoke next. Mr. Bess explained the things his organization has done over the past few years. He said they were part of the work INTASS has done with teacher evaluation. He stated that there is a need for more data to determine how things can be improved. He also said the ISP can assist the committee in various ways. Mr. Bess mentioned that ISP has been meeting with the Department and Board staff, and has a legislative committee that could provide useful feedback. Mr. Bess said they will help in any way they can. Dr. Freitas said an issue that comes up often is the teacher evaluation system. He said the problem seems to be implementation within some school corporations, and not the policy of it or the law. Mr. Bess agreed and stated that the INTASS work can help guide on this issue. Dr. Freitas recommended targeting specific corporations that are having issues with implementation. Ms. Shockey responded that the Department recently implemented a system that involved visiting the schools based on information the Department receives. Dr. Freitas requested this information in a private way to review for effectiveness of this program, and Ms. Shockey responded they would be happy to provide that.

Brian Smith, the Executive Director of the Indiana School Boards Association, spoke next. He stated that he has had many conversations with educators throughout the state. He said one question that comes up a lot is the role of school boards. He said schools must hire and evaluate superintendents, but also have strategic plans in place that include teacher and principal evaluation, which should include student growth. He said it's all about student learning. He suggested working more with superintendents regarding the evaluation process. Mr. Smith stated that there needs to be consistency across the district and across the state, and that an evaluation is only as good as the evaluator. He commented that the range of different evaluation models out there can be problematic. He stated that another issue is the lack of communication to districts. Mr. Smith also mentioned that grades are often not easy enough to

understand. This limits a superintendent's ability to communicate to the constituency why a certain grade was received, he said.

Dr. Freitas said he appreciated the comments about student achievement and growth driving the evaluation. Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Mr. Smith spoke about the timing of the release of grades and its effect on schools. He stated that starting a new year's evaluation process without completing the last year's can blur things a bit. He said it would be nice without the carryovers. Mr. Smith stated that a nice end would be the end of the school year. Ms. Fiddian-Green said the conundrum is that individual student growth is part of the evaluation, which is calculated using the ISTEP data. She said this data does not come back until August 31. Ms. Fiddian-Green stated this is why the evaluation process carries over. She said there are discussions within the new RFP process regarding how quickly this information could be obtained to try and move the August 31 date up a bit.

IV. Presentation by National Consultant on Teacher Evaluation¹

Ashley Cowger, Program Director for the Center for Education and Career Innovation, introduced Jessica Conlon from The New Teacher Project ("TNTP") to address the committee. She began by giving a background on TNTP. She said TNTP is a national nonprofit organization focusing on great teaching and student learning. Ms. Conlon also explained work TNTP has done Indiana in the recent past, including the development of the RISE model for teacher evaluation. She then discussed how TNTP will be supporting Indiana in strengthening its current system. She said Indiana's current system is one of the best in the country. She informed the committee that TNTP's work will be in three phases: policy review, stakeholder engagement, and recommendations and improvements. Dr. Freitas asked how many districts are using the RISE model and Ms. Conlon responded that she believed about half of the districts are using RISE or a modified RISE model. She said part of TNTP's work will be to see how well RISE is being implemented.

Ms. Conlon explained that phase 1 is providing initial recommendations for strengthening current law and rules governing teacher evaluation. She said these recommendations will be presented to the Board on December 3, 2014. In phase 2, TNTP will engage stakeholders to gather feedback on the design and implementation of RISE and other evaluation systems in use. She said this will result in recommendations to the Board. Ms. Conlon explained that phase 3 is to make final recommendations to the Board and support a stakeholder design committee to execute on the proposed changes.

¹ The presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Presentation_to_Strategic_Planning_Committee_11_12_14.pdf.

Dr. Freitas requested that the data be disaggregated to get a better picture of what is happening district to district. He also requested that data be separated out to look at residence: urban, suburban, and rural etc. Ms. Conlon explained that the end product will be a report to the Board. She said they will work with the Board to make sure the Board has all the information it wants. The committee then took a recess.

-- RECESS --

-- Dr. Oliver joined the meeting --

V. Discussion SBOE Legislative Agenda Recommendations

Mr. Hendry explained that the Board plans to make recommendations to the legislature regarding education policy. Mr. Hendry asked the Department to present on their legislative agenda. Ms. Shockey explained the components of the budget agenda, including technology, second language learners, tuition support, David C. Ford funds, and textbooks.

Dr. Freitas asked how the Department is supporting the Board's strategic plan in the Department's legislative agenda. Ms. Shockey said Scott Reske, Executive Director of Government and Public Affairs for the Department, would have more details. Ms. Shockey gave a few examples, including performance dollars and teacher leaders. She said they are working to make the legislative language more in line with schools' needs.

Mr. Hendry asked for comments from the committee members regarding a legislative agenda that can be later brought to the Board to discuss and approve. Mr. Hendry expressed that this is a time sensitive issue. Dr. Freitas began recommended six legislative issues: 1) legislation around school turnarounds that will include the work of the Board's Turnaround Committee, 2) the annual release of grades, 3) the role of Board staff, 4) the Board's authority to seek outside experts, 5) the Board's access to data, and 6) prekindergarten education and standards.

Dr. Oliver listed the following items for the legislative agenda: 1) defining the Board's authority concerning the use and accessibility of financial data and student achievement data, 2) defining the Board's authority with regard to assessment, 3) prekindergarten, 4) school turnaround, and 5) the teacher evaluation and teacher compensation model.

Mr. Hendry echoed Dr. Oliver's comments and reiterated the importance of effective prekindergarten. He stated that there is a mountain of evidence showing how vital prekindergarten is to a student's overall academic success. Mr. Watts agreed on the importance of prekindergarten.

The committee clarified that staffs should look at whether rulemaking or implementation would suffice to carry out some of these goals rather than statutory changes. Dr. Oliver stated that an ideal situation would be the Board, Department, and the General Assembly all to be on the same page. He recommended thinking about how to align things when making legislative recommendations.

VI. Next Steps

Mr. Hendry commented that committee meetings will be scheduled 8-10 days in advance of regular Board meetings going forward. He said this will allow information to be sent to the Board with enough time for then Board to review before the business meetings.

The committee adjourned.