



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Business Meeting Agenda  
March 7, 2018  
9:00 AM (ET)  
Indiana State Library  
History Reference Room 211  
315 West Ohio St.  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

**Board Members Present:** Dr. Jennifer McCormick (Chair, by phone), Mr. BJ Watts (Vice Chair), Dr. Byron Ernest (Secretary), Dr. Vince Bertram, Dr. Maryanne McMahan, Mr. Tony Walker, Mrs. Cari Whicker, Ms. Katie Mote (by phone), and Dr. Steve Yager.

**Board Members Absent:** Mr. Gordon Hendry and Dr. David Freitas.

- I. **Call to Order**
  - a. Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance
- II. **Approval of the Agenda**
  - a. The agenda was approved by a voice vote.
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
  - a. The minutes from February 14, 2018 were approved by a voice vote.
- IV. **Statement from the Chair**
  - a. None.
- V. **Board Member Comments and Report**
  - a. Mr. Watts welcomed the future education students from Butler University.
  - b. Dr. Ernest thanked the Community Education Coalition for putting together a group to discuss implementation of business and higher education partnerships within schools throughout the state. He also commended the Indiana Concurrent Enrollment Partnership on hosting the first annual Indiana Dual-Credit Summit. He thanked Greater Clark County Schools for their efforts to help other schools implement graduation pathways. Lastly, he thanked NASBE for their work in their legislative conference.
  - c. Mrs. Whicker thanked the Department of Education for putting together a program on Teachers-Teachers, a new online job search for teachers. She also thanked all of those who are attending the accountability meetings and providing public comment.
  - d. Dr. Yager thanked the Greater Clark County Schools for providing guidance to other schools. He also thanked Board Staff for holding the public hearings and summarizing the comments made. He also reminded all of the next accountability meeting on March 9<sup>th</sup>.
- VI. **Public Comment**
  - a. Revonda Johnson, Academic Improvement Officer at Indianapolis Public Schools, recommended the implementation of freshmen-on-track and shared the success of Indianapolis Public Schools in using the indicator.

- I. Dr. Bertram asked if there was a correlation between a student's on-track status in eight grade and freshmen year.
- II. Ms. Johnson responded that there are many more opportunities to not be focused when students start high school, so this program helps them transition more successfully.
- b. Steve Shaw, President of Indiana Association of Career and Technical Education Districts, expressed the need to maintain the integrity of CTE and CTE Concentrators in the implementation of graduation pathways.

**VII. Best Practices – Innovations in Education – Student Success**

- a. Resolution Honoring Annie Ostojic
  - I. Mr. Walker offered a resolution to honor Annie Ostojic as an exemplary student.
    - i. Annie Ostojic has been recognized by Forbes magazine in its 2018 edition of 30 under 30 for advancements she has made in the areas of microwave and battery technology, at the age of 15.
    - ii. She has also been invited to the White House twice for recognition of her inventions.
  - II. The Board voted by a voice vote to approve the Resolution.
  - III. Discussion starts at [23:28](#).
- b. Modern States Education Alliance
  - I. David Vise, Executive Director of Modern States Education Alliance, gave a presentation regarding the success of the Alliance's program, Freshmen Year for Free.
    - i. Ms. Mote asked if the organization covered the costs of taking the AP exam. Mr. Vise responded that the organization did pay for those exams. Ms. Mote further asked if the receiving institution was able to accept some of those AP classes, but not others if they so chose. Mr. Vise responded that the receiving institutions have pre-arranged tables that say which courses the institution will accept.
    - ii. Mr. Walker asked if the organization offered science courses. Mr. Vise responded that they offered every imaginable freshmen year science courses. Mr. Walker further asked how the organization handled labs with these courses. Mr. Vise responded they handled labs on a simulated basis.
    - iii. Ms. Mote asked what the rate of students that pass the AP exam who took the free course. Mr. Vise responded that they did not have the data because the program launched in August and the AP exam takes place in May.
    - iv. Dr. Bertram asked if student's receiving subsidized exams or if waivers affected the student's access to the program. Mr. Vise responded that it was not a factor and that all were welcome to use the program. Dr. Bertram clarified that the program was essentially using philanthropy to subsidize the government and their commitment to students. Mr. Vise responded that it was all privately funded.

- v. Ms. Mote asked if the Department was aware of how many students took the AP exam annually. Dr. McCormick responded around 24,000 students took the exam. Mr. Vise offered that the program offered exam preparation materials that could save students money for these exams as well.

II. Discussion starts at [26:42](#).

**VIII. Consent Agenda**

- a. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the Consent Agenda.

**IX. New Business – Action**

- a. Ambassador Christian Academy Choice Scholarship Waiver

I. Danielle Graham-Harris, Principal of Ambassador Christian Academy, presented information to the Board showing that the school had achieved academic improvement during the 2016-2017 school year and asked for a delay in consequences resulting from the school’s two consecutive “D” accountability grades.

- i. Dr. Yager asked how many of the students were the same from year one to year two and what their impact was. Ms. Graham-Harris responded that 20% of the students that moved in were in the bottom 25% and 10% were part of the top 75%.
- ii. Dr. Yager asked if the Board was setting a precedent that would send a message to other schools across the state to also come ask for a waiver in these types of situations. Mr. Walker responded that this would not be setting precedent because this needs to be viewed in the context of what is happening within the Gary Community School Corporation.
- iii. Dr. Yager clarified that the school was asking for this waiver to be able to continue receiving choice scholarship students. Ms. Graham-Harris responded that that was correct and not allowing this may preclude families from staying together, which often leads to those students leaving the school. Mr. Watts expressed that he believed that there should be an exception for siblings even in these cases.
- iv. Mrs. Whicker stated that this school has not gained a lot in proficiency, and she understood how difficult this was, but that she wanted to continue to show the importance of growth.
- v. Mr. Watts expressed that the only thing the Board was voting on was whether to allow the school to continue to accept choice scholarship students and he believed the parents of these students should be able to make the decision of their children attended this school.

II. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the waiver.

III. Discussion starts at [43:30](#).

- b. The Independence Academy Choice Scholarship Waiver

I. Chad Ranney, Deputy General Counsel for the Board, informed the Board that Independence Academy was coming before the Board to ask for a waiver of consequences resulting from the school receiving two

- consecutive “F” accountability grades. The school was coming before the Board with additional data to show growth.
- II. Marissa Gill, Director of Schools for Independence Academy, presented information regarding the school’s student population and growth data points.
  - III. Dr. Bertram asked if the school was asking for a waiver or a null grade designation.
    - i. Mrs. Gill responded that the school was asking for a waiver, but ideally would like to receive both.
  - IV. Mrs. Whicker expressed that the school’s accountability grade had actually decreased from a 31% to a 29%.
    - i. Mrs. Gill informed that many of the students were not factored into the majority because they did not take a state assessment. The school’s graduation rate was also off, which the Department was made aware of.
    - ii. Mrs. Whicker also informed that the Department’s website listed the school as 2/3 special education, not 100%, so they need to look into the data.
    - iii. Mrs. Gill responded that 100% of the students at the school have an ISP or an IEP.
  - V. Mr. Watts expressed that hearing that students are leaving high performing districts to come to this school because they believe this is the better option is a very telling fact.
  - VI. Dr. McMahon asked for clarification regarding the statute and if the Board was allowed to make this decision if the school has not demonstrated academic improvement.
    - i. Mr. Schultz, General Counsel for the Board, responded that there is no definition for academic improvement within the Indiana Code or Indiana case law.
    - ii. Mr. Watts further asked if being a “special population” school could be a reason for granting a waiver.
    - iii. Mr. Schultz responded that he would be very cautious as using that as the standard.
  - VII. Mr. Walker asked if the data being shown to the Board was effected by the misreporting by the Department and if it had been verified that there was misreporting.
    - i. Mr. Ranney responded that the initial analysis was done using the 40 students that attend the school, but that was incorrect because the school is only accountable for 32 students, the other 8 student’s data goes back to their “home” school, which was corrected by the data in front of the Board. The graduation data also had an error, but it has been treating graduation rate as 0 because this error has not been corrected.
    - ii. Mr. Walker responded that he would like to see the real data and not the misreported data.

- VIII. Mr. Schultz offered that the Board had the option to postpone the vote until the next month so the data could be corrected and shown how that affected the school's grade.
  - i. Dr. Bertram asked how delaying the vote for one month would affect the school.
  - ii. Mrs. Gill responded that it puts the school in a difficult situation because the Choice Scholarship Application had already opened.
- IX. Dr. Bertram asked if there was anything that gave the Board the authority to issue a null grade for the school.
  - i. Mr. Schultz responded that that would be problematic because it has been too long since the Board issued a final administrative decision.
- X. Dr. Bertram asked for an explanation of the areas where the school has shown academic improvement.
  - i. Mrs. Gill responded that 75% of the middle school students demonstrated improvement, 100% of graduating students have passed the ECA, and over the past three years, 75% of students have passed both portions of the ECA, and 100% of students have shown growth.
- XI. The Board voted 8-1 to table the waiver decision until the next month's meeting; Superintendent McCormick voted no.
- XII. Discussion starts at [59:18](#).
- XIII. Ms. Mote excused herself from the meeting at this point.
- c. Work Session Dates
  - I. Mr. Ranney recommended that the Board hold two additional meetings to discuss the proposed accountability rule, the dates of which were to be March 21 and April 3.
    - i. Dr. Yager asked what the intention of the work sessions were. Mr. Ranney responded that this would be for the Board to discuss the comments received on the proposed rule.
  - II. The Board voted 9-0 to approve the Work Session dates.
  - III. Discussion starts at [1:49:05](#).

**X. Discussion and Reports**

- a. Turnaround Academy Update
  - I. Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation
    - i. Kelsey Wright, Director of School Turnaround, gave a presentation regarding the status of the three turnaround schools within the Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation.
      - a. Students come to these schools behind, but are growing at a faster rate the longer they are with the school.
      - b. Coaching sessions are held monthly to learn what is working well in each building and taking that success to scale.
      - c. Aspirational goals for all the classrooms have been set to consider the whole child, beyond content to encompass all children's social-emotional needs.

- d. EVSC will continue to embrace continuous improvement and take proactive measures to improve their schools and teachers in a sustainable manner.
    - ii. Dr. McMahon asked if the schools were having good progress regarding out of school suspensions for the upper grades as well as the lower grades that were mentioned. Ms. Wright responded that all of the data shown was for the entire school.
    - iii. Discussion starts at [1:51:00](#).
  - b. Perkins Funds Update
    - I. Stefany Deckard, Director of CTE at the Department, provided an update regarding Perkins Funds and how the 2017-2018 state allocated budget for the Fund will be used.
      - i. Dr. Bertram asked if she believed that there were barriers that limited access to students within the plan. Ms. Deckard responded that she believed looking at the state plan was always a good idea to determine where the state wants to go. She also mentioned that the biggest impacts would be seen in changing the definitions within the plan.
      - ii. Dr. Ernest asked for clarification regarding the definition of concentrator. Ms. Deckard responded that the definition of a concentrator was a student who completed six credits. The point of contention is how students get to that status. Dr. Ernest further asked if she believed these classes should be ones that scale the student toward skills and competencies and not just a beginning step. Ms. Deckard replied that a natural progression in the courses was the purpose of the pathways. Dr. Bertram stated that he believed the idea behind a concentrator needed to change because multiple disciplines needed to be integrated to develop a number of skills. Ms. Deckard responded she absolutely agreed, but the overall goal is that classes build upon each so students are not stagnant in the types of skills they are learning.
      - iii. Dr. Bertram asked if a teacher needed to have a CTE credential to receive the funding for a CTE course. Mrs. Deckard responded that as it currently stands, yes. Dr. Bertram further asked if she believed this was a limitation of CTE. Amanda McCammon, Chief of Workforce & STEM Alliances for the Department, responded that there were opportunities for teachers through workplace specialist licensure based on their industry or workforce experience.
      - iv. Discussion starts at [2:06:47](#).
  - c. Assessment Update
    - I. Dr. Charity Flores, Director of Assessment for the Department, provided an assessment update.
      - i. ISTEP+ Part 1 is currently underway and several systematic improvements have been made after discovering issues in the 2017 administration.

- a. Dr. Bertram asked how decisions were made around test regulations. Dr. Flores responded that decisions are made primarily during content review process.
      - ii. American Institutes for Research has been selected to be the vendor for the Alternate Assessment and the assessment will be named Indiana's Alternate Measure.
      - iii. Two educator meetings have been held to draft the blueprints for ILEARN to ensure that content aligns to the expectations of Indiana's teachers.
        - a. Mr. Walker asked if ILEARN was being designed to be more difficult than the current ISTEP. Dr. Flores responded it was not being designed to be more difficult, but to have different items. She also mentioned that the cut score changes are often confused as increasing difficulty.
      - iv. Discussion starts at [2:18:32](#).
- d. Accountability Update
  - I. Steve Baker, Principal of Bluffton High School, offered his concerns and possible solutions regarding the proposed accountability rule. His concerns and solutions centered on growth and the academic achievement indicator.
  - II. Tamara Skinner, Principal of Glenwood Leadership Academy, offered the story of her school and how the current and proposed accountability system do not accurately assess her school due to the lack of importance placed on the growth and the addition of a science and social studies indicator.
    - i. Mr. Walker asked what other types of multiple measures indicators she believed could be used as opposed to using standardized testing. Ms. Skinner responded that she believed this should be done in a group to find better alternatives. She then asked how the multiple measures were determined for the high school level. Mr. Walker responded that these ideas were brought up through group talks, but not many ideas had been mentioned for elementary school.
    - ii. Dr. Bertram asked what she believed growth and proficiency should look like if used to grade a school in the current model. Ms. Skinner mentioned she liked the idea that growth can exceed 100 points. Dr. Bertram then asked then would we believe that the students could become proficient. Ms. Skinner responded that eventually high growth would become the proficiency bar.
  - III. Mr. Ranney gave an update regarding the status of the proposed accountability rule and the public comments received thus far.
    - i. Academic progress and growth have been the number one topic due to the elimination of growth at the high school level.
    - ii. There has been general support for the ESSA accountability plan and following that plan.

- IV. Dr. Bertram asked what the most rational reasoning for elimination of growth at the high school level is. Mr. Ranney responded that Graduation Pathways would definitely play a role in this rule and implementation of that would basically grade an exam that is no longer applicable to all students, so looking at a different measure may be a better option.
  - i. Mr. Walker further asked if there was a minimum requirement from ESSA on the measurement of standardized tests. Mr. Ranney responded that the wording requires significant measurement.
  - ii. Mr. Watts clarified that this was only for federal accountability. A representative from the Department responded that the measurement for standardized tests from ESSA must have substantial weight, meaning more than non-academic indicators.
  - iii. Mr. Walker stated that he believed holding proficiency steady at 20% would be a good compromise.
- V. Dr. Bertram asked if there was a rationale for capping growth.
  - i. Mr. Ranney responded that ESSA requires growth to be capped at 100 points at the indicator level. The idea behind capping it at the subject matter level is transparency, because this will control for things such as high growth in one area and low growth in another.
  - ii. Mrs. Whicker stated that she believed that this change would not mask the growth based on subject matter, but would mask the attainment of the student.
  - iii. Dr. Bertram asked what the cut score was set at for the SAT. Mr. Ranney responded that it is set at 1010, 480 for English and 530 for math.
- VI. Dr. Yager asked when the last day for e-mails to be sent in regarding this proposed rule was. Matt Voors, Executive Director for the Board, responded that accepting public comments up until the day before the vote would not give the Board an opportunity to hear those comments, so the date would be set a few days before to allow Staff enough time to go through them.
  - i. Dr. Yager then asked how many days Staff would need to summarize and disperse those email comments. Mr. Ranney responded that he could get through emails within 24 – 36 hours and that he would be updating the summarization on a continuing basis.
  - ii. Dr. Yager asked to receive new summarizations on every Friday.
- VII. Dr. Bertram asked if the Board must have specific testimony regarding particular subjects in order to be able to change that portion of the current proposal. Mr. Ranney responded that changes should be tied back to some sort of comment or Board discussion.
- VIII. Dr. Bertram asked if growth as an indicator was tied only to an exam. Mr. Ranney responded that was currently how growth was set.
  - i. Dr. Bertram asked if there were other measures that could be considered in the growth indicator at the high school level. Mr. Ranney responded that the ninth-grade on track measure did

measure growth towards graduation, but clarified the difference between growth towards proficiency and growth toward other indicators.

- IX. Mr. Walker asked if it were possible to look at some non-testing based growth measures. Mr. Ranney said that he could do that.
  - X. Dr. Yager asked if it would be difficult to use GPA to set standards since different schools will score grades differently. He also mentions that one thing that can't be regulated is the rigor in the classroom. Dr. Bertram followed by saying isn't that true of anything we do. He specifically mentioned the honors diploma, CORE 40 and On-Time progress. He argued that most metrics that are used are locally driven metrics.
  - XI. Mr. Walker noted that Mr. Ranney has been doing a great job working the Accountability Rule.
  - XII. Discussion starts at [2:32:33](#), but video cuts out at 3:22.
- e. Dropout Recovery Rule
- I. Mr. Tim Schultz, General Counsel for the Indiana State Board of the Education, provided an update on the Dropout Recovery rates. He went over the proposed draft language which amends 511 IAC to account for IC-20-31-8-4.6 with allows for certain at-risk students to not be included in the calculation of school performance. The proposed regulations track with ESSA where possible.
  - II. Dr. Bertram asked about being “physically present” at a virtual school. Mr. Schultz said that they are working on a regulation for virtual schools so that they are not excluded. Mr. Schultz did say that he could revise the proposed language to include virtual schools.
  - III. Dr. Yager asked about what the timeline was to vote on the proposed language. Mr. Schultz said that there was no set timeline. Dr. Yager said that was fine as he would like to see revised versions before a timeline for a vote is set.
  - IV. Mr. Watts asked what the goal for this conversation was today. It was to have it introduced, have some discussion, propose changes, but was proposing changes limited to that meeting. Mr. Schultz said discussion was not limited to that meeting, but that Board Members could send him proposed changes, they could be red lined in and then it could be brought back to the Board for further discussion.
  - V. Dr. Bertram asked Lee Ann Kwiatkowski, Chief of Staff for IDOE what are some of the primary reasons students drop out of high school. She responded with that there are variety of reasons. But that it could be that they are not finding success or experiencing difficulties or disconnected.
    - i. Dr. Bertram also offered up that students drop out due to boredom, even those students that are well advanced. And that is why he would suggest being careful with the definition of “at risk”.
- f. Graduation Pathways Update
- I. Steve Baker, Principal of Bluffton high school provided an update on behalf of a Principals focus group that has been working with state board staff on guidance regarding Graduation Pathways. He said that staff has

done a good job acting as a bridge between policy and implementation. He did offer some concerns and solutions centered on the CTE concentrators.

- i. Dr. Yager asked Mr. Baker to clarify his comment on removing some courses would harm high schools. Mr. Baker said that removing foundational courses for a CTE concentrator would force students to take courses that his school or other schools may not offer.
  - ii. Mr. Watts stated that staff has said that Mr. Baker has been very pleasant to work with. He then asked Mr. Baker if the courses that could be eliminated are prerequisite to a concentrator or included in a concentrator. Mr. Baker said they would be included as part of the six credits.
  - iii. Dr. Yager then asked if we need to keep those foundational courses in and Mr. Baker said yes because if they are removed then he cannot offer a high level CTE course.
- II. Lizz Walters, Principal of Beech Grove High School offered her concerns and possible solutions regarding locally created pathways and guidance for Graduation Pathways.
- III. Alicia Kielmovitch offered an update on Graduation Pathways. She said that staff is currently working with 65 educators in various positions from around the state to develop guidance for Graduation Pathways. It is a geographically/regionally/professionally diverse group. She is also very appreciative of the feedback that has been received from IDOE. She hopes to have a version of guidance to share with the Board by late spring or early summer.
- i. Ms. Kielmovitch provided follow up on the locally created pathway from the previous meeting. She worked with practitioners and focus groups on develop a new memo on what the locally created pathway (LCP) would look like. It was vetted through multiple groups and will continue to be before it's brought to the Board.
  - ii. She wanted to focus on the three criteria for schools and districts to meet and those three criteria are:
    - a. Collaboration: LCP must be developed in collaboration (or partnership) with business & industry, postsecondary education & training providers, and/or community organizations. Optional partners may include neighboring schools/districts, career and technical education centers, and other local partners (e.g., Workforce Boards, Chambers of Commerce, etc.);
    - b. Competency: LCP must provide students with recognized postsecondary knowledge and skills (e.g., credits, credentials) that prepare students for meaningful postsecondary education/training and/or employment opportunities; AND

- c. Continuous Improvement: LCP must be evaluated and continuously improved based upon the evaluation at the local level. Applicant will serve as a model and point of contact for other districts interested in creating a similar pathway.
- iii. She already has about a dozen or so school districts ready to roll with this and be model districts.
- iv. Dr. Bertram said that he sees a lot more flexibility woven into this plan. In regards to Collaborators, would a school need a collaborator for each pathway or a collaborator across all of their pathways? Ms. Kielmovtich said potentially, but if it's a different pathway the school would still need to come before the Board for approval.
- v. Further discussion was had on locally created pathways and student created pathways and the ability of schools to have multiple different pathways for multiple careers as well as different levels of acceptable pathways as needs for rural schools are different to those of urban schools.
- vi. Dr. Yager brought up, for thought and not discussion, what happens when schools don't have partners because there is a possibility it does happen and how they're going to work around it.

**XI. Adjournment**

- a. The meeting adjourned by a voice vote.