



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2015
9:00 a.m. (EDT)

Indiana Government Center South
Auditorium
302 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, Mrs. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. B.J. Watts and Ms. Cari Whicker (by phone).

Board Members Absent: Mr. Tony Walker; Ms. Whicker was present by phone for the beginning of the meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER

- Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order, the pledge of allegiance was recited, and roll was called. The roll reflected all members present except Mr. Tony Walker.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- Superintendent Ritz informed the Board that Dr. Freitas asked that a legislative update be added to discussion. Further, the title of Action Item E was changed to Initiate Rulemaking of Standards and Benchmarks for Teacher Prep Programs. Ms. O'Brien asked that Action Item B, Subsection b - Resolution Regarding Indiana's 2015-16 Assessment: Component 7 and 11, be tabled until some budget questions can be answered. Lastly, Dr. Freitas requested that Action Item D, a - Standard for Success, be moved to Item IX – Best Practices - Innovations in Education - Student

Successes. The Board voted to make all of the aforementioned changes to the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Upon motion and second, the Board approved the minutes from April 1, 2015 by a vote of 10-0.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

- Superintendent Ritz commented that the Department released the IREAD-3 preliminary spring results, with the final results coming after the summer. She said 84.2% of students passed the IREAD-3. She informed the Board that the Department also awarded 281 four-star schools, which are schools in the top 25%. Superintendent Ritz commended Kathy Nimmer, who was one of the four finalists nationally for teacher of the year, saying Ms. Nimmer represented Indiana well. Superintendent Ritz invited the Board to attend any of the 23 eLearning conferences that will be held statewide.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

- Ms. Whicker commented that it's teacher appreciation week and wanted to thank all the teachers in Indiana. She stated that she has been inspired by, and has worked with, phenomenal teachers in Indiana.
- Ms. Whicker also stated that she had concerns about the ISTEP+ ("ISTEP") and that the stress test did not go well at her school. She said they were denied a request for paper/pencil and then another stress test didn't go well. Ms. Whicker continued that subsequently some of the students were approved to take the paper/pencil version. She said a week before the test they were asked to do another stress test with less than one day notice, and it again did not go well. She said they tried to get paper/pencil again for the rest of the students in the building, along with others in the district, and then found out the Friday afternoon of that week that they would be allowed to use paper/pencil for all students in her building and the other buildings. She expressed concern for schools having these types of problems.
- Ms. Whicker continued that when the materials arrived the window had already been open. The materials had to be sorted and then sent from central office to her

school and the students still had to take a practice test. Ms. Whicker expressed concern regarding the climate within the schools that face this issue. She went on to say that there are now two due dates, one for students who were given permission to take pencil/paper earlier and now one for students who took paper/pencil later. She informed the Board that when this situation occurs within a building it creates a lot of problems. She asked if the window could be the same for everyone. She asked the Board to be compassionate and give everyone the same due date so that schools can administer the test well. She said schools that have a combination of students taking paper/pencil and online should be given the same date as well. Superintendent Ritz responded that this could be addressed by Dr. Michele Walker later in the meeting.

- Mr. Elsener stated that he appreciated the legislature's efforts in clarifying governance for education in Indiana. He stated that the Board makes the policy and that the Department's job is to implement the policy with fidelity. Mr. Elsener said the legislature helped to further clarify these roles, which will help the Board going forward. He also expressed concern about IREAD-3 numbers going down a bit.
- Dr. Oliver spoke about attending the INTASS meeting celebrating the districts working on their teacher evaluation plans. He said the Board has been engaged in a survey through the Strategic Planning Committee. He stated that he appreciated that there was autonomy around well researched models and that he also appreciated the academic improvement presented.

-- Ms. Whicker left the meeting by phone --

VI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT (public comments on specific agenda items are taken at the time each item is before the Board)

- Erin Tuttle signed up for public comment. She stated that some parents are objecting to the next generation science standards. Ms. Tuttle said these standards are a step down from existing standards. She said the Fordham Institute found that the new standards are vague, poorly worded, and sub-par.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. CTE: Attrition and Persistent Rate Report; B. CTE: State Approved Industry Certifications; C. Approval of September and February ADM Count; D. Common School Construction Technology Loans; E. Special Education Child Count

- The Board voted 9-0 to approve all items on the Consent Agenda.¹

VIII. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION

- Superintendent Ritz asked the Board if it objected to rearranging the action items so that the A-F rule (Action Item B) could be addressed last; no one objected.

A. TSO and Lead Partner Funding and Process²

- Superintendent Ritz moved to adopt the recommended process for allocating the SIG 1003 funds for schools in intervention as presented in the attached materials. A mistake was noted in the materials under reserve for potential 2015-16 interventions (the last page of the Staff Recommendations for Intervention Support) - Washington Middle School in Evansville should have been listed rather than Beveridge Elementary in Gary. That correction was made part of the motion. Upon a second the Board voted 9-0 to carry the motion.

C. CTE Approval of Changes to State Approved Course Titles³

- Superintendent Ritz moved to approve the changes to course titles as recommended and Dr. Oliver seconded. Mr. Albert asked when the numbers will be assigned to the courses for preparation for next year. Jenny Berry, Director, College and Career Readiness for the Department, responded that the numbers are already waiting to be added; she said the new courses start next year (2015-2016) and that the courses that are changing can start the year after that. Upon further inquiry by Mr. Albert, Ms. Berry said the information will be published on the Department's website.

¹ Consent Agenda materials can be found at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/attrition_and_persistent_-_Merged.pdf, http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/State_Approved_Industry_Cert.pdf, http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/FY2016_count_dates_SBOE.pdf, http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Common_School_Loan.pdf, and http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/4-1-15_SBOE_Special_Ed_COUNT_MEMO.pdf.

² Materials can be found at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TSO_and_Lead_Partner_5-7-15.pdf.

³ Materials can be found at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/2015_4-24_memo_to_SBOE_approved_course_titles_update.pdf.

Superintendent Ritz added that the Department will use the listserv and the information will be placed on the DOE Dialogue as well.

- Ms. Neal inquired about the process of creating new course titles, and Ms. Berry explained that panels are formed to decide what the courses should look like. Ms. Neal asked if there is data regarding how many students are enrolled in the various electives. Ms. Berry said the Department does have that data. Ms. Neal asked if there has been a trend away from electives. Ms. Berry responded that she is not aware of a trend away from electives. She said she has seen a balance of students being able to take their academic work and also pursuing the electives they are interested in. The motion carried 8-1, with Ms. Neal voting no.

D. Approval of the Hanover University Teacher Preparation Program Proposal⁴

- Dr. Freitas moved to approve the Hanover Teacher Preparation Program and Mr. Elsener seconded the motion. The motion carried 9-0.

E. Initiate Rulemaking of Standards and Benchmarks for Teacher Prep Programs (House Enrolled Act 1388)⁵

- Scott Bogan, Coordinator of Educator Preparation at the Department, addressed the Board. Mr. Bogan stated that there has been collaboration in the development of standards. He said the Department is required to draft the standards and the Board's role is to engage in rulemaking regarding said standards. Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, Mr. Bogan said there is a high correlation between these and national standards. If Congress passes a bill, the Department will work to align the standards, he said. Mr. Bogan also informed the Board that these standards are based on CAEP standards so that Indiana can be a CAEP recognized state. Mr. Bogan also stated that the standards have been distributed for comments and have not received significant concerns.
- Superintendent Ritz moved to initiate rulemaking of standards and benchmarks for teacher prep programs and B.J. Watts seconded the motion. The Board voted 9-0 to carry the motion.

⁴ Materials can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Hanover_merged_document_3.pdf.

⁵ A memo can be found at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE_rule_making_merged_document_4.pdf.

*B. Final Adoption of A-F Rule and Summary of Public Comment*⁶

- Superintendent Ritz commented that the Department had additional changes they wanted to make. She said the Department is in charge of implementing the rule, and although a large list of changes had been sent to the Board, she wanted to walk through some she felt were necessary changes for interpretation of the rule. Superintendent Ritz also stated that she was very happy with the collaboration that has occurred in creating this rule.
- Superintendent Ritz invited Steve Baker to the podium who signed up for public comment on this issue. He stated that educators greatly appreciated being part of the process of creating this rule. He stated that he wanted to speak about the 10-12 improvement item of the rule. He said in the original plan it was a .5 point bonus. He said assigning value to this is important to prevent waivers and promote college and career readiness. He stated that under the new rule the bonus is not as clear. He said the more points that can be added to this part of the rule is a win for everyone. Superintendent Ritz stated that the Department agreed and had the same concern.
- Superintendent Ritz stated that the Board would recess and then go through the recommended changes.

-- RECESS --

- Cynthia Roach, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the Board, addressed the Board. Ms. Roach walked the Board through changes made to the rule as a result of public comment. She said the changes included: 1) the federal requirement that there be a provision addressing achievement gaps, 2) weighting growth and performance at 50/50, 3) that schools too small to receive an accountability category shall not have consequences imposed, and 4) atypical school options to be provided so that it will be very rare that atypical schools will exist under this rule.
- Ms. Roach also showed the Board what the data looked like under the new model. She clarified that under the old rule, failure to close the achievement gaps would be a drop to a C, it now means a drop to a B under the new rule. Further, Ms. Roach said any improvement in growth or achievement will allow schools to meet this requirement. She also stated that an A could still be achieved regardless of

⁶ Materials from Board staff can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/A-F_merged_document_5.pdf. All public comments were sent to Board members for individual review as well.

achievement gaps being closed if annual measurable objectives are met for each subgroup. Additionally, she explained that there will not be many small schools under the new rule, but they will not be punished for that fact.

- Ms. Roach then summarized public comments received. She noted that the public wanted more weight given to growth, and that the public expressed this in a variety of ways.
- Superintendent Ritz then informed the Board that the Department contracted with Molly Chamberlain, and that many of the recommendations before the Board are at her recommendation.
- Dr. Oliver commented that he has not seen the edits Superintendent Ritz was referring to until just now. He stated that the Board received an email at 10:17 p.m. on the Tuesday before this Thursday meeting. He said he called Ms. Chamberlain and she was unable to verify that the edits she recommended were the ones the Board was going to see because she could not open the documents, as he couldn't. Dr. Oliver expressed concern going down a path with information just received.
- Dr. Oliver moved that the Board approve the Final Rule Language in the Board materials and proceed forward with what was published to the public. Superintendent Ritz said they will take a motion after discussion. Dr. Oliver responded that he felt it was unfair that these changes were not made available to the public until this late hour.
- Dr. Oliver added that Ms. Chamberlain told him the changes were not substantive and that she would not be at the meeting today.
- Ms. O'Brien asked what changes could legally be made at this meeting. John Snethen, General Counsel to the Board, responded that changes can only be made that are logically related to public comment. Mr. Snethen advised against voting on those types of changes at this meeting. He said Board staff had been talking to the Department for months, but that these particular changes did not come up until recently.
- Superintendent Ritz said it was not the Department's intent to propose new things, but changes for clarification. Mr. Elsener asked about passing a rule today and then amending later and Mr. Snethen said there are legal procedures for that. Upon inquiry by Mr. Elsener, Mr. Snethen stated that the process to create this rule had been ongoing for two years, starting with the A-F Panel. Mr. Snethen said Board staff determined some of the changes the Department wants are substantive. Mr. Snethen also stated that further substantive changes could be made to the rule through the rulemaking process. Mr. Snethen expressed concern that if too many

changes are made the Attorney General may deem some of them substantive and reject the rule. Mr. Snethen stressed the importance of meeting the deadline for this rule so the field has sufficient notice.

- Dr. Freitas stated that information was received from the Department late yesterday. He expressed concerns about the lack of transparency of voting on the Department changes at this meeting. Mr. Snethen added that Board staff received 30 changes in less than 24 hours and was not comfortable recommending those changes be made because there has not been enough time to assimilate them.
- Dr. Freitas moved to adopt the Final Rule provided in the Board materials on April 29th. Superintendent stated that she felt the Department changes should be made. Ms. O'Brien said discussing additional changes would be confusing to the public.
- Mr. Hendry asked if the Department's proposed changes are linked to public comment, and Mr. Snethen responded that there has not been time to review that. Mr. Hendry then asked if Department counsel has an opinion on that question. Michael Moore, Director of Legal Affairs for the Department, addressed the Board. He stated that there must be a logical outgrowth from public comment. Mr. Moore said Mr. Baker's comment at the meeting today could be considered, as well as comments from the Economic Development Corporation, to make changes to the rule.
- Mr. Moore said every change does not have to be tied to a specific comment; he said it should be looked at in the totality. Mr. Hendry expressed concern about the Board's legal exposure if further changes are made today. He said he would be happy to hear out the Department, but that today is probably not best. Mr. Moore said the only exposure the Board would have would be the Attorney General rejecting portions of the rule. Mr. Moore said amending the rule would take a year. He went on to say that the Board may not have the authority to amend the rule later.
- Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, addressed the Board. She stated that the draft received at this meeting was the same as that received Tuesday night. Dr. Oliver responded that he couldn't open the file. Ms. Shockey said that Mr. Moore sent out a file immediately following that email that could be opened. Mr. Albert said he was able to open the second file. Ms. Shockey said Board staff had the changes before materials went out and they chose not to share them with the Board.
- Mr. Hendry said he had concerns about the changes at the last minute. Ms. Shockey said the changes are not substantial. Ms. Roach clarified that the changes sent late

Tuesday were not all changes Board staff had seen before. She said there were five seen before and that Board staff chose not to include. She said all of the rest were new and some were substantive. Ms. Roach said she was not able to link the substantive changes back to public comment. Superintendent Ritz stated that the conversation was not finished.

- Ms. Neal stated that bringing changes at the last minute is the definition of dysfunction. She said the meeting has been derailed by last minute changes. She said she wanted to speak about big picture concerns.
- Dr. Oliver moved to approve the Final Rule sent out with the materials and Mr. Elsener seconded the motion. Mr. Elsener said the consequence of error is on the side of delay. He said the rule can be amended and clarified in the future if needed. Mr. Elsener said there is a pattern of this sort of behavior where things go out late by the Department. He stated that this behavior was not professional, and was not organized.
- Robert Guffin, Executive Director for the Board, stated that he is confident the rule is a good rule, and that further changes can be made if needed at a later time. Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, Mr. Guffin stated that the original rule had a weighting of 60% growth and 40% proficiency, but that was changed to 50/50 pursuant to public comment.
- Dr. Freitas moved to revert back to the 60/40 weighting, and Mr. Watts seconded the motion. Mr. Watts said he felt 60/40 gives a truer picture of what's happening in the school. Ms. Roach said the public supported the 50/50 weighting and that when she ran the numbers there was not a huge difference. Mr. Elsener stated that he liked the fact that the 50/50 weighting would give a little more incentive to bring students up; he also said the weighting could be changed later at some point. Dr. Oliver said he now supports 50/50 as well after attending two of the public hearings. Mr. Watts commented that school grades should not be confused with teacher grades and the motivation for teachers to, or not to, teach in high poverty schools.
- Mr. Hendry said it's unfortunate that the two year collaborative process has been clouded by the late changes recommended by the Department today. He stated that it's important to remember that both staffs and the Board are working together to try and make sure an important rule is correct and fair. The motion to revert back to a 60/40 split between proficiency and growth, respectively, failed 2-7. Dr. Freitas and B.J. Watts voted in favor of the motion.
- Mr. Albert asked about addressing the amendments at a later date. Mr. Snethen asked Brian Murphy, Assistant General Counsel to the Board, to address the Board

further. Kirstie Anderson, a Staff Attorney at the Department, came to the microphone and said technical changes can be made through the Legislative Services Agency (“LSA”). Mr. Murphy informed the Board that once the rule has been approved by the Attorney General and signed by the Governor, technical changes can be made through a process called agency corrections. He stated this involves filing a document directly with LSA and bypasses the full rulemaking process.

- Mr. Murphy said Board staff was put in a tough spot because of late notice. He stated that staff tried its best to process these changes; he said Board staff rejected the substantive changes and made the technical changes that Board staff agreed with. He said staff had to weigh making these changes against delay of the rule.
- Upon inquiry regarding substantive amendments, Mr. Murphy stated that he disagreed with Mr. Moore about the Board being able to make substantive changes based on comments made at this meeting. He said the statutory section talks about a public comment period within which people may make comments to be considered by the Board. Otherwise, he said, the period could essentially be never-ending and the rule would be delayed.
- Further, Mr. Murphy said amendments to the rule through the promulgation process would be streamlined because it deals with a portion of the rule, and not an entirely new rule. Mr. Murphy also pointed out that Department did not link any of their substantive suggested changes to any of the numbered public comments.
- Dr. Walker said looking at the improvement from grade 10-12 is important, as Mr. Baker stated, and could be done as an amendment to the rule down the line.
- Upon inquiry by Ms. Neal, Dr. Walker responded that there is only one test that is part of the calculation for elementary and middle schools. She then explained the multiple measures part of the rule, which are primarily used at the high school level. She said the multiple measures portion of the rule is open so that additional multiple measures could be added later for the lower grades and also high school.
- Ms. Neal expressed concern about the fact that the new assessment would be used in a high stakes system as the only test component of the score for elementary and middle school. Dr. Walker responded that Indiana is using the current A-F rule with the ISTEP assessment that is being given right now. She said the new model won’t be used until the spring 2016 test is given. Dr. Walker also mentioned that equipercentile concordance mapping can be used when transitioning to a new test. Ms. Roach stated that this year both models will be run side by side so schools will have an idea of how scores will look going forward. Dr. Walker added that there will be validity studies to ensure the test is valid and reliable.

- Ms. Neal stated that she hoped more multiple measures will be looked at going forward, like for civic literacy. Dr. Walker said as other multiple measures become available they can be added.
- Mr. Elsener emphasized that the ISTEP is a test that measures essential skills. He stated that it is very important for students' futures. He said the questions were mulled over by teachers, and are very connected to standards we care deeply about.
- The Board voted to approve the Final A-F Rule, as distributed with the Board materials on April 29th, by a vote of 8-1; Ms. Neal voted no. Superintendent Ritz stated that she appreciated the dialogue concerning this important issue. The Board took a short recess.

-- RECESS --

-- Mr. Elsener left the meeting --

IX. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES (this best practices discussion was moved up from Discussion Item D at the beginning of the meeting)⁷

- Ashley Cowger, Chief of Staff for the Board, introduced Mr. Steve Baker, from Bluffton High School, Ms. Kathy Sagorsky, from Center Grove Community Schools, Mr. Todd Whitlock, from Standard For Success (“SFS”), and Ms. Tammy Brothers, from Standard For Success to present regarding best practices in teacher evaluation. Mr. Whitlock explained the online teacher evaluation system SFS developed. He stated that the system provides: 1) transparency, 2) customization, 3) stakeholder input on development, 4) customer service, and 5) a user-friendly design.
- Ms. Sagorsky informed the Board that she works in professional development and educator training. She stated that her district has had great success using SFS. She said the system is customizable for local districts and that everything is in one place. Ms. Sagorsky also mentioned that teachers like the system very much. She also commented about the user-friendliness and value of the analytics. She showed the Board some examples of how the system works online.

⁷ The presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SFS-best_practice_v4.pdf.

- Mr. Baker spoke next. He stated that SFS allows him to provide timely and effective support and professional development because the system produces specific data. He stated that the system has also helped dialogue with teachers.
- Mr. Whitlock said a system is needed to provide targeted professional development. He said data has been collected, and now a formal process is needed to implement. He stated that partners have been brought in to help build that into the system.
- Mr. Watts said his school uses this system and that he likes it because there are no surprises. He stated that there is always room for improvement, and this system highlights those areas so teachers can continue to improve. Mr. Watts stated that all teachers can improve, including highly effective teachers.
- Dr. Freitas said the notion of individualized professional development is critical. He said hopefully the days of large group professional development are over. He said this system reinforces continuous improvement. Dr. Freitas said the analytics could be shared on a statewide level to assist the Board in setting policy. He asked if the system will provide inter-rater data statewide. Mr. Whitlock said the information can be collected, but they must be sure common denominators are flagged. Dr. Freitas also said he liked the local flexibility aspect of the system. He continued that the Board could identify a set of criteria that is essential, which schools could then adopt into their rubrics.
- Dr. Freitas asked Board staff to develop and bring back to the Board more specific recommendations and more specific information like costs.
- Mr. Albert commented that he respected this system because it builds from the teachers up. He said this will greatly help buy-in. Ms. O'Brien added that her schools have been utilizing this system and that from her perspective the system is interactive from the start, which is an improvement over how evaluation has been done in the past.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS (legislative update was moved to the end of discussion)

B. Assessment Update

- Superintendent Ritz reiterated that Ms. Whicker inquired about whether the Board should extend the window for paper/pencil. Dr. Walker responded that the Department had already given approval for those sites who moved to paper recently until May 15, 2015.

- Ms. O'Brien explained the issue is that the initial group, who was already paper/pencil, had been holding off pending approval of the second group switching to paper/pencil. She said within Ms. Whicker's school, the understanding was that half of the school had until May 8, and then the group that petitioned and ended up being allowed to use paper/pencil had until May 15. Dr. Walker responded that part of it is that the Board established a number of days; she said schools shouldn't need beyond the number of days established.
- Ms. O'Brien moved to extend the window to May 15, 2015 for all and Mr. Albert seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0. Dr. Walker said the Department would be happy to share this information with schools.
- Dr. Walker addressed the Board concerning assessment issues. She explained that there were some sites that did not have the capacity to test online so the Department evaluated that information in December. She continued that 7.6% of the sites across the state were paper/pencil. She stated that some sites began to experience problems when administering the practice test. She said the Department worked with the sites to remedy that situation, and if the problems could not be fixed they were given the option to switch to paper/pencil. She said some sites experienced problems with the screen reader. She said the Department was given two options: 1) order paper/pencil for that student, or 2) utilization of read aloud guidance created by the Department.
- Upon inquiry by Ms. Neal, Dr. Walker stated that students with accommodations that require a paper/pencil test as part of their IEP would be one example of a situation where an automatic paper/pencil would be granted. Upon further inquiry by Ms. Neal, Dr. Walker said in 2012 the Board voted to require online testing for all sites that had capacity and connectivity, with the exception of some students with disabilities. She explained that pedagogy is not one of those pieces.
- Ms. O'Brien asked what percentage of schools asked to use paper/pencil versus the amount that were approved. Dr. Walker responded that the Department didn't deny any of those, but waited until they had data on the final test delivery client. Ms. O'Brien then asked what percentage of schools were using both paper/pencil and online; Dr. Walker stated that most of the schools doing that are falling into the 6%.
- Dr. Walker moved on to say 67.4% of the sites have all online testing. Dr. Freitas asked if, among the 67.4%, there are schools that fall back to paper/pencil. Dr. Walker responded that they've already included those schools in the 19% group of schools in the handout. Dr. Freitas said he hoped to see the 67.4% number increase

going forward. Dr. Walker said a new platform has been used causing that number to drop, and also the Department is seeking more funding to help as well.

- Mr. Albert commended the IT departments and coordinators across the state in the administration of the test.
- Ms. O'Brien commented that one of the concerns she is hearing from the field is that some of the math questions are testing over standards that are past what is expected within that grade level. Dr. Walker responded that this was covered with test coordinators in a required training. She stated that it relates to how the Department is building the vertical scale. Dr. Walker said she will be happy to send out a reminder in the DOE Dialogue. She said the items Ms. O'Brien was referring to involve items the students have not been tested on but are bridged to the next grade level to build the vertical scale. She said it's a way to gather data for the vertical scale.
- Ms. O'Brien expressed concerns about student stamina with these items. Dr. Walker said there are only five items – two above grade and three below, or vice-versa. Dr. Walker said the Department didn't want students to be taxed beyond what they can handle.
- Ms. O'Brien asked about the stark difference between the paper/pencil and the online test administrations. She said she is hearing concerns, for example, students taking the paper/pencil had a certain number of choices, whereas students taking the online had an infinite number of open-ended responses with no ability to guess or eliminate choices. Dr. Walker responded that this was also covered in the trainings. She said they look at the difficulty of each item once they get the student performance statistics. She said they then lay out those items on an S curve so they can determine the level of difficulty of the test. She stated that the items of every student's test must match exactly on the S curve.
- Ms. O'Brien said she is concerned about the student experience, especially in the younger grades. Dr. Walker said all of the items on the online test are not open. She explained that most of items are multiple choice or a selection response. She said the level of difficulty of every item is determined in the beginning by teachers.
- Ms. Neal added that there is a different cognitive experience for online versus paper/pencil. She said she hopes the Board can take another look at the online test requirement or have further discussions about the issue in the future.
- Mr. Watts asked if there would be a way to move the scale questions to the end of the test. Dr. Walker responded that many of them do appear at the end, but it depends on the form.

- Dr. Walker moved on to discuss the timeline for the next assessment, and the fact that it has been pushed out due to the need to get the statistics ready for standard setting, which will occur in September. Dr. Walker asked the Board to consider adding a Board meeting to be able to address cut score setting sooner to get results quicker in 2015.
- Superintendent Ritz explained that she is very cognizant about getting things out before the end of the 2015 school year. She recommended having a second meeting in September in order to get the cut scores done, since the meeting in September is early and it can't be done by that meeting, or moving the September meeting back. She explained this will move up the rescore request window so everything can be finished more quickly. Superintendent Ritz stated that is something to consider to vote on at a later Board meeting.
- Dr. Oliver asked if this will cause legal issues regarding letter grades and Dr. Walker said the U.S. Department expects delays in grades in cut score setting years.
- Superintendent Ritz handed out a draft document that explained the budget line item for remediation testing. She stated that a test will not be developed through CTB. She explained that parameters would be set for how the formative assessment systems might look like at the local level.
- Superintendent Ritz continued that it will be open to any school in Indiana and the Department wants to have it ready before the school year. She said the Department will be giving a per pupil amount to local districts so they can use approved assessments at the local level; the state will not be contracting for the development of a state-level assessment, she said. Superintendent Ritz added that the Department will be having meetings regarding offering state rates for assessments.
- Dr. Walker moved on to inform the Board that only a sample of students will be tested on the vertically scaled items for grades 8 to 9 to 10. Dr. Walker added that this will occur in the spring of 2016. Dr. Freitas asked how the sample was selected, and Dr. Walker responded that they choose students who represent a cross section of all students, and that they work with the vendor to carry this out. She also said it's a required book to be administered as part of the assessment program, so the chosen students must take the items as part of the test. Upon further inquiry by Dr. Freitas regarding the added length, Dr. Walker said they can make the test shorter by using more students in the sample or vice-versa.
- Dr. Walker commented that teachers will be recruited this summer for ECA cut score setting (Algebra I and English 10), to get started on the September cut score setting,

for the NCSC assessment cut scores (the assessment that replaced ISTAR), and to work on the Grade 10 assessment.

- Ms. O'Brien asked if there will be a separate cut score for paper/pencil versus online, and Dr. Walker responded no because of the S curve. Ms. Neal asked about Senate Bill 566. She said there was nothing in the bill that prevented the Board from using common core in the development of the assessment and asked for clarification on this issue. Dr. Walker explained that items can come from a variety of sources if they align to state standards.
- Dr. Walker spoke next about testing windows for the next two years. She said they will be working with the vendor to get these windows, and that Board staff will be involved in the process. Dr. Walker asked for any input the Board wanted to give at this point. Mr. Albert recommended looking at school calendars to see what's best for students.

C. SBOE Staff Update

- Mr. Guffin informed the Board that IDOA denied the appeal filed by Data Recognition Corporation. IDOA said at this time it was appropriate for the Department to begin contract negotiations with Pearson.

D. Strategic Planning Committee Update

- There was no update.

A. Legislative Update from Board Staff

- James Betley, Technical Advisor to the Board, spoke briefly on this issue. He provided a written document outlining the legislative changes made at the last legislative session. Mr. Betley stated he would be available for questions at this meeting and going forward. He spoke about the Board's obligation to approve all data reported to the state by local districts; Superintendent Ritz stated that the Department has already done an analysis of all the data collection that they have. Mr. Betley said a committee will need to be convened to bring the recommendations regarding data reporting to the Board to approve after August 1, 2015.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

- Board operations not discussed.

Upon motion and a second the Board moved 8-0 to adjourn.