



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

September 3, 2014
12:30 P.M.

Ivy Tech - Fort Wayne
Student Life Conference Room 121
3701 Dean Dr.
Fort Wayne, IN 46835

Board Members Physically Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (chair), Mr. Troy Albert, Mr. Dan Elsener (Secretary), Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Andrea Neal, Dr. Brad Oliver, and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Mr. Tony Walker and Mr. B.J. Watts attended by phone.

Board Members Absent: Ms. Sarah O'Brien.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and roll was called. The roll reflected all members present except Ms. O'Brien, Mr. Walker, and Mr. Watts. Mr. Watts joined the meeting by phone right after the call to order, and Mr. Walker joined the meeting by phone during discussion of the first action item. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Neal moved that the discussion item B. Lead Partner Update – TNTP and IPS, be moved up in the agenda and changed to an action item. The Chair and three Board members agreed, and the agenda was then approved.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After making a few minor changes and an addition, the Board voted 10-0 to approve minutes for the August 6, 2014 meeting.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

Superintendent Ritz stated that schools are off to a great start this year. She said Indiana has seen an increase in student scores. Superintendent Ritz also said the Hoosier Family of Readers had a successful summer and that schools are taking advantage of electronic books. Further, Superintendent Ritz stated she was excited that Indiana had received its No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) waiver without conditions for the coming year.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

- Mr. Hendry expressed appreciation for Ivy Tech at Fort Wayne for accommodating the Board and hosting this meeting. Mr. Elsener echoed Mr. Hendry’s comments. He then commented on a letter sent to the Governor asking for a pause on accountability for the coming year. Mr. Elsener encouraged parents, educators, parents, communities, and superintendents to keep the standards high. He said experts have been hired to ensure the tests are administered in a professional and accurate way. He then encouraged not backing off accountability for the benefit of the students and the future of the state. Mr. Elsener concluded by saying he believes in Indiana teachers and that they can make it happen.
- Ms. Whicker commented that she appreciated having the meeting in Fort Wayne and the visit to her school beforehand.
- Dr. Oliver thanked Ms. Whicker for the tour of her school. He also thanked Department staff in the approval of the waiver extension. He stated he appreciated the support from lawmakers and recommended having a larger conversation with the legislature around NCLB to figure out how to allow states to have more autonomy in the use of federal resources. Dr. Oliver concluded by stating that more local autonomy results in better student outcomes. Superintendent Ritz stated the federal liaisons at the Department would be happy to take that lead. She went on to say that the Department has already expressed the need to have NCLB reauthorized and that they have already had meetings with federal groups regarding that issue.
- Ms. Neal stated she saw the NCLB waiver as what is going wrong with this country. She stated that Arne Duncan is micro-managing the educational policies of the states. Ms. Neal cited a Vanderbilt law review article written by Professor Derek

Black, which stated that the waiver process is unconstitutional. Ms. Neal pointed out that a suit has been filed by Louisiana Governor Jindal on this basis.

VI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT (public comment on specific agenda items were taken at the time each item was before the Board.)

- John O’Neal from the Indiana State Teachers Association (“ISTA”) was the only person who signed up for general public comment. Mr. O’Neal commented that the pressure on teachers is unprecedented given the changes in education policies in Indiana. He asked the Board to consider suspending accountability, because holding schools accountable without a baseline score is not fair.
- Mr. Hendry responded that accountability is important and that it’s relied upon by families to make good decisions. He said the Board will find a way to make sure no one is punished as a result of the new policies in place.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. School Technology Advancement Account applications; B. Common School Construction and Technology loans

The Board voted to approve both items on the consent agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION

- B. Lead Partner update - TNTP and IPS (moved up in the agenda and changed from a discussion item to a discussion and action item)
- Superintendent Ritz invited representatives from TNTP and IPS to the podium. Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Superintendent of IPS, stated that they had received word the morning of this meeting that TNTP was withdrawing their partnership as a lead partner with IPS. Mr. Ferebee requested the opportunity for IPS to review other lead partners who responded to the RFP to initiate a new lead partner relationship for the two schools in question. Ian Scott, from TNTP, responded that they did not arrive at this proposal lightly. He stated they arrived at this point because of a disagreement over who leads instruction. Mr. Scott went on to state that IPS’s vision regarding instruction is not what the Board initially put into place.

- Dr. Oliver asked why TNTP didn't come to the Board first. Mr. Scott responded that there must be a close alignment for the relationship to work, and that it is TNTP's strong request to withdraw. He stated ending the relationship now will prevent more problems in the future. Ms. Neal pointed out that TNTP's expertise is in instruction, and that that is why the Board selected them as the lead partner in the first place. Mr. Ferebee stated that IPS wants to collaborate with TNTP, and wants to shift instruction to IPS. If that's not possible, he said another lead partner that is more aligned with IPS's vision would be better.

-- Mr. Walker joined the meeting by phone --

- Robert Guffin, Executive Director of the Board, referred the Board to slides six and seven of the IPS presentation that showed IPS's intention to lead instruction; he stated that was not the will of the Board in selecting TNTP as a lead partner. Mr. Guffin stated it was supposed to be collaborative with TNTP leading instruction. Dr. Freitas stated this situation is unfair to the schools and students.
- Mr. Elsener asked if these differences are irreconcilable, given timing with the school year and the potential negative impact this could have on students. Dr. Ferebee stated he would like to proceed with the plan as outlined in the presentation. Mr. Elsener asked for Board staff, IPS, TNTP, and the Department to get together and make this work. Mr. Hendry expressed agreement with Mr. Elsener.
- Superintendent Ritz stated she believed the issue of who leads instruction was supposed to be based on the needs assessment. Dr. Oliver clarified that the instruction from the Board was to have Board staff, the Department, and IPS to work together from the needs assessment to select a vendor. Dr. Oliver said the lead partner should be leading. Mr. Scott stated that IPS has a clear vision to lead instruction, and that he doesn't believe it will work out. Dr. Ferebee added that IPS is not comfortable with TNTP's instructional model. He said if the Board wants the lead partner to lead instruction, then they would like another lead partner.
- Mr. Walker stated he voted against the plan in the first place and that this situation is one of the reasons. He said the Board's action should be rescinded. Mr. Walker then said that at a minimum the Board should vote to define the scope of work and relationship. Ms. Neal expressed the importance of using TNTP for instruction given their reputation. Ms. Whicker pointed out that IPS has been given a lot of leeway already. She went on to say it's the Board's responsibility to ensure the intervention works. Ms. Whicker expressed concern over the precedent set by allowing IPS to

have so much leeway. Mr. Watts said it was not his intent, nor the Board's, to allow IPS to lead instruction. Mr. Watts said the co-lead partnership arrangement needs to be reviewed at this point. Mr. Elsener said he hopes the disagreement is not so wide apart that things can't be worked out at such a late time. He asked that it be worked out.

- Upon request by Mr. Hendry, Mr. Guffin stated his recommendation is to establish TNTP as a lead partner and get back to the table to try and fix the relationship. He stated that is the best thing for the students. Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, agreed that she would like to see the partnership continue.
- Dr. Oliver asked TNTP if the situation could be resolved if the Board took action today to establish them as the lead. Mr. Scott responded that there are two parties here that are not aligned, and that it would still not be a good thing for kids. He stated it's disconnected from a broader district vision.
- Ms. Neal asked why IPS can't pursue its vision in the other schools in the district, which can then be compared with TNTP's at a later time. She stated that the Board wants these two schools to have a different approach so the Board can review the data later. Ms. Neal said it's important that TNTP take the lead on instruction in the two schools at issue. Mr. Scott iterated that they would not want to continue the relationship even if the Board gave TNTP more authority. Dr. Freitas recommended moving forward to pick another lead partner. Mr. Albert commented that there must be good relationship between the parties for this to work. He said without buy-in there can't be positive changes.
- Superintendent Ritz stated the only course of action is to review the RFP responses and then come back at the next meeting to select another lead partner. Superintendent Ritz made a motion to have the Department review the RFP responses and bring a lead partner recommendation to the Board at the next meeting; Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Mr. Elsener offered an amendment to the motion to allow Board staff to take the lead in this process, while working with IPS and the Department. The motion to amend Superintendent Ritz's motion was not seconded. The Board voted on Superintendent Ritz's original motion, and it carried by a vote of 8-2.

A. *Approval of final rule language for REPA III*

- There were several speakers who signed up for public comment regarding this topic. The first speaker was Phyllis Bush from the Northeast Indiana Friends of Public

- Education (“NIFPC”). Ms. Bush stated that REPA III is a solution in search for a problem. She said there are already alternative ways people can transition into teaching. Ms. Bush expressed concern over the original 6-5 vote; stating that the educators on the Board objected. Lastly, she commented on the letter sent to the Governor regarding accountability. Ms. Bush said sometimes we focus on numbers too much, rather than things like the hopes and dreams of parents and kids.
- Terry Springer, from NIFPC, expressed concern about REPA III making it much easier to get into to teaching. She stated teachers should have more education rather than less. Ms. Springer stated that education classes and proving oneself in the classroom are important requirements for teachers.
 - John O’Neal, from ISTA, was the next speaker. Mr. O’Neal stated that ISTA is against the career specialist language in REPA III. He stated this is another attempt to dilute the teaching profession. Mr. O’Neal said removing the pedagogy requirements would be detrimental. He also said there are other alternative pathways to teaching.
 - Janet Gibson, from NIFPC, commented that weakening the standards for educators will weaken the quality of education in Indiana. She stated teachers who are well prepared are the best role models for our students.
 - Sandra Moliere, a former educator, had the floor next. Ms. Moliere said teacher training gives teachers instructional practice, which is different than content knowledge, and is important for work in the classroom.
 - Laurie Mullin, the President of the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (“IACTE”). Ms. Mullin stated that the IACTE recommends the following: 1) that REPA teaching standards guide the oversight of implementation; 2) that candidates be required to meet the same licensing requirements as others, and 3) that the approval process mirror the approval procedures stated in 511 IAC 13-1-1.
 - Superintendent Ritz asked if, pertaining to the Career Specialist Permit, candidates must take the pedagogy test. Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services, responded that candidates would not be required to take the pedagogy test. Superintendent Ritz also asked if candidates required to meet licensing approval according to 511 IAC 13-1-1. Dr. Michelle McKeown responded no to the last question. She explained that the reason behind this is a concern that effective principals who are also pedagogy providers would be deterred by the extra paperwork and lack of flexibility. Superintendent Ritz then asked if the permit complies with HEA1388. Ms. Regnier stated that HEA1388 deals with reporting requirements and that the Career Specialist Permit requires passing the content

area test, which is aligned to the standards. She said this meets the requirements of HEA1388.

- John Jacobson, Dean of Ball State University, had the floor next. He strongly recommended voting against REPA III. He encouraged the Board to look at the effect of REPA I. Mr. Jacobson said if the Board votes yes, he recommended that the Career Specialist Permit language be deleted. He stated that with the other pathways there are no teacher shortages in Indiana. Mr. Jacobson said similar flexibility did not result in better candidates in Texas. He concluded by saying that anything less lowers teaching standards in Indiana.
- Shawn Sriver, from Ball State University, spoke after Mr. Jacobson. He began by expressing concern for the Career Specialist Permit. He stated there are two additional problems in the rule. The first, he said, is the Accomplished Practitioner's License in the REPA III. Mr. Sriver said people can qualify with two years of teaching experience. He expressed concern over the lack of additional requirements. He stated the rule should require all of the listed requirements in the rule (a master's degree, graduate course work, or a National Board Certification) instead of allowing a candidate to obtain the license by complying with one requirement from the list. Ms. Regnier responded that the requirements are supposed to be 2 years of experience and then one of the listed requirements; she explained it was a scrivener's error in the rule that can be corrected. Mr. Sriver then moved on the Emergency Permit. He pointed out three issues: 1) language was removed indicating that a person holding an Emergency Permit be required to complete six semester hours per year; 2) language was removed that required documentation from a licensing advisor where the program is completed and that applicants need to be in an approved program (approved by that advisor); and 3) the cap on the number of times the Emergency Permit can be renewed has been removed.
- Ms. Regnier stated the intent is the same but the way the language is expressed is different. She stated that in order for a person to renew an Emergency License for successive years, an individual must demonstrate progress of completion towards an approved program; she said that is not written in the same way as saying someone must have six semester hours every year, but the intent remains. Ms. Regnier explained that the two year cap was removed so that people who can't get the coursework completed through no fault of their own could finish. This allows for more flexibility but requires proof of progress, she said. Ms. Regnier said this change was in the proposed version as well; this was not a change between the proposed version and the version before the Board.

- Rick Matysak, from American Federation of Teachers in Indiana, commented that AFT is against REPA III. He said the rule does not mention a minimum number of credit hours in the content area for the Career Specialist Permit. He also said the rule doesn't mention what courses are needed. Mr. Matysak stated there are already enough pathways to becoming a teacher. He stated Indiana doesn't want people teaching until they can find a job in their field.
- Michelle Bandor, from NIFPE, stated that she didn't feel like these rules were even close to being ready to go. She stated these rules are antithetical to what we expect from our students in Indiana. She stated the rules are less rigorous.
- Anne Duff, from NIFPE, was the last person who signed up for public comment but she had to leave the meeting before her name was called.
- Dr. Oliver made a motion to strike 511 IAC 16-4-6 and 16-4-7, the Career Specialist Permit language, from the rule. Superintendent Ritz seconded the motion. Dr. Oliver stated he is a big believer in free market, and that it's important to find ways for non-educators to have pathways to become teachers. He stated he is also supportive of the idea that it is possible to have non-college, non-university programs that are quality programs, if the groundwork is laid for it. Dr. Oliver stated his concern was that the language in REPA as it exists right now, in his opinion, does not serve those purposes. Dr. Oliver stated that just like the Board wants things like A-F to mean something, the Board wants teacher licensing to mean something. He stated there is no requirement of a pedagogical assessment. He went on to state that there is nothing in the language that addresses the issue of how the Board would approve the pedagogy provider, yet there is other language that allows for a principal to potentially provide that pedagogy training. Dr. Oliver said it only requires 40 growth points to renew every two years. Lastly, Dr. Oliver said his biggest concern is that we now have a regulation that is being imposed on pre-service programs to demonstrate that they are producing quality graduates out of their preparation programs, but no one in this alternative route would be required to provide similar data.
- Dr. Freitas stated he believed the rule was important to empower schools to hire good teachers. Mr. Elsener stated he has confident in Indiana's educators will use this option intelligently and carefully. Dr. McKeown also clarified that teacher evaluation rules apply to Career Specialist Permit.
- The Board voted on Dr. Oliver's motion to delete the Career Specialist Permit language in 511 IAC 16-4-6 and 16-4-7; the motion was voted down 7-3. Mr. Albert, Dr. Oliver and Superintendent Ritz voted yes. The Board then voted to approve the

REPA III rule as written. Dr. McKeown clarified that the vote should include the language regarding the Accomplished Practitioner’s License to fix the inadvertent error. Specifically, language in 511 IAC 14-4-1 that states that the applicant has a minimum of two (2) years of experience in the teaching, administrative, or student service area of the license. Dr. Freitas moved to approve as amended and upon a second the Board voted 7-3 to carry the motion and adopt the REPA III language as written and amended. Mr. Albert, Dr. Oliver and Superintendent Ritz voted no.

B. Categorical placement of 2012-13 A-F accountability for Flanner House

- Debbie Dailey, Director of Accountability, spoke about this agenda item. She stated that the Department has deemed the school grade for Flanner House is an inaccurate reflection of school performance. The Department recommended the Board change the grade assigned to Flanner House from an “A” to “no grade”. Upon motion to accept the Department’s recommendation and change the grade from an “A” to “no grade” and a second, the Board began discussion. Dr. Freitas asked about the consequences for the violation of public trust in general. He asked about the licenses of those who participate in matters that violate public trust. Dr. Michele Walker, Director of Student Assessment, responded that these matters are investigated at the local level. Dr. Walker stated that the Department then reviews the documentation and works with the school to come up with a corrective action plan. The Department legal counsel also looks at whether a license should be revoked based on what occurred, at the Superintendent’s direction. Dr. Walker said this sort of action is infrequent though.
- Dr. Freitas then asked about criminal penalties and Michael Moore, Director of Legal Affairs with the Department, responded that the matter had been referred to the Marion County Prosecutor’s Office. He went on to say that certain convictions result in license revocation. Mr. Elsener said he was surprised about a comment he heard that this is the sort of situation that results from high standards and high stakes testing. He stated that this the result of unethical behavior, not high standards or testing. Mr. Elsener also asked about if there is a light that goes off, so to speak, when there is a drastic change in test scores, like in this case. He said he was also concerned that this wasn’t addressed before school started. Dr. Walker responded that the Department can see dramatic increases and look for best practices. She said the Department will want to look into those. Dr. Walker said staff went to the school in the 2013-14 school year; she stated the Department was wrapping up an investigation in late 2013 when a second concern came to their attention about the

same school with a different security issue. Shortly thereafter, a short concern arose involving the same school. Dr. Walker clarified the concern began in spring 2013. Superintendent Ritz stated that fluctuations in performance in and of itself is not a reason to go in and investigate.

- The Board voted 10-0 to carry the motion adopting the Department’s recommendation to change the Flanner House grade to “no grade”. Mr. Hendry said he was happy the system worked and this came to light, even though he said the timing may not have been ideal. Mr. Hendry said this issue underscores the importance of accountability in charter schools. He commented that Mayor’s Office has developed a strong accountability system and the charter has been revoked.

C. Schools with atypical school configurations for 2013-14 A-F accountability

- Ms. Dailey spoke about this issue, referring the Board to a memo regarding atypical configurations. The memo included some background information regarding atypical school configurations not addressed in rule. She said the Department recommends the continued use of combined models, using the available combinations of elementary/middle school and high school models currently defined in rule. Ms. Dailey referred the Board to the portion of the memo that listed seven schools that the Department determined fell into this category this year. Ms. Dailey stated that in each of these, the recommended model is to use elementary/middle school or in one case the small elementary/middle school model combined with the 9-10 high school component to form a combined model for this year. The memo also listed the models used last year. Ms. Dailey also referenced a memo provided by CECI that contained some additional information.
- Upon request by Superintendent Ritz, Ms. Dailey explained a few discrepancies between the memos provided. First, she stated that Moment Lighthouse closed in the 2013-14 school year. Therefore, she said compass lists it as closed and no previous year data is displayed. She stated that the Department will proceed with calculating a grade for the 2013-14 school year. Secondly, with respect to Terre Haute SDA school, Ms. Dailey explained that it was noted as too few students/open less than 10 years. She said that is likely accurate and that once the Department runs the calculation this school may fall off and end up with no grade because of too few students. She recommended assigning the school that model and letting that school fall off as other schools do. Ms. Dailey also clarified the list is slightly different than last year’s list of atypical schools.

- Superintendent Ritz moved to adopt the recommendation of the Department and Mr. Albert seconded. Ms. Dailey that stated last year they used all available data for the schools, and that that is the recommendation for this year. Superintendent Ritz stated the Department will not be calculating grades based on data run through different models. Robert Guffin, Executive Director of the Board, inquired about whether the Department was going to run the models and let the Board select one, in accordance with the recently adopted regulation.
- Ms. Neal asked if the Christel House problem has been resolved by this recommendation. Namely, the issue of a charter school being penalized for a grade-level configuration that doesn't fit neatly within the rule language. Mr. Elsener stated his recollection is that the Board would decide the model that is the most fair to the school. Superintendent Ritz said all the models are before the Board, but that the Department does not intend to run each of the models for a grade calculation and present that information to the Board. Dr. Oliver expressed concern over the anomalies that can result at no fault of the school; he said he is concerned with these issues because they can cause grades to be skewed. Ms. Neal commented that data used a year in arrears can cause problems as well. Ms. Dailey said the ECA data used is current; the data used that is a year in arrears is the graduation data and college and career readiness information.
- Upon inquiry by Dr. Freitas, Ms. Dailey clarified the weighting is based on enrollment. Ms. Dailey also clarified that the difference between the combined model in the rule and the one being recommended here is that in the rule there are four data elements used, whereas here four data elements do not exist but all the available information would be used. Cynthia Roach, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for the CECL, commented regarding using the past year's data for this year's calculation. Ms. Dailey responded that statutory deadline is October 1 and the Department will not have the 2014 graduation rates for October 1. Mr. Elsener said growing schools with atypical configurations could be disproportionately affected by running the recommended model. Mr. Guffin recommended the elementary/middle school model be available to use when it's fair to do so; he recommended the Board select the model that is the most fair and appropriate for the individual school.
- The Board voted on the Superintendent's motion to use a combined model across the board for schools with atypical configurations. The motion was voted down 8-2; Mr. Albert and Superintendent Ritz voted yes. Dr. Oliver made a motion to apply the elementary/middle school model only to the seven schools that are the anomalies. Dr. Freitas seconded the motion. Mr. Elsener stated this model represents the

biggest body of work for these schools. Mr. Walker and Ms. Neal stated that they felt like they could do better regarding these schools. Ms. Neal stated that the Board should be able to look at all the models and select the one that is the most fair for the particular school. Superintendent Ritz stated that looking at each individual atypical school is unfair to other schools that are not on the atypical list this year. The Board voted down the motion 8-2; Mr. Elsener and Dr. Freitas voted yes.

- Superintendent Ritz moved to approve the use of combined models using available combinations of elementary/middle and high school models currently defined in rule. Superintendent Ritz stated the Board would discuss the appeals process during the next agenda item. Ms. Dailey and Superintendent Ritz clarified that there would only be one grade but that the schools would see both scores and the weighting. Mr. Elsener stated he wanted clarification that the Board will hear the appeals directly with the K8 the base model. Mr. Elsener moved to amend the motion to have the Department run both models, K8 and the combined, so the Board can have all the information necessary to be fair. Distinct from Mr. Elsener's motion to amend, Superintendent Ritz asked for roll call for her motion without amendment and Dr. Freitas seconded. The Board voted down the motion 5-4. Dr. Freitas, Ms. Neal and Dr. Oliver stated they voted no because they were unsure of the appeals process. Mr. Watts vote was not heard but he was on the phone. Superintendent Ritz tabled this issue and moved to the appeals process agenda item.

D. Appeals process criteria for 2013-14 A-F accountability

- Superintendent Ritz stated the appeals process does not include what was discussed today. She then outlined a memo provided to the Board with statutory information regarding appeals. One of the things discussed was the phrase "other significant issues" in the regulation as a basis for appeals. Dr. Freitas moved to adopt the recommended process from the Department with the amendment that atypical schools could appeal to the Board directly. Dr. Oliver seconded the motion. Dr. Freitas said the intent of the motion is to allow atypically configured schools to appeal for any reason they feel is warranted. James Betley, Interim General Counsel to the Board, stated it's within the Board's discretion to determine what "other significant issues" means. He stated that atypical schools could appeal under that language. Ms. Neal asked about schools that enter data incorrectly and then discovers that mistake late. Ms. Dailey stated that the Department does consider these but requires significant evidence to hear those appeals. Superintendent Ritz stated that schools are given chances to correct data mistakes within window

periods. Ms. Neal stated that schools sometimes don't find out until after the data is submitted. Ms. Dailey stated that schools sign off on the data submitted, and the Department typically stands firm to the data submitted. Ms. Roach stated that sometimes honest mistakes do happen after the data has been submitted to the Department.

- Superintendent moved to approve the criteria for appeals of school placement for A-F accountability as amended. Dr. Oliver seconded. Mr. Elsener clarified that the atypical schools can appeal the data used to calculate the grade as well as the grade itself; Superintendent Ritz and Ms. Dailey agreed. Mr. Elsener clarified further that schools could appeal the model used even if the data is correct if it doesn't fairly represent the school; Superintendent Ritz agreed. The Board voted 10-0 and the motion carried. Ms. Neal said her vote came with a caveat that schools should be able to correct data mistakes through the appeals process.

C. Schools with atypical school configurations for 2013-14 A-F accountability (revisited)

- Superintendent Ritz made a motion to calculate the grades using a combined model using all available data for elementary/middle and high school for the schools with atypical configurations, subject to appeal if so needed. Dr. Oliver seconded and the Board voted 9-1 to carry the motion; Mr. Walker voted no.

E. Testing window extension for ISTEP+ Spring 2015

- Dr. Walker presented on this issue. She referred to a memo previously sent to the Board. Dr. Walker began by stating that she would like to Board to vote to fix a typo with regard to the July ECA testing window, and changing from the 6th to the 20th. Superintendent Ritz moved to approve the changes in the testing windows, as well as fixing the typo, all reflected in the memo to the Board and the motion was seconded. The Board voted 10-0 to carry the motion.

F. Resolution regarding Parliamentary Authority

- Mr. Hendry moved to approve the language provided, adding to the Board operating procedures a section on parliamentary authority. Dr. Freitas seconded. Mr. Hendry explained that the meetings will be governed by Robert's Rules if the Board operating procedures don't cover a topic. Superintendent Ritz stated that the Attorney General's Office recommended against Robert's Rules when the Board began drafting its procedures. Mr. Hendry stated there are provisions like this in most governing rules. He said this provision was essentially taken from the National

Association of State Boards of Education. The Board voted to carry the motion 9-1; Superintendent Ritz voted no.

G. Selection of voting delegate for NASBE Delegate Assembly

- Mr. Hendry moved to have Dr. Freitas nominated as the voting delegate and Mr. Watts seconded. The Board voted 10-0 to select Dr. Freitas.

H. Nonfinal Order of Dismissal relating to Edison Learning's Request for a Determination of Noncompliance

- Mr. Walker moved to adopt the order of dismissal. The motion was seconded and the motion carried by a vote of 10-0. The Board took a recess.

-- RECESS --

IX. BEST PRACTICES – INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION – STUDENT SUCCESSES

This agenda item was not discussed.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS

F. Charter Authorizer Annual Reports and updates (this item was moved up in the agenda to accommodate representatives from the charter authorizers present at the meeting)

- Representatives from three Indiana charter school authorizers, Grace College, Trine University and Daleville School Corporation, presented to the Board. Each charter referenced reports previously provided to the Board and made available on the Board's website.
- During the question and answer period with Trine University, Dr. David Freitas asked for additional information regarding Duggar Union Community School Corporation, and its relationship with Indiana Cyber Charter School. Lindsay Omlor, Director of Charter Schools for Trine University, explained that the Duggar school facility was purchased by Indiana Cyber Charter School for \$1 under the unused facilities statute and is now a "learning community" for the charter school.
- During the question and answer period with Daleville School Corporation, Dr. Brad Oliver asked whether students can move at their own pace through the online

curriculum available through the virtual charter school. Daleville's representatives confirmed this was the case. Dr. Oliver also asked about how Daleville was accessing data on its charter school's performance. Daleville stated that it would be helpful if the state could provide access to authorizers, so that they can access the STN Data Center and the secure Learning Connection site in an "administrator" status for all charter schools overseen by that authorizer. This would enable authorizers to have a better idea about the performance of the charter schools they oversee on a real-time basis.

- Following the authorizer reports, Dr. Freitas asked the State Board to take a closer look at consistency across Indiana authorizers with respect to authorizing quality and authorizing practices, and asked for this topic to be a discussion item at a future Board meeting. Dr. Freitas noted that the state should ensure that charter schools are not engaging in "authorizer shopping." Dr. Freitas directed State Board staff to look further into this matter.

A. SBOE staff update

Mr. Guffin directed the Board's attention to the planning calendar and asked if there are any items that should be added so they can be addressed on a regular basis. He also officially introduced Cynthia Roach to the Board as the Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer for CECL. Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, spoke about the required modifications to the A-F school accountability model required under House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1427, enacted in 2013. Ms. Fiddian-Green reminded the Board that she has served as a member of the A-F School Accountability Review Panel since last year, and stated her concerns about the status of that work given the statutory timelines as well as the need to finalize changes to the rule in advance of the 2015-2016 school year to ensure time for professional development and training for schools on the new accountability model. Ms. Fiddian-Green reminded the Board that the state had entered into a contract with national growth expert Dr. Damian Betebenner, who was working on a report assessing the A-F panel's work and providing recommendations for transitioning to the new system. Ms. Fiddian-Green recommended that the Board and the A-F panel meet together at a special meeting on October 1, 2014 to discuss the panel's final recommendations to the Board. She reiterated the importance of the Board having sufficient time to work through the critical policy issues associated with any modifications to the A-F system, so that technical work can be completed by staff with the assistance of third-party experts,

and so that work can begin on the rule language in a timely manner. Mr. Daniel Elsener and Dr. Freitas both stated that they want to engage with the full panel to learn more about the panel's recommendations. After some discussion, the Board agreed to a special meeting with the panel, following the panel's September 22 meeting. Ms. Fiddian-Green also noted that Dr. Derek Briggs, another national expert on accountability, would also be available to advise the Board.

B. Lead Partner Update

Moved up in the agenda and changed to an action item.

C. School Turnaround Committee update

Mr. Elsener stated that the first turnaround committee meeting went very well. He then said that there is a moral obligation to intervene in schools that are chronically failing. Mr. Elsener stated the meeting was productive and roles and responsibilities were established. Lastly, he stated that the turnaround law has a good deterrent effect for schools that were about to require intervention.

-- Mr. Elsener left the meeting --

D. Strategic Planning Committee update

Mr. Hendry stated there is no update since the last meeting.

E. NCLB Waiver update

Board members congratulated the Department and thanked them for their work.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

A. 2015 Meeting Dates

Superintendent Ritz directed the Board's attended to two meeting dates, March 4 and May 6, which fall within the ISTEP window. She stated moving these dates might be appropriate.

X. DISCUSSION AND REPORTS (continued)**G. Assessment Update**

Dr. Walker stated that the RFP was released on August 27th and that a Q&A with vendors was coming up.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn and Board voted to adjourn the meeting.