



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

February 19, 2015

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room A
302 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
1:00 p.m. (EST)

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

Committee Members Absent: None.

I. Call to Order/ Meeting Minutes Approval

The Chair, Mr. Hendry, called the meeting to order. Mr. Hendry invited a motion to approve the minutes from the January 26, 2015 committee meeting, and upon a motion by Dr. Freitas and a second by Dr. Oliver, the minutes were approved 4-0.

II. Priority Initiatives: Stakeholder Engagement¹

Leroy Robinson, the Department's Director of Family and Community Engagement, addressed the committee. Mr. Robinson spoke about the timeline regarding the scientifically valid parent and community survey. He stated that the goal is to customize the survey from March to August, using stakeholder and committee feedback. Mr. Robinson went on to say that they plan to create a communication plan. He said by the end of September they will have a concrete plan to roll out the survey and communicate to the field. Mr. Robinson mentioned an Ohio Department of Education survey that captured what they were trying to accomplish regarding scientifically valid surveys.

¹ A memo concerning the Ohio survey can be viewed at <http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/ODE-Family-Involvement-Instructions-and-Survey.pdf>.

III. Presentation by Administrator Assistance²

Mr. Hendry invited Mr. Steve Wittenauer, the co-owner of Administrative Assistance, to address the committee. Mr. Wittenauer stated that this program was put together by teachers and administrators. He said as they have put the assessments together, with teacher buy-in. He also said there is a lot of flexibility for each school district. They have been working with INTASS as well he said. Mr. Wittenauer stressed that they ensured the system is defensible since evaluation is tied to teacher evaluation.

Mr. Russ Mikel, from Administrative Assistance, addressed the committee next regarding assessment and evaluation for non-tested grades and subjects. He stressed that this has been a collaborative process and that it was taken through a facilitative process. Mr. Mikel said the goal of the assessment and evaluation consortium for non-tested is to collaboratively work with all stakeholders in all of the involved districts to assure that student achievement and growth are measured and converted into a Teacher Effectiveness rating.

He continued that they are looking at three key areas: 1) student achievement, 2) student growth, and 3) teacher effectiveness. Mr. Mikel commented that consistency is important as well. He said the power in this process is to collaborate and connect with teachers.

Mr. Mikel then moved on to discuss readiness or preparedness. He said from the readiness score, students are classified into three categories: 1) basic skill level, 2) proficient skill level, or advanced skill level. He stated that from these levels, predictions can be made for the end of course assessments (“ECA”) showing effective student growth, instructional quality, and/or curricular quality. He said they project out to see where students should be for a future comparison. Mr. Mikel outlined the scale for the committee, discussed some specific examples, and explained the conversion to effectiveness rating.

Mr. Mikel walked through a five day process in developing readiness and ECA; he said task 1 is the standards and decision making tool in which teachers are given the opportunity to work together and decide what those are. The remaining tasks are: 2) writing student learning objectives, 3) writing assessment questions, 4) creating the blueprint, 5) ranking order, 6) book

² The presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Administrator_Assistance_SBOE_Strategic_Plan_Committee_Presentation_2-19-15.pdf.

marking, 7) writing the student assessment, 8) creating the teacher answer key, 9) item analysis, 10) piloting, and 11) policies and formatting.

Mr. Mikel then discussed data, and that test results from across all participating districts will go through an item analysis and other reports. He stated that the data will be used to check and refine readiness and ECA scores. Mr. Mikel also commented on the benefits of the consortium, as outlined in the slide presentation.

Mr. Wittenauer discussed the cost, which depends on the amount of students, he also said districts must be a member of the consortium for at least three years. He stated that the main goal is to make this affordable to help schools measure student growth. He said this program will help develop student learning objectives, which many districts don't sufficiently have.

Mr. Hendry asked what the presenters thought about objective measures in Indiana. Mr. Mikel responded that in his opinion it is not very strong based on the information he has. He said it would be nice if there was one test that could be used for the non-test areas, but there isn't. He said there isn't a common approach and there is a lack of consistency.

-- Dr. Freitas left the meeting --

Dr. Oliver added that he is encouraged by the fact that this starts to address local input on utilizing growth measures in the evaluation system, and also solutions for eliminating a model that uses different weights for non-tested areas.

-- Dr. Freitas rejoined the meeting --

Dr. Oliver also mentioned that there must be incentives to get teachers to teach in high poverty schools and to reduce mobility and attrition. The committee then thanked the presenters for their presentation and work.

IV. Staff Update on the Strategic Plan and Project Charter³

³ The presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE_Staff_SPC_Slides_2_19_15.pdf, and the memo can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/At-A-Glance_Project_Charter.pdf.

Ashley Cowger, Chief of Staff for the Board, addressed the committee next. She began by stating that an amended version of the balanced scorecard and strategic plan is populated and available online per the SBOE's recently adopted amendments. She then informed the committee about the project charter. She said the purpose of this is to help the committee see the status of all the projects currently being executed and managed.

Dr. Oliver expressed concern about potentially having too many projects going on at once, even though each project is important to him. He said if he had to pick one he would like to continue to move forward on teacher evaluation, especially considering legislation that is working its way through; Mr. Hendry agreed. Ms. Cowger responded that she would place the other projects on deck for the short term future.

Ms. Cowger then moved on to next steps. She talked about the Board staff convening a stakeholder design committee per the Strategic Planning Committee's direction and continuing to draft the committee's second teacher and administrator feedback surveys.

The committee decided to meet next on March 13, 2015.

The committee voted 4-0 to adjourn.