



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

July 16, 2015

Indiana Government Center South  
Conference Room 1  
302 W. Washington St.  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
1:00 p.m. (EDT)

Committee Members Present: Gordon Hendry (Chair), Dr. Vince Bertram, and Dr. David Freitas (by phone).

Committee Members Absent: B.J. Watts

### **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 April 23, 2015 committee meeting, and upon a motion by Dr. Freitas and a second by Dr. Bertram, the minutes were approved 3-0.

### **II. INTASS/Indiana University Educator Support Overview (Dr. Cole and Dr. Murphy)<sup>1</sup>**

Mr. Hendry invited Dr. Cole and Dr. Murphy to the podium to present information regarding the INTASS scope of work and a high level discussion of the projects. Dr. Cole addressed the committee first. She commented that the work is just beginning. She said INTASS has created a management board that is made up of Dr. Cole, Dr. Murphy, Sarah Pies from the Department, and Ashley Cowger from Board staff. Dr. Cole informed that they have met monthly about the scope of work to ensure it is complementing the Department's work, and also about the rollout of projects.

Dr. Murphy addressed the committee next. He stated that one of purposes is to ensure that everything is coordinated across agencies. He said the management board is there to

---

<sup>1</sup> The INSTASS memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/INTASS\\_Work\\_Scope\\_Update\\_July\\_2015.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/INTASS_Work_Scope_Update_July_2015.pdf).

ensure the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. Dr. Murphy added that there are about 12-15 districts in the consortium that provide feedback on the work. He said the next step is to tie everything to student learning. Dr. Murphy stated that an overall research design is being developed that will allow INTASS to look at teacher evaluation.

Dr. Cole informed that both she and Dr. Murphy have been involved in the stakeholder design committee (design committee), which has been looking at teacher evaluation. She stated that they have received a lot of very good feedback from educators regarding teacher evaluation.

Dr. Cole then moved on to level one evaluator training. She stated that this training is an online training INTASS created to help educators gain a common base of knowledge of evaluation across the state. She said level two will include face to face interactions. She said this can be a resource to districts as they go through the monitoring process. Dr. Cole said educators that participate in this will earn continuing education points and a certificate. Dr. Cole added that data is being collected as the training occurs.

Dr. Murphy added that the feedback is used to make revision to the process. Dr. Cole said the feedback has been extremely helpful. She continued that level two training is the face to face on site training that gets deeper into the content. Dr. Cole also mentioned that the level two training will involve the educational service centers. She said they hope to create the materials for level two by early September. Dr. Murphy said the idea is that evaluators will come out of this with a standard set of skills and knowledge.

Dr. Murphy then discussed work with superintendents regarding their role in the evaluation process and their feedback. He said this will be helpful because there is a lack of research in this area. He said the plan is to work with them to help create the modules. Regarding the superintendent training, Dr. Cole said they have discussed with the INTASS advisory board the standards and the criteria for the training. She continued that they will be working with J.T. Coopman regarding development of the curriculum in the fall.

Dr. Murphy moved on to the talk about the RISE rubric. He stated that INTASS seeks to compile information from districts across the state regarding how they have modified this rubric. He said he hopes that will allow the development of a more useful rubric to be used on the teacher evaluation process. Dr. Murphy added that this process will be underway immediately.

Dr. Cole commented about guidance and resources to teachers and districts for plan revision. She said this work will continue so there will be value added and no redundancies.

Dr. Cole continued that another exciting part of the work scope is that there will be districts who will be recognized for doing things right. She said INTASS will be developing a list of high quality districts that can be used as resources and models, and that they hope to have a cohort of districts this fall.

Ashley Cowger added that she and Sarah Pies have worked with INTASS closely to ensure the process is inclusive and to prevent overlapping work. Ms. Cowger then thanked INTASS for their work.

Mr. Hendry expressed his excitement and appreciation for the work INTASS is doing. He stated that feedback has shown that teachers are not happy with the evaluation system in Indiana. Mr. Hendry said that TNTP had been previously retained to help improve this process. Mr. Hendry continued that there have been a very high number of highly effective and effective teachers in the state according to the current evaluation system. Mr. Hendry expressed that there is a need for constructive feedback to teachers that must improve, and a need to identify those teachers that are really excelling so they can get the recognition they deserve. Mr. Hendry reiterated that this is a research-based process, and that the Department, Board staff, and stakeholders are working together to improve teacher evaluation. He said this work is critical to improvement of education in Indiana and for Indiana kids.

Dr. Bertram said he appreciated the focus on collaboration. He inquired about next steps beyond the evaluation process. Dr. Murphy responded that the feedback process goes with a particular teacher, as well as more generalized feedback that a district has involving the development capabilities for the entire teaching staff in the district. Dr. Murphy said feedback can provide an opportunity for teachers to grow. Dr. Bertram responded that it is a systems issue and expressed the importance of teachers improving based on the feedback. He expressed the importance of professional development making a difference.

Dr. Bertram then asked about whether part of the professional development will be helping principals navigate this process. Dr. Cole responded that INTASS hopes that some of this information can be learned from the recognized districts – how they are utilizing resources and time in different and effective ways. Dr. Cole said it is also an issue that can be analyzed in the work with superintendents.

Dr. Bertram commented about the capacities at schools. He said it's important to be clear about who establishes priorities in a school. He said it is very important to be cognitive about what is added and what goes away when there are capacity issues. Dr. Bertram said that this work is the most important thing for education in Indiana for teaching and learning. Dr. Bertram said he would like to continue the conversation going forward about alleviating some of the concerns around capacity and the use of resources.

Dr. Freitas thanked Dr. Cole and Dr. Murphy for the presentation. He asked about the assessment of how well this initiative will do. He continued that he believed an assessment system is needed to determine what changes result from the work INTASS is facilitating. Dr. Cole responded that the management team is doing a logic model to ensure the work is in line with expectations. She said the logic model will be shared with the committee. Dr. Freitas said he is not looking for an assessment of the process, like deadlines being met, but is looking for an assessment of change that has occurred as a result of the work. He said he could work with his colleagues at IU and Ms. Cowger to develop an assessment.

### **III. Overview of IDOE's Equity Plan (Sarah Pies, IDOE)<sup>2</sup>**

Sarah Pies addressed the committee. She gave a background of United States Department of Education ("USED") requirements and gave an overview of the work. Ms. Pies stated that the USED created these requirements as a result of studies showing inequalities in the access of great teachers and leaders across the country. She informed that this is treated as an individual state plan.

Ms. Pies outlined the plan for the committee, including an analysis of root causes, review of data, and the development of strategies to address root causes. She added that stakeholders were convened to help gather information. Ms. Pies continued that the strategies cover the following topics: professional development, working conditions, and public perception. She also stated that an equity plan website will be launched in August as a resource for LEAs. Ms. Pies informed that the goal was to have the equity gap reduced below 5%.

Mr. Hendry asked about recruitment into schools that face difficult circumstances; he inquired about why increased accountability and decreased public perception cause there to be a gap. Ms. Pies responded that this information came from stakeholders. Ms. Pies stated that teachers with zero to three years' experience are leaving the field faster than any other group

---

<sup>2</sup> The presentation can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/IDOE\\_Equity\\_Plan\\_Overview.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/IDOE_Equity_Plan_Overview.pdf).

of teachers. When asked why, the teachers gave accountability as a reason, especially since accountability is tied to compensation. Mr. Hendry responded that he could understand if teachers feel that accountability can more negatively affect a new teacher in a high poverty district. However, he continued, he didn't think overall accountability made sense as a reason for the increased gap. Mr. Hendry pointed out that many teachers in D and F schools were rated highly effective and effective; he said accountability as a general reason didn't seem to add up. Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Ms. Pies added that teacher pay is in the plan as a separate cause.

Dr. Bertram stated that when he thinks of root causes, he thinks of things that happen well before students enter the classroom. He acknowledged that once students are in school there are still things that can be done to help. He asked if there are things that can be done to address root causes going back years, and what higher education can do to help address these issues. Dr. Bertram gave the example of the tendency of people to choose where they live before they have employment. He also stated the focus should be on attracting teachers into a long-term great career, rather than a short term job.

#### **IV. Update and Recommendations from SBOE's Stakeholder Design Committee (Ashley Cowger, SBOE Staff)<sup>3</sup>**

Ms. Cowger addressed the committee with an update on the work of the design committee. She informed the committee of the vision, belief statements, and theory of action, and asked the committee to approve them to be brought to the full Board for a vote. She said after the Board adopts it, it will be built into the strategic plan.

Dr. Freitas expressed concern about the numerous listed objective measures in the design committee recommendations document. His concern was the number of indicators diluting the data. Specifically, he expressed concern about climate and culture being used as

---

<sup>3</sup> The following reports and recommendations were discussed or touched on: 1) an educator evaluation survey executive summary can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC\\_IN\\_Educator\\_Survey\\_Results\\_Exec\\_Summary\\_SPC\\_July.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC_IN_Educator_Survey_Results_Exec_Summary_SPC_July.pdf), 2) the evaluation survey full report can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC\\_IN\\_Educator\\_Survey\\_Results\\_Full\\_Report\\_SPC\\_July.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC_IN_Educator_Survey_Results_Full_Report_SPC_July.pdf), 3) design committee recommendations that can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC\\_Update\\_and\\_Recommendations\\_to\\_Strategic\\_Planning\\_Committee\\_7.16.2015.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC_Update_and_Recommendations_to_Strategic_Planning_Committee_7.16.2015.pdf), and 4) design committee vision, belief statements, and theory of action can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC\\_IN\\_Vision\\_Belief\\_TheoryofAction\\_Results\\_2015\\_06\\_05.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SDC_IN_Vision_Belief_TheoryofAction_Results_2015_06_05.pdf).

part of a teacher's evaluation. He asked that issue be brought back to the committee for further review before going to the Board.

Ms. Cowger then explained the vision document. Dr. Freitas expressed that he was uncomfortable voting on documents in a piecemeal fashion. He stated that he is on board with the vision document but wasn't comfortable signing off on it and never being able to revisit it. Ms. Cowger responded that adoption of the vision statement is important for the design committee to move forward with its work. Dr. Bertram said the design committee can move forward without an official vote and that would allow for flexibility. Ms. Cowger commented that it could be voted on and then amended later if needed. Dr. Bertram said he thinks the documents look very good, but would rather vote on everything all at once.

The committee then agreed they approved of the vision, belief statements, theory of action, and work of the design committee so far but agreed not to take an official vote until the work was complete.

Ms. Cowger moved on to discuss the educator evaluation survey. Ms. Cowger said the big takeaway is that the educator evaluation system needs improved support, especially in communication, training, and resources. Ms. Cowger also stated that there tended to be a misunderstanding about the purpose of evaluation; many said it was about complying with state law rather than what it is about – growing teachers. Ms. Cowger also informed that there was a misunderstanding about what objective measures are, and what their role is in evaluation. She said teacher training in evaluation is also a need.

The next issue Ms. Cowger addressed was the recommendations of the design committee. She discussed recommendations regarding: 1) defining objective measures, 2) defining significantly inform by a percentage range, and 3) a division of responsibilities. Dr. Bertram commented that alignment across systems will be important, and that he had concerns about that. Ms. Cowger said there is a need to improve systems generally and then a need to improve systems within systems. Ms. Cowger said the committee will look at aligning systems if possible.

One issue Ms. Cowger addressed was that some people misunderstand objective measures and their role in teacher evaluation. She clarified that there are multiple objective measures that collectively must significantly inform the evaluation. Of all of the objective measures, she explained, the statewide assessment must be the primary of the objective measures used. Dr. Freitas said he still has concerns about diluting information. He stressed the

importance of teacher effectiveness pure data and asked that it be further explored. Ms. Cowger stated that she would follow up to continue that discussion.

Mr. Hendry said the next step is to begin planning for an audit of objective measures. Ms. Cowger added that it will be an audit of the last four years of data. Mr. Hendry clarified that the audit is a look into what school corporations are using to make up the objective component of teacher evaluation.

Dr. Murphy stated that he believes there are best practices with respect to the percentage range for the objective measures component of evaluations. Mr. Hendry inquired about the percentage range in relation to how many objective measures are used. Dr. Murphy responded that the farther you get away from the statewide assessment, things do look different. Dr. Murphy said Mr. Hendry's point was a good one and a point to look at closer in the audit.

Dr. Freitas expressed concern to a piecemeal approach to policymaking. He said there needs to be an alignment between the evaluation system, teacher pay, and other issues. He said at some point this issue needs to be addressed in the near future. Dr. Freitas said he wanted to figure out how to create policy using a systems approach. Mr. Hendry said the strategic planning committee would be supportive of an audit that would help reveal what a lot of the issues are relating to objective measures.

Ms. Cowger explained that the design committee is tasked with multiple projects to work towards the goal of maximizing human talent. She said part of that is evaluation and part of it is compensation. She said while it may feel piecemeal, the design committee is working towards one large goal. Ms. Cowger said in the future she would present in a way that emphasizes the connectedness of the work.

## **V. Next Steps**

The committee decided to meet next on September 17, 2015. Dr. Freitas asked that Board staff look at some of the incorrect information being reported about the number of teachers in Indiana seeking teacher's licenses, and Mr. Hendry commented that he would appreciate the same to better understand the issue.

## **VI. ADJOURN**

The committee voted 3-0 to adjourn.