



# INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

December 18, 2014

Indiana Government Center South  
Auditorium  
402 W. Washington Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
9:00 a.m. (EST)

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

Board Members Absent: None.

### **I. Call to Order/ Meeting Minutes Approval**

The Chair Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order. Mr. Hendry announced that the agenda would be shifted slightly; he stated that Agenda Item IV - Priority Initiative: Stakeholder Engagement would be moved to the third agenda item. The committee voted 4-0 to approve minutes from the September 26, 2014 and the November 13, 2014 meetings.

### **II. The Balanced Scorecard (BSC)<sup>1</sup>**

Mr. Hendry invited Ashley Cowger, Program Director for the Board, and P.J. McGrew, Associate Director of Research for the Center for Education and Career Innovation, to address the committee. The presenters informed the committee that the scorecard had been populated with all available data; they also highlighted those areas where data wasn't available. Ms. Cowger also informed the committee that some areas will be populated in the future as information becomes available.

The presenters also spoke about the "90/50/90" goal, which is that: 1) 90% of students pass both the Math and ELA sections of ISTEP+ and End-of-Course Assessments, 2) 50% of all

---

<sup>1</sup> This presentation can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SPC\\_Slides\\_12.18.14.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SPC_Slides_12.18.14.pdf).

graduates demonstrate College and Career Readiness as defined in the accountability model, and 3) 90% of students graduate from high school without a waiver. In addition, they said another overarching goal is that 100,000 more students are in seats in A or B schools by 2020.

Dr. Oliver commented that he appreciated the work being done and that the committee was on the right track. He said he liked where the goals were set in the scorecard at this point. He also inquired about whether the “100,000 more students in A or B schools by 2020” goal would be added as a metric and Ms. Cowger responded that it would be.

Mr. Watts added that it’s important that a message is conveyed to teachers that this is not a “gotcha” system. Ms. Cowger explained the plans in place for effective communication to ease some of the anxiety that could result from the goals in the scorecard. Mr. Hendry said communication to the field is vital. Dr. Freitas asked about the accountability factor. He said the scorecard holds the Board, the Department, and local districts accountable for the metrics in the scorecard, and asked how that will work practically. Ms. Cowger responded that communication is one key. She also stated that it’s important to have robust discussions in regular Board meetings to allow the accountability piece to exist.

Dr. Oliver recommended review of the scorecard at full Board meetings once data comes in to assess how well goals are being met. He also stated that he was concerned about targets with subgroups. He commented that the reasonableness of targets for subgroups should be looked at as a separate issue. Dr. Oliver added that, with regard to the meetings twice a year, he would like to see those as public work sessions. He explained that this would allow a review of the metrics and a discussion about whether projects need to be created. Mr. Hendry responded that he felt that made a lot of sense, especially since at regular Board meetings there may not be enough time for more in depth discussions around the strategic plan.

### **III. Priority Initiative: Stakeholder Engagement<sup>2</sup>**

Mr. Hendry invited Leroy Robinson, Director of Family and Community Engagement at the Department, to present to the committee. He began by giving some background on his position at the Department. Mr. Robinson discussed efforts to support family and community engagement in Indiana. He spoke about surveys that have been created to get input from

---

<sup>2</sup> This presentation can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE\\_Committee\\_PPT\\_on\\_Family\\_and\\_Community\\_Engagement.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/SBOE_Committee_PPT_on_Family_and_Community_Engagement.pdf).

communities. Mr. Robinson explained that the vision of the Office of Family and Community engagement is to assist the Division of School Improvement with an intentional approach to family and community engagement. He explained the mission is, with the help of the Outreach Division of School Improvement, to serve all Indiana schools, including Focus and Priority Schools, with improving their family and community engagement initiatives. In addition to identifying and designating applicable schools as “Family Friendly,” he said his office will create and share a statewide framework for Family and Community Engagement.

Mr. Hendry pointed out that the current surveys are voluntary and asked if there are any plans to engage in a scientifically valid survey. Mr. Robinson responded that that is in the works. He said the current survey will be adapted to be scientific. Mr. Hendry stated that the current survey will be very useful and thanked Mr. Robinson for all the work he has done. Dr. Oliver added that it’s also important to ensure that the survey is implemented in a way that will promote good information.

Dr. Oliver said he hopes to continue to get updates on stakeholder engagement from Mr. Robinson and stated that he was glad Mr. Robinson was in this role. Mr. Robinson concluded by explaining his responsibilities. Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Mr. Robinson said he will give updates on request. Dr. Oliver recommended an update at the January committee meeting and the committee agreed to include it as an agenda item. Mr. Watts recommended that Mr. Robinson make contact with the National Association of State Boards of Education to see if they could add value and Mr. Hendry agreed that was a good recommendation.

#### **IV. Priority Initiatives: Teacher Evaluation Systems and Stakeholder Engagement<sup>3</sup>**

Jessica Conlon, from The New Teacher’s Project (“TNTP”), presented by phone. She began by giving an update on the stakeholder engagement process. Dr. Freitas asked about the questions for the focus groups. Ms. Conlon said the questions are centered around experiences and perceptions. Dr. Freitas then asked about the validity of perceptions. More specifically, he inquired about whether there are follow up questions asking why a stakeholder has a particular perception. Ms. Conlon clarified that the questions ask about direct experience. Ms. Conlon

---

<sup>3</sup> A TNTP update on stakeholder engagement can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP\\_Stakeholder\\_Engagement\\_Update\\_FINAL\\_12.11.14.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/TNTP_Stakeholder_Engagement_Update_FINAL_12.11.14.pdf). A TNTP policy recommendation memo can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Memo\\_to\\_IN\\_SBOE\\_FINAL\\_11.26.pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Memo_to_IN_SBOE_FINAL_11.26.pdf), and a policy recommendation presentation can be viewed at [http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Initial\\_Policy\\_Recs\\_to\\_IN\\_SBOE\\_FINAL\\_11.26.14\(1\).pdf](http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/Initial_Policy_Recs_to_IN_SBOE_FINAL_11.26.14(1).pdf).

stated that they have been intentional about having plenty of follow up questions to flesh out the issues Dr. Freitas was concerned about.

Dr. Oliver expressed concern about the ESEA waiver and the importance of the Board's awareness of how the waiver is being constructed. He stated that it's important to ensure the waiver application is in line with Board policy, including teacher evaluation, and that the waiver is aligned with the strategic plan. Mr. Hendry commented that TNTP was hired as the result of the U.S. Department's concerns about teacher evaluation in the prior waiver application. Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, responded that the U.S. Department was not necessarily concerned with the teacher evaluation system per se, but the 23 corporations that have not yet identified a compensation model and a plan. Dr. Oliver stated that a collaborative dialogue regarding the waiver with the committee would be helpful. Ms. Shockey agreed that the committee would be the perfect venue to drive this collaborative dialogue.

#### **V. Next Steps**

Mr. Hendry said the next committee meeting will be on January 26, 2015 in Indianapolis. Mr. Hendry commented that Ms. Conlon will present in person at the next meeting. Mr. Hendry also thanked all those who watched the meeting and those who participated.

The committee adjourned.