

**Minutes of the Special Meeting of the
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
OLIVER HODGE EDUCATION BUILDING
2500 NORTH LINCOLN BOULEVARD, ROOM 1-20
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

November 6, 2013

The State Board of Education met in special session at 1:04 p.m. on Wednesday, November 6, 2013, in the Board Room of the Oliver Hodge Education Building at 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The final agenda was posted at 12:45 p.m. on Tuesday, November 5, 2013.

The following were present:

Ms. Kalee Isenhour, Secretary to the State Board of Education
Ms. Terrie Cheadle, Administrative Assistant

Members of the State Board of Education present:

State Superintendent Janet Barresi, Chairperson of the Board
MG (R) Lee Baxter, Lawton
Ms. Cathryn Franks, Roosevelt
Ms. Amy Ford, Durant
Mr. Daniel Keating, Tulsa
Mr. William "Bill" Price, Oklahoma City
Mr. William "Bill" Shdeed, Oklahoma City

Others in attendance are shown as an attachment.

**CALL TO ORDER
AND
ROLL CALL**

Superintendent Barresi called the State Board of Education special meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Isenhour called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, OKLAHOMA
FLAG SALUTE, AND MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Superintendent Barresi led Board Members and all present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag, a salute to the Oklahoma Flag, and a moment of silence.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT

Information from the State Superintendent

Superintendent Barresi thanked Board Members for attending the special meeting and congratulated Board Member Shdeed on receiving a Lifetime Achievement Award from Oklahoma City University.

She overviewed the National Governor's Association Initiative attended with Governor Fallin. As chairperson of the association Governor Fallin's agenda is "American Works, Education and Training for Tomorrow's Jobs" traveling throughout the country conducting a series of roundtables. At the recent meeting held in New Mexico, her Oklahoma team discussed best practices, opportunities, closing regional skills gaps; developing skilled and educated competitive workforce. Approximately 21 states were represented focusing on improving education systems and workforce training programs. Governor Fallin's initiative is to consider a new minimum for students to complete one-year post high school or receive an industry certification because a high school diploma is no longer enough for employment. The National Governor's Association summit is scheduled for March 2014 in Oklahoma City.

Regarding the assessment test and reports today it is our commitment to increase rigor which is a process that comes with challenges and rewards. Oklahoma raised the bar and look forward to implementing the Oklahoma Academic Standards. Grade 4 reading improved dramatically, but very little changes in Grades 3 through 8 reading and math. Science and writing were new tests. Statistically, significant number of students (special needs) took the OCCT. The results are against the background of more special needs students taking the traditional OCCT test. The end-of-instruction (EOI) test student scores were higher in algebra I and II, geometry, and english II and III, Biology I was a new test.

The A-F report card grades submitted for approval are a part of a larger and comprehensive strategy to increase academic rigor and improve education in Oklahoma Schools. Over the past three years the State Department of Education (SDE), Governor Fallin and Oklahoma Legislature focused on educational results through strengthening accountability and standards. An important component is a transparent school grading system that parents, public, and educators can easily understand. Oklahoma has used the A-F report card to raise the bar for excellence while also strengthening schools. Evidence shows that higher expectations for students and schools yield better results. The grading formula introduced in 2012 underwent changes earlier this year as a result of legislation of the expressed concerns by district administrators. Elements such as increasing the number of advanced placement classes and decreasing the dropout rate are now factored in as bonus points schools can accrue. District superintendents have advocated and supported this, and moreover the strengthened A-F formula also raised the grade percentage factored in for student performance. The focus is put on the success of children in our classrooms. Admittedly, the process has not been smooth because of problems with calculation errors, tests score factored late, hundreds of data verification update changes, data points view after first review window. Grades were kept online for districts to view throughout that time for full transparency. The SDE worked with districts and allowed time to update testing files so that the data used in the report cards could be accurate. There was much sound and fury discrediting the grading criteria from those district sites receiving an F grade. If those who criticized the grades put forth the same degree of energy and enthusiasm into turning around challenged school sites, I will be optimistic about the future of those schools. The final report card accurately represents how Oklahoma schools are performing and changes to the grading formula increased rigor and instructional shifts made by teachers statewide have impacted the resulting grades. This year more schools received “A” but an increase of “D and F” schools.

The grades are not cause for despair or means our children do not know less nor that teachers are doing a poor job. The A-F report card means we are expecting more from them. We have every confidence our schools and students will rise to that challenge. School that have include Will Rogers High School, Tulsa Public Schools, with 80 percent eligible for free and-reduced lunch, 90 percent passed math, 87 percent passed English, and received a “B” this year. Pierce Elementary School, Oklahoma City Public Schools, with 90 percent eligible for free and-reduced lunch, 91 percent passed math, 85 percent reading proficient and received a “B-”. Also, U.S. Grant High School, Oklahoma City Public Schools, consistently on the needs improvement list, missed an “A” by one point this year.

Oklahoma is in the midst of a renaissance in many realms with a strong economy, low unemployment, vibrant culture, and growing national and international profile. Yet the bedrock of it all, education stubbornly lags behind the nation. Increased rigor is vital and begins with accountability and transparency. This is time for all of us to work together putting aside political gamesmanship and remember we want the best for our young people. Reasonable minds can disagree but let’s be mindful of the reason we are at the table and that is for Oklahoma children. Board Members were provided 2013 Federal R & D and STEM jobs report.

First-Year Superintendents

First-year superintendent(s) attending the meeting were Mr. Raymond Rice, Velma-Alma Public Schools and Mr. Jerry McCormick, Maud Public Schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Hickman, Epic Charter School, Oklahoma City, said first and foremost Epic Charter School was not present to complain about the A-F grading system, or the formula used to derive the A-F grading system. In fact, Epic Charter School embraced the A-F grading system and created the race to 95 from last year's result of 93 students tested. Epic Charter is an online school with approximately 1000 students and this year with support of parents through community involvement to get students to testing sites to take the test our grade is 97 percent. Epic agrees that the A-F grades can be important and provide incentives to schools that help do things better for improving school performance and academic growth. It is all things that are the underlined purpose of the A-F system Epic stands for, supports, embraces and Epic is willing to take the letter grades to improve the strategies of how Epic educates their students. Every child learns differently especially in an online environment to make those kinds of improvements and incorporate them into their fundamental systems of how they teach children.

Mr. Hickman went on to say on June 30, Epic Charter School completed its corrections to its testing data received from the State Department during the allowed correction window. On August 6, a report was provided to the State Department as requested that provided information about various students that took the tests and how they were considered in the grading formula. Epic Charter School received a State Department email on October 16 that stated the grades were available online for review and to provide feedback. There were no grades available online for Epic Charter School and Epic's representative called the State Department to inquire where the grades were to review online. Mr. Hickman asserted that at that time, Epic was told a mistake had been made because one grade had been calculated and there should have been three grades calculated. Due to Epic having elementary, middle and high school there had been prior discussion about how Epic would receive three grades. Then on October 21 Epic received a letter informing that Epic Charter School would not receive a letter grade for the 2012-2013 school year.

Superintendent Barresi advised Mr. Hickman his comments would be discontinued and that General Counsel had visited with him to prior to the meeting.

Ms. Ronda Boston, Oklahoma PTA said she was representing Jeff Corbett, President, PTA in his absence and provided his statement. The Oklahoma PTA believes every child must be provided a well-rounded, high quality education. It will ensure all children the opportunity to reach their full potential and become productive members of society. Access to free public education is the most effective method to secure the opportunity and should not be denied to any child. In order to develop a stronger accountable system of education schools must place priority on student performance and achievement, focus on what children know and are able to do, and held accountable for ensuring all children succeed. The school report card data must be put in context with other factors that can affect performance, evaluated as a school's performance on more than just student achievement, and include teacher qualifications, class size, school safety, and dropout rates factors. Oklahoma PTA believes parents, teachers, students and general public are affected by school policy it is appropriate they participate in its determination. The Oklahoma PTA believes such sharing of responsibilities will result in

greater responsiveness to student and societal needs and therefore improve the quality of educational opportunity.

It is because of this belief that the Oklahoma PTA strongly encourages the Oklahoma State Board of Education to work in cooperation with our public school administrators to ensure the assessment of public education in Oklahoma is further developed, benefits our educational system and the students it serves.

**Presentation on the test results for 2012-2013 for the
Oklahoma Core Curriculum Test Grades 3-8 and
End-of-Instruction and Oklahoma Modified Alternate
Assessment Program Grades 3-8 and End-of-Instruction**

Maridyth McBee, Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Accountability and Assessments presented the results of the Oklahoma School Testing Program (OSTP) for the 2012-13 school years. The three assessments included Oklahoma Core Curriculum Test (OCCT) designed for most students that measures the Oklahoma Academic Standards; the Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP) more assessable for students on IEPs that are being instructed in grade level standards and is measured by the Oklahoma Academic Standards; and the Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP) the portfolio test that measures students with severe cognitive disabilities. Ms. McBee reviewed Grades 3-8 general assessments and transition trends, Grades 3-8 math and reading, Grades 5 and 8 science and writing results, end-of-instruction (EOI) general assessments and results.

Board members discussed varying testing times and requirements, districts' test distribution, time allocations and process, increasing/decreasing student scores, testing goals, federal accountability measure, and test revisions.

This was a report only and no action was required.

**Annual Reports (A-F Report Cards) pursuant to 70 O.S.
§1210.545 and State Board of Education Rules Approved**

Joel Robison, Chief of Staff presented a request to approve the annual A-F report card report and rules. Mr. Robison reviewed the timeline steps by the SDE to ensure the data used in the calculations were accurate as possible. He clarified that data clarifications did not mean assessment scores. Data clarification assures student identification is associated with the correct student and the correct test, and using the correct assessment when students have multiple assessments reported. The only students counted in this process are full academic year students or “face students” and need to be identified as meeting the full academic year criteria versus non full academic year criteria. Mr. Robison highlighted various timelines that included June 10, August 30 - September 30, October 15-28, professional development/feedback/webinars and other trainings and meetings; testing disruptions impacts, HumRRO student performance report, student assessments grade calculations, and system transparency of posted grades, formula, calculations and corrective steps and data verification changes.

Board Member Ford said the recent research studies discussed the five point difference between an “A” and “F”, please clarify.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the State Board of Education
November 6, 2013

Ms. McBee said Megan Clifford who is a Harvard Research Fellow, replicated the research studies done by University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University. She questioned how could they have done this and several things occurred. In answer to Ms. Ford's question, the difference is after we take into account the characteristics of individuals bring to us. Let's say there are actually truly 50 points between an "A" and "F" but the researchers said that typically students of poverty score 30 points or less than students not of poverty. They took the 50 points and subtracted 30 points for a school that had poverty because we would not expect any more than that. They looked at things such as ethnicity, gender and some ethnicities would score 15 points less than other ethnicities. So they subtracted then again another 15 points. We started out with an actual score of 50 differences but by the time we subtracted the individual characteristics and possibly prior achievement we were left with a small number. It is probably somewhat misleading because when people look at it they think there is only a two or three point difference between an "F" school and an "A" school. But that is not true, that is if you assume that students with certain characteristics have no chance because they will score the way they have always scored before. Unlike Pierce, Grant and Will Rogers that Superintendent Barresi brought up that beat the odds. So please know to interpret the small points that are in the study as those are derived scores. The ones where you have subtracted out all of the individual characteristics those students bring to school.

General Baxter said just to frame this; we are where we are here. The decision we have to make is whether or not to release the grades. To debate on the relative merits of A-F "falls on my deaf ears at this point." It is a legislative matter. When something like this is created, which is enormous in scope, and if anybody in the room thinks you are going to get it right the first few times, you are not. It is going to be replete with various errors. General Baxter stated that he called half of dozen school superintendents who usually call him that are not very happy with the situation in A-F and other areas. He asked them if they understand the grade they received for their schools and district, what the system was and did they agree that the grades were correct? Everyone said yes. They did not like them but they did understand them. He did not hear anyone say, "We got a "D-" and we really should have got a "D."

Board Member Baxter made a motion to approve to release the grades as they are. He said it is the decision to make and any debate on A-F belongs at the Legislature or another forum other than this one. Board Member Ford seconded the motion.

Board Member Keating referred to the assessments that some students were full academic students and some are not. How many students are in each of the categories? Are there a large number of students not part of the overall numbers?

Ms. McBee said in order to be as fair as we could be, the SDE defined that you have to be in the school for the whole year to be included in the grade card. We have mobility in the state and without the exact figures at this time, Ms. McBee estimates that it is probably 30 percent. It is different district to district and from site to site. Oklahoma City, for example where there is mobility between sites, would not have credit for the students but the district as a whole does because they stayed in the district the whole time. Ms. McBee promised to locate exact mobility figures for our state so Board Members will know what percent the grade cards represent.

Board Member Ford said if they stay within the district, the district gets credit for the student.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the State Board of Education
November 6, 2013

Ms. McBee said the district gets the credit for their student achievement and if they stay in the school for the whole year the school gets that.

Board Member Price said part of this, too, is that we have had new legislative criteria, last year's legislative criteria, and then we had a system before this which was called API. API was the score that lasted 20-30 years. The API scores have an incredible correlation between that and the A-F scores. Mr. Price stated that he looked at the API scores and would compare them and nobody argued about the API scores or raised a fuss whatsoever. It has almost a 90 percent correlation and is interesting because there is a grade to it everybody is concerned. When you had the old system where there was no grade you still had almost the exact same group of "F" schools, and the same kind of lack of progress. The good thing about this it brings to light and makes people concerned about it enough to request all these different changes. Mr. Price asked Mr. Robinsonto point out the major changes between the new legislative system and the last legislative system. Mr. Price stated that he thinks a lot of these criticisms of A-F are on the margins and 90 percent of it is about the same as it has been for 20 years. Small changes have been made over the course of time and those have been in some cases used as excuses for why the same "F" school is still an "F" school.

Mr. Robison said the current system is more closely aligned to the API system than last year's was. The API system was really dependent upon assessment results as this one is as well. Last year Superintendent Barresi was hoping in the initial formula to look at other factors that might impact a grade outside of student achievement and reward schools for the advanced placement courses, parent engagement and those type things. When we used this system last year, those sorts of factors were singled out by the opponents as being things those schools could not control. When the legislature addressed A-F this year, they were getting away from things that schools may or may not be able to directly affect.

Board Member Price asked if that is a major difference.

Ms. McBee said it is a major difference and in the API we had either performance or could substitute growth if it was substantial. Now we have both performance and growth in the same measure. Attendance and graduation rate were a part of that and they are now in bonus points.

Board Member Price said the other major changes are the plus and minus which means it creates greater changes in grades with minor things. It might look like you have to adjust more but it will show up as greater needs to change grades with minor modifications.

Superintendent Barresi said that in the original legislation we wanted to have an opportunity, as we always tell parents this grade card is an important report on student academic achievement. This is a report that parents will use as they work with educators to talk about the full gambit of what their student experiences in schools and to be part of the answer. Indeed, we have supplemental materials available to parents and community if they would like to use them to guide them in those discussions with schools, teachers and principals or to continue to investigate the full range of services and full academic experiences their children are receiving. This is a starting point for parents to guide them as they become more involved and overall continual improvement of their schools.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the State Board of Education
November 6, 2013

Board Member Franks asked if there were writing tests that need to be scored that will affect this A-F grades?

Ms. McBee said these are different types of writing test than in the past. We noticed there were 5600 that did not have adjacent scores and they all should be rescored if they did. Those are rescored and included in the grades. But we always have the option for districts if they receive their writing back and disagree with the particular score, and this is not new this year, this has happened every year and anything that is open ended, they have the option to appeal. Traditionally for the last few years not just this company but many others the deal is that the company will rescore and have a third person (not the same one) rescore it. If the score is the same then the district is obligated to pay \$125 for that service. If the score is different, the student receives the new score. With this particular writing assessment, as students are required to cite evidence, there were some students that copied the writing passage word for word. Their writing looked wonderful but when looking at the passage from which they were to respond it had the exact same words and same sentences. That has been a difficult way for people to judge the writing and look at the passages from which the student responded. Ms. McBee believes we will have more appeals and those will not be included in the report card but the vast majorities are.

Board Member Franks said to be clear it is only if there has been an appeal, correct?

Ms. McBee said correct.

Board Member Price said out of the almost 1800 schools 34 were nonreported. He stated he presumed Epic is in that category. It seems like it is a unique school in that it is both online and has various age groupings. What is the reason in general for nonreporting of those 34?

Ms. McBee said the vast majority of the 34 schools are kindergarten through second grade centers that do not have an assessment. Per the law, if 60 percent or more of those students matriculate to a school with a third grade then the pre-school, kindergarten, first grade, and second grade center will receive the score of the third grader. We have many kindergarten, first, and second grade centers that send students across a larger district and so there is a not a place that receives the majority of their third graders. Therefore, there is not a score to give them and for the most part that number does include younger grades where they do not yet have state assessments.

Board Member Price said what happened on the Epic situation?

Kimberly Richey, General Counsel, responding to Board Member Price question regarding Epic Charter School, said the information reported during public comment was inaccurate in a significant respect in that Epic Charter School will receive a report card this year. The State Board of Education promulgated rules section (j)(2) allows the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to withhold a grade if issues have been raised about the integrity or validity of the data. The closer October 16 came, we experienced more difficulty ensuring that the charter school appropriately classified students as full academic year and none full academic year. A letter was sent October 16 informing Epic Charter School that beginning the next week, SDE staff would visit the charter school to ensure the classifications had been made appropriately. Once the data validity upon which the report card is issued is entirely accurate, we will resubmit Epic's report card to

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the State Board of Education
November 6, 2013

the SBE for issuance. It is not correct to state Epic will not receive a report card this year because they will; the report card just could not be issued due to questions on the validity of the data.

Board Member Price said we are not voting on this today but that would be something the SBE will look at some other time.

Ms. Richey said that is correct.

Board Member Shdeed requested that Mr. Hickman, Epic Charter School representative, continue his earlier presentation to hear everything before voting.

Superintendent Barresi advised the board that Epic Charter School has a pending claim with the SDE and it is against the policy to allow public comment when there is a pending claim.

Board Member Shdeed said he was not aware of the pending claim and why it was started if a claim was pending, stating "I just hate to start and not finish."

Ms. Richey said she spoke with Mr. Hickman's associate, Mr. Clark, prior to the start of this public meeting. She was told that Mr. Hickman would not be addressing their claim they had filed with the SDE. Once Mr. Hickman's comments began to address the issues raised in that claim is when Superintendent Barresi decided to suspend the public comment. Mr. Hickman's law firm requested a response from the SDE, today, and was the deadline by which they asked for a response from the SDE. The response is being worked on to send out today.

Mr. Hickman said so that the record is clear and with all due respect General Counsel was allowed to speak as to what was arrived as the reported claim and I have not been allowed to respond....

Superintendents Barresi advised Mr. Hickman he was out of order.

Board Member Shdeed said he did not intend to give Mr. Hickman the floor but to understand why he was cut off.

Mr. Hickman asked whether he would get an opportunity to finish his statement to respond to General Counsel.

Superintendent Barresi said no..

Board Member Shdeed said apparently not.

Board Member Price said it does sound like we will be facing this when the grade on Epic is due to be approved. I presume you will have an opportunity at that time.

Superintendent Barresi said Epic will be receiving a grade. Thank you very much. Ms. McBee brought up a point about the writing assessment and science. As it was discussed in June, it shows a significant shift in expectations and in instruction. Particularly for the writing assessment students in the past have been asked to write a passage based on a typical type of prompt and so it was a more open type of writing sample. This one is very different now where students are actually looking at a passage

and sometimes two passages and asked to make specific inferences from those passages and show evidence. This is a very large shift and when we discussed the difference in grades and the added items in science, raising the rigor in science exams, we saw a shift in that. There are two differences in the grade cards, one the law changed and two; we have raised the bar in Oklahoma. We will continue to raise the bar as we move forward in other subjects and assessment. The biggest point about this today is for Oklahoma to get behind our teachers. Our teachers are working very hard within our school at making these instructional shifts and will continue to do so. It is a big change and for many teachers it is a fundamental change in the way they teach. I ask for every citizen to get behind our teachers to do what they can to support our teachers because a lot of it is laying on their shoulders. We believe in our teachers and there is nothing more important than an effective teacher in every classroom.

The motion carried with the following votes: General Baxter, yes; Ms. Franks, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Keating, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

**Recommendations to the Office of Management and Enterprise Services (OMES)
to award a bid pursuant to 74 O.S. § 85.5 for the Oklahoma College and Career
Readiness Assessment (OCCRA) testing contract for Math and English/Language
Arts in Grades 3-8, RFP#2650000262 Approved**

Ms. McBee presented a request to approve the 2014-2015 Oklahoma College and Career Readiness Assessment (OCCRA) five year testing contract that will measure the college and career ready standards in English language arts and mathematics for Grades 3 through 8. Ms. McBee provided the OCCRA bid evaluations, results and reviewed four companies for five years, total price, committee ratings, criteria scores, no instate bids, testing and instructional times/constraints/technology/price, state comparability, and company "C" recommendation.

Board Members requested providing more detailed information in the future.

Board Member Baxter made a motion to approve the recommendation of company "C" for the OCCRA. Board Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Mr. Keating, yes; Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; Ms. Franks, yes; and General Baxter, yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Ford made a motion to adjourn. Board Member Price seconded the motion. There being no further business Board Members unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the State Board of Education will be held on Wednesday, November 20, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. The meeting will convene at the State Department of Education, 2500 North Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Janet Barresi, Chairperson of the Board

Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the State Board of Education
November 6, 2013

Kalee Isenhour, Secretary to the State Board