

the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
HOWE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
21444 EAST NORTH RAILROAD
HOWE, OKLAHOMA**

January 31, 2013

The State Board of Education met in regular session at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 31, 2013, in the Howe High School Auditorium, Howe Public Schools, at Howe, Oklahoma. The final agenda was posted at 11:10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 30, 2013.

The following were present:

Ms. Terrie Cheadle, Administrative Assistant to the State Board

Members of the State Board of Education present:

Dr. Janet Barresi, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and
Chairperson of the Board
MG (R) Lee Baxter, Lawton
Ms. Amy Ford, Durant
Mr. William "Bill" Price, Oklahoma City
Mr. William "Bill" Shdeed, Oklahoma City
Ms. Joy Hofmeister, Tulsa

Members of the State Board of Education not present:

Mr. Brian Hayden, Enid

Others in attendance are shown as an attachment.

**CALL TO ORDER
AND
ROLL CALL**

Superintendent Barresi called the State Board of Education regular meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Cheadle called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

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

Superintendent Barresi introduced Private Stormi Culbertson, Senior, Howe High School who led Board members and all present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag, and a salute to the Oklahoma Flag, and a moment of silence.

**DECEMBER 6, 2012 SPECIAL STATE BOARD
OF EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES APPROVED**

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 6, 2012, special State Board of Education meeting. Board Member Shdeed seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

**DECEMBER 19, 2012, REGULAR STATE BOARD
OF EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES APPROVED**

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2012, regular State Board of Education meeting. Board Member Shdeed seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, abstain; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT

FIRST-YEAR SUPERINTENDENTS

First-year superintendent(s) attending the meeting were Mr. Curtis Curry, Superintendent, Porum Public Schools; Ms. Marsha Gore, Superintendent, McAlester Public School; Mr. Monty Guthrie, Superintendent, Pocola Public Schools; Ms. Tina Judkins, Superintendent, Leflore Public Schools; and Mr. Leroy Qualls, Superintendent, Cherokee Immersion Charter.

**Recognition of Ridge Howell, a senior at Checotah High School,
Checotah Public Schools, and President of his local FFA Chapter,
for being named a 2012 White House Champion for Change**

Superintendent Barresi presented a certificate of appreciation to Ridge Howell on being named a 2012 White House Champion for Change. Mr. Howell is a senior at Checotah High School, Checotah Public Schools, and the President of the Future Farmers

of America (FFA) local chapter. The United States Department of Agriculture and the White House Office of Public Engagement recognizes students nationwide whose projects positively impact their communities. Mr. Howell's project was recognized for aiding senior citizens in his community through a variety of volunteer and service efforts.

Information from the State Superintendent

Superintendent Barresi - I canceled thank Board Members for their attendance at the Board meeting today in Howe, Oklahoma. I want to acknowledge Superintendent Parks for the enormous amount of effort he and his staff have taken to put this meeting together and the preparation for this. It is an extraordinary project. I want you to know we hope what we learn from our discussions today are going to benefit all the children of this state as we begin to move forward in this area. I thought it was important Board Members for you to come to Howe Public Schools so that you could see a possibility, a vision of what is possible for this state and the students in the future. I thought it was so important for you to see the environment, and hear what I call is the Howe story. I know that as we talk about digital learning in the future we are reminded of those that are reporting different methods of doing this. But we also have a lot of resources available to us and it is so difficult sometimes to pick through that and decide on an appropriate strategy. I know I was moved about this by Mr. Tom Vanderark and the book he wrote "Getting Smart" on how digital learning is changing the world. It is a wonderful commentary on what is possible. What has happened at Howe Schools is Superintendent Park and his wonderful, incredible staff has brought what is in the book to life. We commend you and we are just thrilled that you have allowed us to come down and invade your district to give the State Board of Education members and really to all Oklahomans a chance to see what is possible for our state.

Mr. Scott Park, Superintendent, Howe Public Schools – I appreciate the opportunity to visit briefly with all of you. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to host the remote location of the State Board of Education meeting this month. It is truly an honor for us to have this opportunity to bring you into our region. Dr. Lance Ford, who you can see on the screens, is my co-presenter today. Dr. Ford is our former technology director and has ties to many of our beginnings as we made the transition from where we found the district 15 years ago into what we have been able to establish today. We are hoping to take you through some basic ideas as to whom and what we are about.

Vision was mentioned earlier which is where I star. Vision is absolute in the process of creating where you want to go, and it is where we started as a shared vision of what we wanted to accomplish for our school. What that vision built out of is what binds us in this room right now. It is the four walls and how we can tear down the four walls to provide access to our students who are otherwise very isolated. Just as you are here but some at times coming to this location have a hard time finding this location it is isolated. In reality across the State of Oklahoma, all of our kids are isolated in many respects. With that said our vision and focus was "how can we break down, tear down the four walls," and provide access to things and experiences our students need to allow them the greatest advantage to enter the world of work of tomorrow. We all know that is guess work at this point. The world of work is changing so rapidly that many of the things we are trying to do to prepare our students, if we are not careful, have already become outdated. We have to prepare our kids to become lifelong learners and engage with the resources at hand.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Dr. Ford works for Sysco as their Education Advocate and will help me as we progress through this. We are very fortunate he offices here on staff as he works on a national level educating teachers on best practices for technologies.

Dr. Ford – The part of the vision I wanted to speak to is the matter of the vision being caught. Not necessarily taught to everyone who is involved and Dr. Barresi has already mentioned our incredible staff. The things you see happening here do not happen without involvement up and down. It takes visionary leadership, but that leadership grows the folks who are the heart of the organization. Visionary leadership does not run ahead of them, does not always push them behind but is in the trenches with them. That is one thing I will say about the leadership that it is visionary on our campus. You will not find Mr. Parks on a regular day seated in a corner, a closet or in his office not engaged and not involved. He is very hands own in every aspect to the things that go on here. This energizes the folks who are a part of this organization who propel that vision forward. Mr. Parks will talk about network infrastructure of which we could not do the things that we do here without our ability to connect. Board Members toured multiple classrooms all over the campus and with every device you have seen, a student leverage was built out from what is behind the scenes. The things that are in the wall and things that make this happen. But as we talked to some folks yesterday it was not always that way here on campus.

Mr. Parks – Infrastructure is the key and paramount to our successes. We thought early on what it would take to be able to accomplish what we wanted to do in terms of technologies, distance learning technologies, one to one initiatives, and iPads. A robust network is required; it takes a lot of thought, and looking at the resources available to make that happen. Some eight years ago, we established the network that you are residing on today that is going on behind the scenes to make all of this happen.

The technologies we currently use, as we have said, manage a one-to-one laptop initiative district wide. With that we have been slowly embracing the iPads but we do have a variety them. But when you already have a one-to-one initiative blending it in takes some thought as to where it can fit in. We are very fortunate there. We use a combination of Netbooks as well as our MacBooks of which the SBE had an opportunity to see.

Dr. Ford – Just before we started I was working with a group of teachers and superintendents in California and one of things superintendents voiced was they do not want their technology to just become a babysitter or a toy to use during the last 30 minutes of class because you have nothing better to do. On this campus one of the things you will see is that technology is transparent to learning and is an intricate part of the process. It is not just a superficial devise that sits there for when a student is done early can be played on. It is an actual part of what is going on with the instruction and kudos to the teachers for redesigning parts of their curriculum to make that happen.

Mr. Parks – We were certainly able to do that through a component that cannot be absent. I learned this in the early days of mistakes and that is professional development. Sustained ongoing professional development is absolutely necessary to success. It has to focus on authentic uses and allowing teachers to develop professional communities. This is why we use twitter. In many schools across the state twitter is a bad word but it is one of our strongest professional learning communities that we have where they have real time access to ideas, strategies, and abilities to one with another. In our classes we have one or two teachers teaching at each grade level. They are great folks and professionals

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

that have ideas to share and it limits them in terms of the number of ideas that they can borrow from. It is where professional learning communities really bring to life the opportunities to better engage our students. The key is ongoing sustained professional development.

Dr. Ford - Mr. Park is very active on a global scale in professional development to find the best of the best practices, and get them tucked into the things that are going on here on campus. When we talked about distance learning for some people it is kind of a bad word but for most distance learning is not just a onetime class that we teach. It is opportunities to take students to places, opportunities for professional development, and opportunities to use a lot of different tools. Some of which sometimes are even generated by the students.

Mr. Parks –On the screen you are seeing what was an actual live shot of our students on the lawn and private access of Mt. Vernon. We had the opportunity to stay at Mt. Vernon four days in their private quarters, and did a live virtual field trip from the location. When we talk distance learning it is not just video technology, but it brings the iPads, laptops, and video production technologies to life where students are a part of creating the story and telling history. They tell the stories in their backyard, which is where we started by telling these stories in our backyard and suddenly the backyard becomes Mt. Vernon. These types of opportunities have happened for our students at Howe schools all by starting somewhere.

Dr. Ford – I think you are right on and I want to jump on what you said about “starting somewhere.” So many times people have expressed they are overwhelmed and are asking “where do we go?” What we talk about is identifying that flashpoint for implementation and we are not just talking about technology but about transforming the way we do business as an organization. If you start there and grow the technology we need to make that happen now, you can begin to spider out throughout the organization. The distance learning opportunity we thought we would be concurrent enrollment or the class turns into students standing on the lawn of Mt. Vernon delivering content. It turns into them being able to go to Ft. Smith to the National Historical Monument, hanging out at Judge Parker’s courthouse, and delivering content to kids in Vermont. So it is no longer writing and regurgitating information that we are learning, it is applying the knowledge in a real world circumstance and situation.

Mr. Parks – With that digital learning, you noticed we did not spend long on technology because for us it is not about the technology. Technology is just a tool in the process. It is about the resources that we can bring to the table, and so digital learning allows for those software programs to come to life. It is having curriculum portals such as Edmodo and Moodle where teachers can use either as a filing system to gather the resources together to create the resources they want to use to engage their students. Students log into their assignments and are able to interact and engage with the content. It brings outside content in and gets kids involved in doing email, using goggle accounts to work with the very tools we work with every day. To put the students in social sites for us Edmodo is that safe environment site. Some may choose to embrace Facebook, we use Facebook to advertise what we are doing but there are safe venues where we can actually get our kids working. Part of digital learning for me is the digital citizenship. If we are not teaching our kids best practice who is going to be doing it. Yes, we have some good homes out there with very involved parents who try to teach their kids best practice. But we have many kids that have access to technology but have no guidance on the proper use and practical ways, things to be guarded for, copyright laws, or what

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

happens if you get caught at places that are not appropriate, etcetera. We are here as a partnership to help educate our kids on best practice and that is if we want focus on the standards, the skills, but it is one of the very important standards our workforce needs. It is graduates that know best practice and focus on using it as a legitimate tool in the process versus a hindrance to the process.

Dr. Ford –I worked with teachers at a school district on Monday and one of the things they were concerned about, even though I was showing them a lot tools they could use but sometimes their mindset from a technology implementation standpoint the folks who are behind the scenes, was “no you can’t, no you can’t” or “you can’t access this, what will happen to our network when you do that.” Mr. Parks allows us to be able to say “yes you can” and lets empower you to do that. Now does that mean we just threw everything wide open for everything? No, absolutely not. When we are looking at opportunity, as was mentioned using twitter, Facebook, etc., I would venture to say many schools, even in our own state, block those sites for student use. What we are doing is preparing the next generation workforce to be responsible with these tools so that when they get on the job to not just waste time in social media portals, but to use them as a part of the authentic work that is due to their employer. Again, there is a fine balance to be struck here, but it must be said that we cannot just block things. It is a process of the educational process in what to do.

Mr. Parks – With that we move onto blended learning and online learning. Certainly, this has provided tremendous opportunity for us to create a blended learning environment as the SBE was able to see our teachers utilizing in some cases a very traditional means of educating. Some are very engaging, authentic ways of working with our students in differentiated instructional practices to include as a result of our State Department of Education (SDE) providing Think Through Math. It is a prime program where we are able to individualize instruction and use it as an enrichment tool. We reflected on Think Through Math which has been wonderful for us but when we look at the mass number of resources, we are perhaps not the biggest user of it even though we do use it. We use many other resources hand-in-hand with that resource according to the tools teachers have found that work effectively for them. It has become a tremendous component to who we are and it is currently free to us because the SDE has chosen to fund that and making it a priority for the state. We appreciate that and it brings about an open mind to online learning. We are piloting projects now through Connections Learning to see how that platform works for us. We resisted and I had opportunities a few years ago to embrace a virtual school because we were advanced on technology. I guess it made sense to some out there. I did not like the caliber of curriculum at the time, and wanted something that provided for collaboration, authentic engagement, not just canned curriculum. At this point, we see Connections Learning as one or perhaps many but the one we chose to pilot this semester, to see what it can do to help us continue to change our environment, and provide opportunities for our students. Once again it does go back to the original idea of how can we take ourselves beyond these four walls, how can we open up what the world has to offer appropriately to our students, and not use as the isolation factor excuse as to why we perhaps do not provide the opportunities.

Dr. Ford –You are right on that and the transition is beautiful. When we talk about a real world application with knowledge the students are bringing, it answers their question of “why do we have to know this?” My daughter is 14 and my son is 11 and that is their questions and I can Google this. The answer is because we are expecting that you are going to become an expert, you will own the content in such a way that you can engage people with it. You will own the thought process, the problem solving, the

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

application, so that it is just more than standing up quoting from a powerpoint slide. It is our ability to engage each other that makes us human, makes us want to be with each other and make us commutative beings. Using a tool like project based learning sums up all of these amazing opportunities.

Mr. Parks – Project Based Learning (PBL) is not absent of technology. It is technology rich, authentic learning strategies where students can take the tools provided to them and bring to life these projects. We were very fortunate to be able to work with the Buck Institute in California to develop a background and understanding of PBL. But as we look at common core, we did PBL before common core was an issue for us, but as we look at the comparisons it directly aligns with what the expectations are for common core. We are excited about that.

In wrapping, everybody asks, “well how do you do it?” You have to dream big and you have to start somewhere. We did not do this overnight, but we made a commitment that we would start somewhere. Part of that built out of what teachers would sign up for training with no benefits financially to them, but just a promise of the tools. The promise back in the day of the multimedia classroom was you had one computer and one projector for that day. To build upon that when we rollout our first one-to-one laptop initiative in the fourth grade and experienced successes through some of those same teachers who are committed to changing. We do not want to digitize more of the same. We want to dynamically change the environment. Are we there? No. It is a work in progress; it takes time to understand and to develop new strategies. You have seen an example of it, but you have to start somewhere. I believe by starting somewhere many of our opportunities come to pass. I know for a fact that once we started we had to figure out what to do for fifth grade. The fourth grade teacher wasn't giving up the resources and they wanted to work with their new fourth graders. The fifth grade teacher wasn't going back to the old way, even though they had not experienced the new way, because their kids were fully engaged through authentic learning strategies. We found small grants and small financial opportunities that built into bigger grants, and by doing something made us a player in large financially funded initiatives. It also changed the mindset of our board of education and helped them to understand the benefits to the point that we started lease purchasing to replenish our inventory. So, it becomes a combined effort. We usually leverage our dollar to get the real dollars but there are occasions where we develop a belief and understanding that if we will buy it the needs will be taken care of. We have eroded the textbook process without saying no to textbooks. But as teachers understand and embrace them they become less and less dependent on “Oops, it is adoption time.” I do not know the last time, this may be wrong for me to say, we actually looked at an adoption cycle. Because that is the dynamic changes that have occurred for our district.

We appreciate you coming out and taking time out of your busy schedules to look at our school. We are excited about where your initials are going Superintendent Barresi in trying to move the state forward. I think there are many great things on our horizons and we are excited to be a part of it. Thank you.

Superintendent Barresi – Thank you very much. Board Members may have questions for you. Board Members I think it is important to put this within context, when Superintendent Parks came to Howe schools the district was, let's say, financially strained. He had to bring the district out of that through his management strategies and then begin to put the seed in the work with his faculty towards this effort. I think what I

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

have heard today from faculty was the training and support they had and how they felt engaged and a part of this process. It was truly one of those all hands on deck efforts.

Superintendent Parks – Are any of your board members present that you might introduce them to the State Board?

Mr. Parks – Board President, Elvis Hall; Dwayne Leatherwood, Clerk; Vickie Jirash, Board member-elect. Vickie comes onboard February 18 and another member was present for the luncheon but had to return to work. Our board members have been a big part of this. Had they not opened themselves up to what we were talking and trying to do, because it was challenging back in the day, but they were instrumental in many of our successes, and I cannot say enough. As you mentioned it would not have happened had it not been for all hands on deck. The staff has been phenomenal to embrace a different way of doing and thinking. The Technology Director, the first was Dr. Ford then Tammy Parks, our current Technology Director/Integration Specialist, if it was not for people like them with their communication skills, and effectively pushing the ideas. Our lead teachers are used to working within their buildings to encourage, promote, give feedback, and have made a world of difference for moving things forward.

Mr. Derrel Fincher, Director of Learning Technologies - This is learning in the digital age and we talk about digital learning. I want to think about learning in the digital age and what that looks like. The key word is learning. It is not about the technology or digital it is about the learning that goes on. Whenever we talk about any of this technology we want to keep it in terms of what the learning is. You saw an excellent example of learning with digital technologies and using it to connect to other people, information, knowledge, and even connecting to your memory. Things you used to remember you now connect to it and just remember how to get there instead of the fact it self. It is used to communicate with others whether it is across the room, in another room or across the world. Use it for collaboration where you are actually working together and that brings us into creation. The joint creation, how do you actually create things whether you are working together in a room, across the state or across the world? There are several implications that we have here, the shifts, infrastructure, professional capacity, and potential directions. Digital age shifts, think about what is happening out there. The concept of where information is previously used to be restrictive. When you went into a classroom you got it from the textbook or from the teacher. Now with these little tools it is everywhere, anywhere that you can get it, and you can go from restrictive to everywhere. If you look out there school is starting to move from just content to trying to get information to you into how do you actually build knowledge. If we go out and actually look at what they were doing at Mt. Vernon, they were actually trying to create the knowledge out of there. Teacher focus is moving from the teaching and instruction where it is how I can get the perfect lesson to what is a student learning and how are they doing that in an authentic situation. The learning focus is starting to go from artificial. Remember when we were in school they took everything apart and gave it to you in little chunks and somehow hoped you would reassemble it together. But looking at that in an authentic context if you are actually out doing something how are you able to go out and learn from what is going there. That is the authenticity that we kept hearing and scheduling in schools, which we will talk about more, going from scheduling where you have a predefined schedule and going to everything in a period, to much more flexible schedules where it is much more open. You spend the time that is necessary to do each part, it is flexible in there, and this brings us to infrastructure. February is Oklahoma School Speed Test month and this is critical. Teachers and students are asked to run speed tests at their schools because we need to build up the speed test. When you look at

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

the recommendations for bandwidth in schools by 2014 and 2015 the State Educational Technology Directors Association has recommended that schools have 100 megabits per second for every 1000 students and staff. What does that really mean? What that means is, just compare to some of our laws, our Oklahoma Universal Service Fund that pays for internet in schools which gives you a little money will pay for 15 students at that rate per school building. It is a huge amount of bandwidth that we are talking. They actually have 400 megabits here and no other school that I know has that for this number of students. So we would need the bandwidth we are doing on there. As we work in the infrastructure of course we also have to get the technology into people's hands. How do they actually get it, actually use it, how are we going to get that in with the challenges we have in there? Our near term is how we actually start getting ready because we have test coming in 2014-2015 but the long term is we do not do this for testing. We are actually doing everything we are going to do for learning. That brings us to developing professional capacity and as you heard how Mr. Parks and Dr. Ford worked with the teachers and the vision. First thing we have to work with, and we will do all of these simultaneously, is how do you work with the board and superintendents to understand the power of the technology as demonstrations like this. How do they get to the point where they can actually think about what actually happens? How do they get to the point where they can actually talk to their IT director? It becomes important for the IT director because, as Dr. Ford said, so many of them say "no, no, you can't get on", that is an issue we have to address. We have to go out and start working with IT directors to help develop networks for learning. How do you create a network that is flexible for learning but also provides the security needed for your back end? That comes with the development for the directors. How do you do the authentic teaching and learning with the technology? How do you get beyond just replicating what is done on paper and actually using the power of the technology to do things never been able to do before? Mt. Vernon, you were never able to do that before until you had the technology that we have. We are working with the universities to bring the pre-service teachers up to speed because they have come out of essentially technology poor environments. When we talk about digital natives I tend to think of them as digital abandonees. Mr. Parks talked about the fact they do not know how to use and operate in this world is because they have been abandoned in the digital world. Schools have a key part of working with parents and children to help them understand how to do this. If we don't do it who else would and this brings us to potential directions we would look at for going here. We have to connect the students with the powerful devices and these challenges we must overcome. You have heard the term authenticity when talking about authentic blended learning and will continue to hear it because if you are learning how to do this to work with the technology in an authentic way that everybody is able to learn as if you were an expert in the field. How do experts learn, how do you work, how do you have the flexible time, and that brings you into the blended learning where you are able set up your times and making them flexible. You have times when you are working on projects or together and may not have teacher in the room and just a resource and/or maybe meeting elsewhere. You're flexible in the time and flexible in the space. Then there will be time when you meet a master or teacher to work with this. It also brings the potential of developing virtual academies. If you are in a place like Howe that is very far away how do you bring the world in? For example, if you are interested in doing public service, how could you get into a virtual academy to work with others in public service and can we create those? These are things we have to look at to see if we can do them and if we can do them in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) of which Mr. Jeff Downs will address. Thank you for time and your attention.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Superintendent Barresi – Mr. Fincher we are very pleased to have you here. He is relatively new to the staff and we certainly appreciate all of your efforts at the department. Mr. Downs will present a video presentation overview via Skype with the SDE STEM team. Mr. Josh Flores is also present for English and Language Arts.

Mr. Jeff Downs, Executive Director, STEM – The members of the STEM team are Ms. Tiffany Neill, Director, Science; Mr. Levi Patrick, Director, Secondary Mathematics; and Ms. Sara Snodgrass, Director, Elementary Mathematics. Thank you Superintendent Barresi for the opportunity to be here to talk about what we in my department talk about 24/7-digital learning. Mr. Parks mentioned Think Through Math, and when we first started the pilot rollout of the program Howe Schools volunteered to jump onboard and started trying the program out. They have not looked back since then and now have numerous tools that enhance the experiences of the students. We are glad they are using Think Through Math. After looking at all of the digital learning experiences that are available Think Through Math is just an awesome experience for students. The program approach can simply be explained by its intentions to teach the students how to think and not how to just get information to pass the test for the moment. It is a highly engaging program and extremely successful no matter where it has been plugged into the state for three key reasons; the program differentiates the students experience based on how they are best motivated; provides adaptive content that keeps the student working in their developmental zones; and provides strategic interventions that are imbedded into the program as well as live instructional help when a student needs it the most.

As of right now, today January 31, there are 267 districts in the state using Think Through Math. There are 534 schools, 64,667 students, and over 8,422,000 problems solved since September 1. The in school problems to even bring that down a little further, 6,485,227 math problems have been solved in school. Even better the out of school time had 1,937,146 math problems, and approximately 280,347 lessons have been completed. We didn't start this counter until September 1 and it does not include the pilot program. It is a lot of math no matter how you slice it. We are very proud of our partnership with Think Through Math and how they are working things. In fact, we are so proud that we have also developed the first ever Oklahoma Math Cup contest which was held last fall. The results came in prior to Christmas, and a fifth grade class in Cyril, Oklahoma took home the state championship. They have a very cool banner hanging in their cafeteria with everyone's signature, as well as, a video of me doing the chicken dance in their cafeteria. We are planning to have this class and the three other classes that did very well in the contest at the Capitol during the month of February. The date has yet to be determined but they will celebrate their successes and be given an award which we are looking forward to.

I want to briefly mention one of the key elements of our statewide strategic STEM plan that is almost in completion phase and ready for the SBE to review. The plan is in regards to what Mr. Fincher reviewed about virtual presence in virtual academies. We have projects within as an element of our plan that will be called our Oklahoma Virtual Academy. The purpose of it is to allow students to receive an exceptional STEM experience without leaving a school or their home. The overlying theme of the academy will be that of integration and application of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. The STEM Focus Fields of Study will embody the courses offered through this academy for rigorous and relevant experiences that give them real world chances that they may not have in districts such as Howe that we have seen already today. This platform will also focus on professional development for educators and give

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

opportunities to use and understand emerging technologies that can be powerful tools to enhance a student's experience with STEM. These are some of our bold ideas we want to go forward with digital learning. My Directors back at the SDE will briefly comment what they see digital learning is doing in their subject fields.

Ms. Tiffany Neill – The possibilities are endless. Some of the things we look forward to initiating are communities of practice where STEM professionals can communicate with students in schools to analyze data and analyze research. We also want to build up opportunities for students to share things they are doing in virtual ways. Things like *emagazines* or digital magazines where they can showcase some of their science writings and findings.

Mr. Levi Patrick – The key point I think we all agree on is that students have the opportunity to communicate what they are learning. That process of being able to talk about what you are doing is so critical. But the standard classroom is a very limited amount of time where you have 45 minutes, 53 minutes or whatever the time blockages. It is not always about timing, really getting into a deep conversation what you are experiencing or what you are struggling with. I think, especially in math, the technology provides students with opportunities to communicate outside the classroom and maybe not just with the people around them but also with people anywhere who are going through the same struggles. It is an incredibly, meaningful, metacognitive brain intensive experience for the students benefit. I think teachers with technology have the ability to innovate a little more. They need to see the way kids are interacting and get to see other ideas that are being had around the country and world which helps all of us. I have benefited from having technology from being imbedded in technology. I have good ideas but I have better ideas when somebody gives me a head start on it.

Ms. Sara Snodgrass – To wrap it up, knowing that students can gather and analyze data, can collaborate and share virtually, and the outcome of that creates students that are excited about learning math and science. They can then apply that knowledge to real world situations instead of just the textbook full of problems.

Superintendent Barresi – Thank you very much. At this time I'll open this up to anyone that has questions or comments for Superintendent Parks, our team or the SBE.

Board Member Baxter – I want to make a comment to Jeff on where I live it is pronounced Cyril and not Cereal, Oklahoma. I raise the point because that fifth grade class is winning a math award and I tell you that in Cyril they would look to Howe as being a large school. Cyril is a tiny rural, very economically burdened community that is just doing wonderful things like Howe. I am glad you stumbled upon them the way you have. I am real proud of them and they are a great, great small school with the same kind of commitment that we see here. So now if we can proliferate this statewide we will have a real winner.

Mr. Downs – Absolutely, I can't agree with you more on that. To close out on that I was told Cyril school has a 79 percent poverty rate. When I walked into that school the students were the happiest that I probably have ever seen and they are learning by leaps and bounds.

Board Member Ford - I have a comment for all who have presented. Thank you Mr. Parks for letting us come to your school today and thanks to the advanced team as I call it. I didn't know a world like this could actually exist. When I went to school it was

literally four walls but now we are watching robotics, learning German, or to the kindergartner who is playing a game and doesn't know they are learning. What has most hit me today is that this community is a rural community, and wealth does not limit your opportunities of which you have clearly embraced and took the step forward. It wasn't a 'we don't know what to do, so we are not going to do anything' but you took the big first step not really knowing what it was going to mean. I am really impressed with the teachers embracing that this was going to be different but we can do it. What you are giving to this community and to the state I applaud you all for that.

Superintendent Barresi – As we heard today Superintendent Parks talked about the process they went through to get to this. The word resources I am sure were upper most in his mind. He knew he had the vision and had the plan but how to fund it. Superintendent Parks and his staff carefully managed their money but then also as he said most vigorously wrote grants and with one grant additional opportunities came to them. We have some challenges facing us in the state. We have needs that need to be met in a relatively quick manner. The state needs to vastly improve in its infrastructure and its ability and readiness to deliver technology to students in every single one of our school districts. This must be possible for all children in this state. Certainly not chief among that but an important element of that is the delivery of the PARCC exams in the spring of 2015. We need to work on connectivity, bandwidth, devices, and professional development. With that in mind we are engaging in discussion with the Legislature and Governor's office at proposing the State Lottery Fund be removed from the state formula and replaced with dollars. The State Lottery Fund becomes a permanent dedicated source for technology within the State of Oklahoma so that we cannot only establish this capability but sustain it onward. This will not be the full amount of money every district needs but what it will be is that important foundation and important leverage point. We need to engage those within the community and interested organizations that want to join with this. I think as we begin this effort, as did Superintendent Parks, you discover you have partners everywhere that you did not know you had and opportunities begin to open to you. We want you to know that aggressively we will be working towards that and engaging the Legislature and Governor's office towards that line.

Once again Superintendent Parks, amazing, amazing! Thank you for opening up your district to us, and letting us know what is possible for the rest of the children of the State of Oklahoma. It is fantastic and this is possible everywhere. Thank you very much. We are grateful to you for all the work. Thanks to the advanced staff that came down and all the dedicated individuals at the department.

CONSENT DOCKET APPROVED

Discussion and possible action on the following deregulation applications, statutory waivers, and exemptions for the 2011-2012 school years, and other requests:

- (a) **Allow Two School Days in a 24-Hour Period – 70 O. S. § 1-111**
Allen Public Schools, Pontotoc County
Porter Consolidated Public Schools, Wagoner County
- (b) **Length of School Day - 70 O. S. § 1-109**
Leach Public School, Delaware County

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

- (c) **Library Media Specialist Exemption – 70 O. S. § 3-126**
Oklahoma City Public Schools, Oklahoma County
Elementary Schools: Adams, Britton, Eugene Field, North Highland, Prairie Queen, Jackson Middle School, U. S. Grant High School
- (d) **Planning Period – OAC 210:35-9-41 and OAC 210:35-7-41**
Haskell Public Schools, Muskogee County
Jones Public Schools, Jones Middle School, Oklahoma County
- (e) **Library Media Services – OAC 210:35-5-71 and 210:35-9-71**
Ringwood Public Schools, Major County
- (f) Request approval on recommendations from the Teacher Competency Review Panel for applicants to receive a license - 70 O. S. § 6-202
- (g) Request approval on exceptions to State Board of Education regulations concerning teacher certification – 70 O. S. § 6-187
- (h) Request approval of sponsorship/donation from Crest Fresh Market, Edmond, Oklahoma, to provide cookies and coffee for the Math and Science Partnership Day at the State Capitol – 70 O. S. § 3-104(12)
- (i) Approval requested to award Advanced Placement Vertical Team grants - 70 O. S. § 1210.701-703
- (j) Approval requested to award Advanced Placement Training grants - 70 O. S. § 1210.701-703
- (k) Approval requested to award Advanced Placement First-Time Materials and Equipment grants - 70 O. S. § 1210.701-703
- (l) Approval requested to award Advanced Placement Second-Time Materials and Equipment grants - 70 O. S. § 1210.701-703
- (m) Request for Bishop Public Schools, Comanche County, to use \$50,000 of its general fund to make expenditures for capital needs – OAC 210:25-5-4
- (n) Request approval for St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, an Oklahoma Private School Accreditation Commission (OPSAC) private school, wishing to participate in the Lindsey Nicole Henry Scholarships for Students with Disabilities program - 70 O.S. 13-101.2
- (o) Request approval of Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) allocations as authorized under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) – OAC 210:40-83-3

Board Member Hofmeister – I request pulling item 6. (g) and (o) from the Consent Docket for questions.

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the Consent Docket absent of item 6. (g) and (o). Board Member Shdeed seconded the motion. The motion carried with the

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Ms. Hofmeister yes; General Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Board Member Hofmeister – I was not sure what this meant and want clarification to understand. Item 6 (g) says request approval on exceptions to the State Board of Education regulations concerning teacher certification. I assume that is something that is standard that we change... It does not spell out what those were.

Board Member Ford – I think we went into this in-depth after we came on the SBE but before Ms. Hofmeister did.

Superintendent Barresi – You are right. Ms. Hofmeister prior to the Board expressing its desire to place this on the Consent Agenda if there were exceptions to the certification requirements previously those applicants would come before the State Board to discuss with them. The Board made its desire known that if they received documentation about these individuals they believed could be placed on the Consent Agenda. Hopefully, that will meet also with your approval.

Board Member Hofmeister – That does. Thank you.

Board Member Ford – Does that make sense?

Board Member Hofmeister – Yes, thank you.

Superintendent Barresi – You had a question about item 6. (o).

Board Member Ford – May I move approval of item 6. (g)?

Board Member Hofmeister – We can combine them.

Superintendent Barresi – That is allowing for qualified zone academy bond allocations. The amounts are under item 6. (o) for Allen Public Schools, Bethany Public Schools, Pocola Public Schools, Stonewall Public Schools and Middleberg Public Schools.

Board Member Hofmeister – I am not clear on what the qualified zone academy bond allocation is. I take it this is just a pass through from federal sources....

Superintendent Barresi – Yes. It's a federal grant. I'm trying to draw on my memory banks as I've engaged with this actually several years ago. This is qualified zone academies who may then receive free or reduced interest rates on QZAB obligations. I think this around capital improvements within their schools. Somebody please correct me if I am at all wrong.

Ms. Nancy Hughes, Executive Director, Financial Accounting – This is an Internal Revenue Services (IRS)...it is called quality zone academy bonds and is a federal government...happened back in 1989. Schools can apply for this money, and Oklahoma has \$5.1 million to spend by December 2013. The bonds are for renovating or repairing buildings, investing, equipping, updating technology, development of challenging curricula, and training quality teachers. Applications were sent to school districts and this is the list of districts that have applied for this money.

Board Member Hofmeister – Is that a competitive process or a use it up until it is gone?

Ms. Hughes – It is a first-come, first-serve basis. If they have met the criteria and once it is gone it is gone.

Board Member Hofmeister made a motion to approve Consent Docket items 6. (g) and (o). Board Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Professional Standards Production Report

Superintendent Barresi – Board Members you have a traditional monthly report on teacher certification. Do you have any questions regarding the production report? There were none.

These were reports only and no action was required.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Office of Educational Support

Award Six Reward School Grants Approved

Superintendent Barresi – Board Members this is a grant you approved last spring and we are getting ready to do some exciting announcements today.

Ms. Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Educational Support – Thank you so much for the honor of being able to be a part of this grant opportunity. The SBE has awarded or set aside \$400,000 for this award and we are honored to tell you about the schools that have applied.

The theory of action behind this grant is that if schools get to celebrate their successes and share the successes with schools that are struggling that all schools have an opportunity to improve. This is part of Oklahoma's Raise the Grade Together initiative.

The purpose is to give grant funds to Reward Schools, either high performing or high progress, so that they can celebrate those wonderful accomplishments and then partner with a Priority School to help them make improvements as well. Our vision is that this will increase the number of schools that receive Reward School status while reducing the number of school that receives Priority School status. These will be 17 month grants, and since today is January 31 we hope to get this award first thing in February. Schools will have until June 2014 to spend their funds for two different types of activities. Celebration of success activities in the Reward Schools and then partnership activities in both the Reward and the Priority School that will help them to be more successful. Schools will be able to apply based on the number of certified employees in the partnerships. Between the Reward School and Priority School they could apply for up to \$50, \$75, \$100 or \$125 thousand dollars. We will be monitoring the

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

implementation of the grant throughout the next 17 months, but even more than that we want to allow the schools to mentor other schools that might apply in future years or would like to use their local funds to increase this type of activity across the state. They will be encouraged to share with us at VISION2020, REAC³H Summits, local REAC³H network meetings, and other activities where schools get to share their successful strategies with one another.

The partnerships must include a Reward and Priority School but can include any other entity that wants to be a part of the partnership to help schools be more successful. Several of the applicants did include businesses in their community, local school foundations, universities, and other entities.

I want to share a few of the proposed celebration of excellence activities included in the six applications that we are suggesting to be awarded. Today we heard about professional learning communities that many of the schools talked about wanting to increase their professional learning communities and professional development that particularly focused on common core, and that they are considering a way to celebrate their successes. Two schools talked about developing beautification or greenhouse projects that would encourage both learning and a more beautiful environment at their schools. Several talked about having family or community celebration nights to celebrate the involvement of others outside the school that helped them become successful. Some talked about how they could include technology into their schools to incorporate more of the digital learning, and use their success and any potential funds from that success to help them increase their digital learning opportunities. The last two, I love, are ways of celebrating academic excellence in a school with pep assemblies and honoring through a Hall of Fame of those people in their schools that have been successful on an academic front not only in the athletics or the arts. A few more suggestions included donations to the school libraries. One in particular wants to focus on Native American resources in their school library because although the school has been very successful their Native American students are still struggling. They want to increase that opportunity. Several talked about teacher mini grants, in other words rewarding some of these funds to help teachers get the resources they need in the classrooms for some innovative ideas. One school would like to take all of their school and faculty, grades 3 through 8, on a trip to Washington, D.C. Maybe they can partner with Mr. Parks in sharing some of those experiences back with others in their community.

A few examples of the proposed partnership activities that will be happening across the Reward School and the Priority School again we hear a lot about PLCs only in this case it not within a school it is across school PLCs. Common core transition talks a lot about using digital learning opportunities for teachers. Online collaboration, book studies, common planning periods so that teachers in these two different buildings can have time during the school day to collaborate via Skype or other opportunities. Site visit exchanges and peer mentors so that every teacher in the Priority School has someone from a Reward School they can talk to about what works and does not work. We saw a lot about flipped classrooms in the partnership activities particularly where a Reward School is somewhat successful in that area and a Priority School is somewhat successful in that area and then collaborating in together in increasing those opportunities.

Several of the strategies talked about what they want to do with students by inviting students to participate in and deciding what they need to do to get better. Use students as peer tutors from one building to another. One of the most exciting opportunities was little free libraries which is a community service project. One of the grants talked about

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

really stepping outside of what is available in their own community by creating mini libraries that they currently do not have in their small community. Sharing between the town where the Reward School and Priority School is those resources that are maybe in some children's homes but not in all children's homes.

We are recommending the awarding of six Reward and Priority School partnerships. The total request of these six that ranked the highest in the scoring process was \$425,000. Since we have \$400,000 to award and it is our recommendation they each be reduced by 1/16 of their request in order to total the \$400,000, just a few thousand off of each of the six requests.

Board Member Ford – I have a questions or maybe a concern. We had 229 eligible we had 14 applications.

Ms. White – Yes. Some of the things I heard from a few of the Rewards Schools, one was the requirement to partner with a Priority School. We asked them to look for a Priority School that we thought they might have similarities with where they could share some those successes. Priority Schools are encouraged to participate if they were invited to do so. Because of other initiatives that Priority Schools have going on working to increase their student achievement in their school were a little overwhelmed by the idea of another grant. Therefore, some of the Priority Schools chose not to participate. In other situations we had Reward Schools that were interested that could not find a Priority School that was of similar demographic and they were not sure they had things they could share with a Priority School that maybe was vastly different from them. We also heard from Rewards Schools that said this sounds like a great idea let us try next year. We just have too much going on right now but we would love to be a part of this if it continues in the future.

Board Member Ford – Maybe when they see those checks start rolling out to some of these districts they will say “hey, maybe we should apply.”

Ms. White – I think some of them were shocked that we only had 14 applicants and several of them were expecting that they just would not have a chance so they didn't even try.

Board Member Ford – They don't have a chance if they don't apply. Thank you.

Board Member Baxter – These applications came from both schools?

Ms. White – The Reward School is the lead on the application and required to work with the Priority School in developing those partnership activities.

Board Member Baxter – So the Priority School was included and identified in the application, and how all that will have to work? I think this is really great.

Ms. White – Yes.

Board Member Ford made a motioned to approve the six grants and Board Member Baxter seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; General Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Update on the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System (TLE) Implementation

Ms. Laura McGee, Executive Director, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness - Thank you Superintendent Parks for having us here from someone who is deeply excited about the new Teacher and Leader Effectiveness tool. I would say that your teachers deserve exemplary or a 5 on their use of technology in the classroom, and I hope they will be willing to mentor other teachers throughout this state who need to integrate technology in their classrooms as well.

I want to update you on the TLE working group that we started. Every educator in the State of Oklahoma was invited to join our working group on teachers of non-tested grades and subjects, teachers without a teaching assignment such as counselors, nurses, and librarians. We had over 160 educators join us at our first working group and met together as a whole. We will be meeting the first three Tuesdays in the month of February at the Oklahoma Education Association (OEA) headquarters where we will break down into specific content areas. The teachers are working furiously to draft recommendations to the TLE Commission so we can have something to them by the next commission meeting in March, and hopefully have recommendations ready for the SDE. We are posting training opportunities online for our teachers so that they really understand the entire TLE system. Mr. Marty Fulk has been gracious to work with me and we will finish up those projects tomorrow and posted early next week. We have created the Other Academic Measures brochure that all superintendents and leaders in the state have received and it is online. These are recommendations approved by the SBE at the last SBE meeting and are now in a pretty package ready for our people to take hold of. We will hold a statewide video conference to explain other academic measures and the process to local school boards will need to undergo in order to adopt policies in relation to other academic measures. The video conference will take place next week, February 7 at 1:30 p.m. across the state and that information, again, will be posted online.

A qualitative survey was submitted to superintendents in regard to how the implementation of the Marzano and Tulsa TLE models are going throughout the state. That information will be back to me on February 15 and will be available to update the SBE. A lot of the positive comments coming in say that the new TLE system is allowing teachers to really gain professionalism, to have very in-depth instructional strategy conversations with one another, and the principals are excited. They are concerned about the amount of time it is taking in the classroom and we want to be sure to listen to their concerns. Continuing training on both the Tulsa TLE and Marzano frameworks is going on. We had Tulsa TLE training through the statewide video conference at the SDE yesterday and the day before. Two sessions are scheduled for February and our Marzano framework experts will be training the SDE very soon. Marzano will also be presenting at VISION2020 for us, free of charge, which we are appreciate. We of course will be inviting Tulsa trainers to VISION2020.

Superintendent Barresi and some SDE staff were able to hear from the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) which is a multi-tiered system of career advancement, support, evaluation, and compensation. It was created by Lowell Milken and is an arm of the Milken Foundation. I have been invited to join them at the TAP conference and am excited to learn about this additional framework.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Another update is in regard to roster verification which is the process of linking students and teachers as part of our ability to form calculations. Roster verification will be voluntary this year and we will encourage participation from all school districts because in order to get data back through this value added process that is accurate, teachers need to have the opportunity to go into their roster and identify which students they taught and what percentage of time. The Office of Management and Enterprise Services (OMES) is partnering with us as we develop the roster verification program and Battelle for Kids is working with us to provide this service free of charge to every school district in the State of Oklahoma. There are biweekly meetings with OMES, we are working on building communication around value added, and helping districts to understand the timeline in regard to TLE.

Next week the videos will be up so that everyone begins to understand how important this value added piece is in helping teachers determine where they are strong and where they struggle in their instruction. Value added will give us a way to determine how our students are growing and if there is any populations that we need to focus on more intently. The OMES will be training district personnel beginning the first week of March teaching how to upload data into this roster verification system and how to clean the data to make sure it is correct. District administrators and superintendent training will begin the last of March followed by teacher training the first week of April. The roster verification window will take place from April 10 through May 30. Principals will then certify this information and close out the window around June 3. It is really important that roster verification take place very close to the state testing window so that teachers remember exactly who was in their class and the amount of time they are responsible for instruction.

Board Member Baxter – I don't get it. Roster verification does what? The value added is what? The return on the investment is what?

Ms. McGee – As you know as part of the TLE system 35 percent of the teachers evaluation will come from data that is value added measures. We are looking at where a student started and how much that student grew in relation to the average growth in the state. Let's say I teach fifth grade and my child started the year, a student, on a third grade reading level. Although they may not have passed the state test, I helped them increase their reading capacity to the middle of the fourth grade year. The value added measure shows that growth happened for the child and so for the first time instead of just measuring achievement we are measuring academic growth and progress which for a teacher from a teacher is very, very exciting. So when that data is uploaded, and our vendor, whoever is selected, gathers the data and every teacher will receive a value added score. In order to make sure the data is correct; every teacher will have the opportunity to complete roster verification. It is simply a process where a teacher sits down and through this free Battelle for Kids program look over their class list, make sure they indeed teacher every child that year. They may also need to determine if they co-taught with a special education teacher, that perhaps Mr. Price is going to share 20 percent of the instructional time of that student, and I only claim 80 percent because we have a unique co-teaching situation. It allows the teacher to identify the child, who they taught, the amount of time they taught the child, so that the value added calculation can be correctly determined for the teacher.

Board Member Baxter – Is this a component of both models that we are using? Does Marzano have this as part of their model and Tulsa has it as part of their model, or is this additive to that or what?

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Ms. McGee – This is actually the other half of a pie. Tulsa and Marzano is the qualitative piece. This is the quantitative piece, the other half of the pie, where we are looking at data and student progress. On that TLE picture, this is the 35 percent component where we are looking at value added data for the teacher.

Superintendent Barresi – The other 15 percent of the other academic measures.

Ms. McGee – Right, which is everything the SBE approved at the last SBE meeting. Does that make sense?

Board Member Price – When will this be up and running for all teachers?

Ms. McGee – It will be up and running by April 10 through May 30. Again, it will be a voluntary process, just the roster verification.

Board Member Price – Then we will be able to see the evaluation of the value added for the next school year?

Superintendent Barresi – That's a very good point. We just completed yesterday another session of the TLE Commission at which we began to discuss the value component during a three to four hour meeting. There was extreme detailed discussion about the different models, value added, different theories, and how to enact, etcetera. The Commission at that time was not ready to make a decision and we are going to put all that information together, compiling it, and hopefully bring the Commission back to, hopefully, make a decision. In other words, the components that would go into that is making a decision on that value added model whether or not to add race into that, whether or not to add socioeconomic status, whether or not to add such things as English as a second language, whether or not to put that in or to agree to the model that is already a component of the testing for the students. This is going to be presented to the SBE in the future and some preliminary information will be provided around the different bodies of thought about that. I believe there was a great deal of discussion at the last Commission meeting and there is no way, right now, within the next few seconds that I can summarize that for you. Two different theories, maybe even a third theory of thought, and we need to sort through that and decide what is best for Oklahoma.

Board Member Price – I think what I am hearing is that if there is benchmark testing you know going in all those socioeconomic factors and then the value added is what that teacher added to the scores. Then some people want to add those socioeconomic considerations in addition to where the benchmark was.

Superintendent Barresi – It will develop, if you will, a predictive model about where the student should be in terms of their progress. The value added component is the amount that the teacher adds above that predictive value. The questions were around what gets baked into the cake of that predictive model and that is where the discussion is lying right now.

Board Member Baxter – Relatively in the scope of things that a school district has to do every week, month or year is this burdensome, easy, nothing to it, or a laugher? Which is it? This is not something that horribly burdensome.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Ms. McGee – No it is not. It is actually a matter of the teacher keeping good records will be very helpful. We have 24 districts across the State of Oklahoma that has already completed roster verification as part of the GEAR UP program through the Regents. Also, Tulsa is a master at roster verification and we will use their expertise and hopefully partners and districts with one another. It really boils down to a teacher coming into a computer lab perhaps or working on his/her own computer and just simply going through clicking. All the data will already be uploaded and they would just need to verify “yes I had the student,” “no, I did not have the student.” As a point of clarification no value added score will be used in an evaluation until the year 2014-15 as proposed by our bill for a one year quantitative delay. Any district who chooses to partner with us, use the roster verification, and to receive data back is going to have the advantage of dissecting the data and using it inform instruction for the next year before the quantitative portion is a part of a teachers evaluation. For me as a teacher I would welcome this into my life as a professional. I would definitely take the 30 or 45 minutes it takes to verify my roster so that I could get valuable reports back to me letting me know if I am adequately meeting the needs of every child in my classroom.

Board Member Price – Am I understanding the first year 2013-2014 is voluntary and then the 2014-15 is everybody?

Ms. McGee – Actually the way it works is this year, this spring, is the voluntary time frame that is the starting point. Then next year, the 2013-2014 school year, every school district will need to complete roster verification so that value added scores can be generated. As you see in the powerpoint presentation there will always be a year lag between the time we can gather data and the time that data can be used in a teacher’s evaluation. Even though there is a one year delay in the quantitative portion we still need to gather data next year. Does that make sense? Because the results of EOI and OCCT tests are not available until the summer, therefore there will always be a one year delay.

Board Member Price – So you can’t really honor exceptional teachers until the 2014-2015 dates.

Ms. McGee – That is true from a state level, however, every instructional leader in the state of Oklahoma should be continually honoring their exceptional teachers.

Board Member Price – They will know something from the 2013-2014 data? They could honor some of the exceptional teachers?

Ms. McGee – Absolutely.

Superintendent Barresi – To make sure we are all focused on the important aim of this system that will lead to direct, targeted strategies so that teachers can continually improve their craft. This will lead to professional development strategies.

Ms. McGee – Dr. Barresi mentioned our Commission meeting where we did have a great presentation from Dr. John White, Senior Analyst, SAS. The Commission also asked to hear from a vendor called Value-Added Research Center (VARC). Both of these companies create value added measures for education purposes. Another meeting is scheduled in February to delve into this and look at the policy the SDE is going to formulate in regards to value added measures. We are moving ahead to submit and RFP so that we can find our value added vendor and this will be very generic. The value

added vendor will do whatever we asked them to do that are based on the policies that are written. We are drafting teacher of record definitions for roster verification purposes.

All of these are in the effort to ensure that every child in the State of Oklahoma has an effective teacher in the classroom.

This was a report only and no action was required.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

School Districts Who did not meet the Administrative Cost Criteria for the 2011-2012 School Year

Thackerville Public Schools, Cameron Public Schools-Tabled Farris Public Schools - Denied

Ms. Nancy Hughes, Executive Director, Financial Accounting - You have additional information in front of you and I am asking the SBE to waive the penalty on Thackerville Public Schools and Cameron Public Schools on the basis of Title 70 O.S. 5-135.2 because the school district failed to operate the Oklahoma Cost Accounting System (OCAS) due to circumstances beyond their control. The circumstance was that a project code was established to eliminate the non-court judgment contract settlement from administrative cost...

Board Member Ford – Restate the “because” part.

Ms. Hughes – Because we established a project code in the OCAS system to eliminate the non-court judgment contract settlement but it was not available until July 1, 2013. We cannot change a code until the next fiscal year and this happened in 2011-12.

Ms. Kimberly Richey, General Counsel – If you recall Thackerville and Cameron both exceeded their administrative cost because of the superintendent buyout. We have since, since that occurred created an OCAS code where they are able to do that. But for the creation of that code they would not have been in excess of their administrative cost.

Board Member Ford – On Thackerville for my own clarification, director, coordinator or consultant, roughly \$60,000. Cameron director, coordinator, consultant \$3700, tell me what that is. What is a director, coordinator or consultant?

Ms. Hughes – Yes. Under Thackerville it could be the director of several programs or it could be several people. For Cameron it is probably just one. These are considered administrative cost according to the law.

Board Member Ford – So we created a code so that in the future if the buyout exceeds that it will have a code. We will not have to approve...

Ms. Richey – It will not be lumped into administrative cost any longer.

Board Member Baxter – Did we ever in the history of the SBE not waive this stuff every time? Every time we just waive it.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Board Member Ford – Let's talk about Farris Public Schools. We have a superintendent that has his salary, fixed cost associated with that salary, principal, teacher, counselor, and librarian salary all lumped in together and the fixed cost associated with that.

Ms. Hughes – yes.

Board Member Ford – That is where our exceedence is?

Ms. Hughes – No. The only exceedence is the part of the superintendent. The principal, teacher, counselor, library salary that he received is not part of administrative cost. I only gave that to you for your information. That is the total compensation.

Board Member Ford – Is it an ongoing waiver? Tell me how often have we waived the superintendent's overage for Farris?

Ms. Hughes – Unless it was due to an OCAS coding error it cannot be waived.

Board Member Hofmeister – Could you remind me of how many students are in the school district of Farris.

Ms. Hughes – Approximately 50.

Superintendent Barresi – The distinction here is if you look at Farris Schools it was not due to an OCAS accounting error. All three of these in front of you we will vote on each of the three. It has been recommended that you waive because they are eligible, Cameron and Thackerville.

Board Member Ford – Similar to those when we used to have the massive amount of people come in and ask us and the only reason we could waive them was a data error or coding issue.

Ms. Hughes – I understand this is when the Board asked to establish this code.

Board Member Price – How large is Thackerville and Cameron?

Ms. Hughes – They are under 500 students.

Board Member Shdeed – Cameron has the highest of any of them at 10.03 percent. Maybe that is because of a buyout. What was the reason for the buyout?

Ms. Hughes – It was because of a buyout and all I have is the buyout contract which does not state the reason.

Board Member Price – How large is Cameron and with a superintendent making, even without the buyout, it is hard to tell, but maybe \$140,000.

Ms. Hughes – That was the buyout agreement.

Ms. Richey – In your past experience superintendent buyout has typically been because the superintendent has just found another job or has been terminated for cause?

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Ms. Hughes – Yes.

Board Member Shdeed – Why do you buy them out if they are terminated for cause?

Ms. Hughes – Sometimes superintendents have three or two year contracts and maybe in their first year, therefore, may have to buy that three year contract out.

Board Member Ford, Superintendent Barresi – It is “without cause” the contract is bought out.

Ms. Hughes – There are different reasons.

Board Member Price – I would think “with cause” violates the contract and there is no buyout.

Ms. Hughes – It is probably different at each school district.

Board Member Hofmiester – This is really a local control issue.

Ms. Hughes – Yes it is.

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the waiver of penalty for Thackerville Public School. Board Member Hofmeister seconded the motion.

Board Member Baxter – The rational again escapes me. Why are we doing this? They give their superintendent \$32,000 buyout which takes them \$28,000 over their allowed expenses. They owe eight percent of that or whatever it is. Why would we waive that?

Board Member Hofmeister - Would there be consideration for going down a road of litigation, factored into the decisions making of the local board in buying out a superintendent’s contract? I don’t know. Is that ever a consideration to decide what is the least cost for the district?

Board Member Baxter – If somebody resigns and goes to another school you are not going to buy them out and if you terminating somebody... I mean if you want to make a decision to buy them out I guess you do. But that does not excuse you from your overall administrative cost, does it? I can’t imagine the rational.

Board Member Ford – In the event it is better to waive this, what happens?

Board Member Hofmeister – Show me again on here the penalty. Where is that line again?

Ms. Hughes – It is the amount that they exceeded so the total over allowed expenditures is what the penalty will be.

Board Member Hofmeister – So for Thackerville it would be \$28,765.97. For Farris it will be \$9,871.06.

Superintendent Barresi – Farris will not be waived.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Board Member Hofmeister – I want to see what we are talking about and we are talking about waiving for Cameron \$58,000 if we were to waive theirs?

Ms. Hughes – Yes.

Superintendent Barresi – Right now we have a motion around Thackerville if we can consider that.

Board Member Ford – Let me get this straight, so next year we will have a code that will not require them to come to us. Where are the requirements if we have a code and thus it does not come before us to not do massive buyouts? Because the money comes from someplace the classroom, away from teachers, or something.

Mr. Joel Robison, Chief of Staff – Last year when this same issue came up the schools that had exceeded administrative cost came before you; each school came and made their case. At that point in time there were two or three, I forget specifically how many, who fell over the line because of this issue of superintendent buyouts and therefore forced them over.

Board Member Baxter – I don't remember that. Is that right? I thought we were passing on data errors which were the quote of the day.

Mr. Robison – I think there was a concern express by the Board that so far as buyouts are concerned that that was kind of an out of the normal sort of activity. The request of the Board was for us to work with the OCAS system in order to create a new line to show that broken out so it would not necessarily fall into just the superintendent salary line. We have done that, but it will be effective this next school year and it was not during this time.

Board Member Ford – Why are the requirements for the buyout do not fall within the 10 percent. To me and sharing General Baxter's concern, if we...

Mr. Robison – That would be a decision that you could make.

Board Member Ford - I think we have that and what we are doing is we are waiving that. Now we are creating yet another coding issue so that we do not even know what that is. If you get a district and they exceed it by 100 or 50 percent if there is no line then...

Board Member Price – I am all for usually not having things before the Board, but I agree if it is just an open ended deal. Farris is about one-third apparently at least monetarily their total budget amount of what the other two school districts are. We have seen more of what Farris is involved in and had a lot of qualms about the way that was all managed. I would like to at least know why school districts did a buyout.

Board Member Ford – Why would a board approve a buyout when they know it is going to exceed it unless they know that we are always going to waive it.

Mr. Robison – I think, Ms. Richey may correct me, without the Board taking action to exempt any of these three schools the law requires us to assess the penalty. So that is what we would be doing.

Board Member Price – How much is the penalty?

Ms. Hughes – Thackerville is \$28,765.97, Cameron is \$58,397.16, and Farris is \$9,871.06.

Superintendent Barresi – If the Board would like we can back these out of the code so they will come to you.

Board Member Ford – I think they should not only come to us but this needs to be the notice moment, people. If a local school board decides to do that overage that penalty sits there because if we do not have the authority like in Farris' case we have no authority to waive that. If we do not create this special designation for buyout we do not have the authority. So in essence do not do it because this is the ramification and the penalty is yours.

Board Member Ford withdrew the motion to approve the waiver of penalty for Thackerville Public School, and said she would like to table the item.

Board Member Price – Can we set this aside until we find out the reasons for the buyout because to me it is a big deal? Why is there a buyout?

Superintendent Barresi – Thackerville and Cameron will be reported back to the SBE with information surrounding the reasons for the expenditures on the buyouts.

Board Member Ford – Do we need a motion for Farris or can it just sit?

Superintendent Barresi – No, just to advise you to let you know we cannot waive it. This motion is set aside.

Board Member Shdeed – Is Farris an action item that we have to vote “no” if we do not vote “yes?” If we can't waive it...

Board Member Ford – Should we make the motion to deny waiving the penalty?

Superintendent Barresi – Lets go ahead and take that action. That's a little bit of a safer road.

Board Member Ford made a motion to deny the waiver overage on the expenditure for Farris Public Schools. Board Member Baxter seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes; Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

C³ SCHOOLS

Update on the Charter School Application submitted to the State Board of Education by Sequoyah, Inc.

Ms. Kim Richey, General Counsel – You recall at the December meeting Richard Caram and I presented an application for a request to the Board to sponsor a charter school on behalf of Sequoyah Enterprises. At that December Board meeting we made the

initial presentation to you with the information that Mr. Caram and I would continue to work on that application and iron out some additional questions that we had with Sequoyah. Since the December Board meeting, we have met with both the staff from Sequoyah, Office of Juvenile Affairs (OJA), and the Department of Human Services (DHS) since Sequoyah Charter School application request to service populations in both of those agencies custody. Our last meeting was last week and we believed at that point we had most of the details ironed out for you. We received some subsequent information later from Sequoyah asking this Board not to act on this application at this Board meeting, but to postpone it to the February Board meeting. We simply wanted to update you on that and if we continue to hear from Sequoyah this is a matter that will be presented to you in February.

This was a report only and no action was required.

CONSENT DOCKET – ACE Appeals Approved

Recommendation: Acceptance into a selective University based upon verified evidence meeting criteria for granting an exception to ACE graduation requirements – Sapulpa 13-0002

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the recommendation of ACE appeal for Sapulpa 13-0002. Board Member Hofmeister seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; General Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Superintendent Barresi – We would ask for a possible action around convening into Executive Session to discuss employment, hiring all the issues around employment of appointment of Kalee Isenhour as Secretary of the State Board of Education.

Board Member Baxter made a motion to convene into Executive Session.

Board Member Hofmeister – Since the rule promulgation is a report after that, is there a way we would be able to swap those out, and wait to go into Executive Session to the end?

Board Member Baxter withdrew the motion to convene into Executive Session.

LEGAL

Report on Current Rule Promulgation

Ms. Stephanie Moser-Goins, Assistant General Counsel – I am delighted to present an update on where we are in our 2013 rule making process. Before getting into the rules, I want to take the opportunity to remind the public we have a Website and the link is on the front page of our sde.ok.gov Website to our 2013 proposed rule for those out there who would like to follow along as to where we are in our current rule making process. In addition, the Oklahoma Register which is where the Notices of Rulemaking Intent are published, we also include information on the status of our current rules. Copies of the proposed rules, rule impact statements, as well as, information on dates of opening and closing of public comment and dates of the public hearings can be found

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

there. Rulemaking process is the ultimate in Democratic collaboration and I look forward to working with the public on hearing their input on our proposed rule.

We have four rules in our first group that I wanted to update the SBE on today. The Notices of Rulemaking Intent on these rules were published in the Oklahoma Register in the middle January, and public comment is currently open on these rules. A public hearing is scheduled for February 15, 2013, 10 a.m., State Board of Education Boardroom. The information regarding these rules is on the SDE Website. The first of the four rules to be presented for adoption at the February SBE meeting concerns a clarification on the rule involving testing of students with disabilities. With this rule we are particularly clarifying the requirements for scoring of our Oklahoma Alternative Assessment Program or what we call the OAAP. This is the test that is given to students with sever and profound disabilities. We wanted to provide clarification on the scoring phase to make sure the rule clarified the difference in what we needed the qualifications for those scoring the exam versus those who are administrating the exam. Administration of these exams is where our special education teacher expertise comes in. That is where in order to administrate these exams the specialized training, providing access to students with disabilities, and the expertise in assistive technologies comes in. The rules do not really change any requirements on the administration element. It addresses what happens when we submit those exams, portfolios, for scoring and that is done on the end of our testing contractor. What is clarified here is the teams of scores, teams of assessors who are evaluating these portfolios, typically are teams of individuals with expertise in the specific content area that the exam covers. These are broken up, typically, scorers work in teams divided up by content areas and two separate individuals score a particular component of the exam. If there is a discrepancy, a supervisor will operate as a referee to resolve the discrepancy(s). We wanted to make sure people scoring the exams have at least a bachelor's level of education in that particular content area. We have Ms. Christie Stephenson who works with the scorers and supervisors providing training in access. So when reviewing these portfolios they understand the technical elements of the access and assistant technologies they are reviewing in order to understand what it is the special education teachers who are administrating these exams are providing. This is what this rule does.

The second rule involves a change and we are basically revoking a rule involving mobile classroom facilities. This is an outdated program no longer funded therefore we revoke this rule.

Board Member Hofmeister – May I interrupt before you leave the first rule back to the change you were referring to with the portfolio being assessed. The word “teachers” is what you are removing and replacing it with instead of teams of teachers, “teams of assessors”?

Ms. Moser-Goins – Right. We wanted to clarify that teachers are the ones who administrate the exams. It's the scorers and they do not necessarily need to be teachers.

Board Member Hofmeister – What research is that based on?

Ms. Moser-Goins – It is standard industry practice. Even if a contractor wanted to hire teachers solely as their scorers, there are not enough teachers who are able to...it is a shortage in the supply of teachers who are able to take these jobs as scores as well. That is handled on the end of the contractor.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

Board Member Hofmeister – This is a shift from prior to this we did except a certified teacher to be a part of this process?

Ms. Moser-Goins – Actually in our existing contract, this is not how it is being done.

Board Member Hofmeister – Is that the fault of the vendor or is that because we have not had that rule?

Ms. Moser-Goins – That contract was entered into.. It is my understanding that the requirement is not in our contract governing the administration of this exam.

Superintendent Barresi – Are these scored at a remote site?

Ms. Moser-Goins – Yes, in San Antonio.

Board Member Hofmeister – I want to be clear that we are talking about potentially, I want to understand the difference of what this change is and why this is such an important change we are making now. What was the impetus for this? Just because we realized this is not happening.

Ms. Moser-Goins – This is not just typical, it is a typical for scoring companies to require teachers be utilized as scorers. In these scoring processes, the emphasis is on knowledge of the underlining content of the exams. The requirement is not an element of the contracts for comparable assessments. We do not have this requirement in, for example, our OCCT that is not a requirement in those exams.

Board Member Hofmeister – I guess my concern is we are talking about students with disabilities. So I have a concern that the one who would be or a team that is evaluating a portfolio which is going to be more subjective than something that is scantron. Right, obviously because it is a portfolio?

Board Member Ford – Do I understand we have been doing this and have been sending these outside of the rules? We have already been doing this we are just cleaning it up so we are following the rules to do it.

Board Member Hofmeister – So we have been doing something that may not be appropriate it sounds like. I do not know.

Ms. Moser-Goins – To address your substantive concern because it is a very interesting one and a question I had myself. How are we at the scoring level guaranteeing that the people assessing this have an understanding of the special needs kids. That is where our SDE involvement comes in. You notice that in the rule we have a requirement that the supervisor of the scoring team has training in providing access to students with severe or profound disabilities from our office of special education. That is where we serve as a bridge to make sure that knowledge and understanding of the access requirement bridges the scorers who will be the experts in the content that is being assessed. On the front end, the concern with making sure the access is handled on the front end with our special education teachers and administration of the exam. What we are doing here that is the access point, which is the key element in providing that assistive technology to give these kids the full opportunity to demonstrate everything they know.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
January 31, 2013

The bridge we then have an employee who goes and trains our scorers in the access so they understand what they are looking at.

Ms. Richey – Ms. Hofmeister, I know that the USDE has recently weighed in on the way the state has been grading OAAP exams and has tightened up that process. I think that some of this is in response to the way that we were grading OAAPs and the way that we should be grading OAAP exams. Some of this is actually linked to the recent feedback from the USDE.

Board Member Hofmeister – Interesting. I will be interested in hearing public comment.

Ms. Moser-Goins – Thank you. As I mentioned the second rule involves revocation of our...

Board Member Baxter – Are we limited to 30 days of public comment by law?

Ms. Moser-Goins – That is the baseline for what the Administrative Procedure Act requires. However, in fact, you will see later on in our rule making season that we have extended the period of public comment in our last set of rules to accommodate teachers spring breaks. To answer your question, we set the public comment period at 30 days, that is the baseline, but yes we can absolutely extend the public comment period. However, in setting the scheduled, we have to have a sense of what our public comment period up front and in planning out the rulemaking season because we start with our deadline of making sure we get everything in for legislative and gubernatorial approval. For purpose of legislative approval it is important to get our rules submitted for legislative approval before April 1 to guarantee the full 45 days of consideration prior to adjournment.

Board Member Baxter – If we have rules, controversial, far reaching or sensitive rules pertaining to certain issues, why are we not working on those on the front end to give us more time through the process of getting the Legislature than we are these? Not that these are not important, but they are not as important as some of the others? I am concerned that what we are going to do here is we will do all this, get through all the rules, and then get where we were last year, which all this is the most important thing in the world, and you have until Tuesday to submit it to the Legislature. I don't want to be there this year and I am talking about A through F.

Ms. Moser-Goins – Absolutely. One of the reasons that we wanted to tackled those in our last rulemaking... is we also wanting to see if there were any potential legislative changes that would affect our rulemaking process. But the other element of that is even though we...

Board Member Baxter – I just remind you if you decide you are going to wait until there are changes in the legislative process and there is then you have two weeks to do the rules.

Ms. Moser-Goins – I understand your concern and thank you for that input.

Superintendent Barresi – In the event that legislation changes, we will either have to make the decision to come back with emergency rules then make them permanent in the following year.

Board Member Baxter – I think so because I think we need more time on those larger issues, whatever it takes. I do not know what the legislative changes are going to be, it might be minor or major, but I do not think we do not do anything based anticipation of a legislative change. I am sorry I'm interrupting this.

Ms. Moser-Goins – Thank you and that is a valid point. One of the other aspects of this or benefits of saving this for later on in the season, even though we have not opened up our public comment yet we can still get more input on the frontend to go into the initial draft of the rule. Even though the public comment period hasn't officially started and the public comment period will be...

Board Member Baxter – I am sure we will be meeting with a number of folks on all of these issues prior to the 30 day period. But I do not want to be where we were last year on some of these rule changes and just not having the time to give them as much time as they need.

Board Member Ford – Heads up is what he is saying.

Ms. Moser-Goins – Thank you. The second of the four rules involves the mobile classroom program.

Board Member Ford – Who provides that now? Does anybody provide mobile classrooms in the event of a national disaster? The statues have been revoked so we now we need to revoke the rule.

Ms. Moser-Goins – We do not have the resources to be able to provide those. It is a very old program. The third rule deals with the transportation rules. This one is a fairly extensive makeover which currently all of the provisions of the rule are lumped into section 1. We want to break it up into separate sections, organize by discreet sub matters so there is an organizational aspect of the rule we wanted to address. As to the substantive requirement of the rule, one of the additional substantive provisions being changed is the addition of a waiver for monocular vision conditions. The condition involves a reduction of visual acuity in one eye, not both. Currently, our visual standard for school bus drivers was actually regulated at several levels. First, our requirements for school bus certification require the applicant possess a CDL issued by the Department of Public Safety. The visual requirements to obtaining a CDL permit for someone with a monocular vision condition can obtain a CDL and not be able to meet our standards for obtaining a school bus driver certificate. We had a request to address this in terms of a waiver and our proposed solution to address it is to craft a waiver that very closely mirrors a waiver provided by the federal government in a program that has been going on since 1992. Obviously, when we are talking about the field of transportation and school bus driving in particular, the utmost concern is safety. In order to address those safety concerns what we wanted to do is look at what is already out there, has been proven to allow for limited exceptions while still ensuring that the level safety is equal to or greater than the existing rule.

Board Member Ford – You have figured out a waiver like we do with the diabetic...

Ms. Moser-Goins – It is very similar and in fact regarding diabetes rule, the federal government ran a comparable study on the diabetes exemption rules along with this

monocular vision program in 1992. Other substantive change to the rule is the addition of a requirement of a post trip school bus inspection by school bus drivers. Basically, making a sweep of the bus to make sure a child has not fallen asleep, missed their stop and lying in the back of the bus. Imagine with the littler kids this may be a concern so adding the requirement added an extra level of safety. There have been reports, in the State of New York in particular of a child who was accidentally left on a school bus because the child had missed their bus stop. Also, some of the procedural requirements for inspections were updated due to outdated citation to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Act we wanted to address.

Board Member Baxter – Do we address anything in regard to school bus security and safety inside our rules that pertain to standardization or transportation?

Ms. Moser-Goins – With regard to safety, specifically, what are you referring to? Give me an example of the kind of safety concerns?

Board Member Baxter – Maybe you are covering it with children left on buses, access of individuals that are not passengers onto the bus, control access to the bus. I believe we have someone in the department that works school bus issue independently. Trent Gibson has the issue in regard to that and I don't know if they belong in here or not. But I think it is worth looking at and talk to him about because he has a lot of data on the subject that may be a value to you.

Ms. Moser-Goins – Mr. Gibson is amazing and I worked very closely with him in the initial draft of the rules. That is not something he specifically mentioned or requested us to address in this set of rules. But it is something, I am sure, that he would be pleased to look at more closely. I will follow up with him.

Board Member Ford – It may be addressed in current rules.

Superintendent Barresi – We could ask also to review for you new technologies that have come along that will increase security on school buses.

Board Member Baxter – Mr. Gibson is after me to work on school bus safety with the School Security Commission which I sit on. But there may be a way for him to get what he needs in terms of school security here rather than through that commission. I ask that you talk to him about that.

Ms. Moser-Goins – I definitely will. He is a delight to work with. The final proposed rule addresses updating one of the accreditation rules. The language needed to be tweaked to update the way we designate schools in light of our current waiver. The new school designation categories we needed to ensure that our accreditation standards caught up with those current designations.

Board Member Hofmeister – Public comment ends February 15....

Ms. Moser-Goins- February 15 at 4:30 p.m. Again I want to plug our public hearing on that same day at 10:00 a.m. in the State Board Room, at the SDE. If there are any members of the public out there who would like to comment by email, our rules email address is rules@sde.ok.gov. I look forward to hearing from the public on these comments.

This was a report only and no action was required.

Superintendent Barresi – Once again we extend our thanks to Superintendent Parks for an amazing day, and a wonderful experience. You are at the tip of the spear. It is exciting that your kids do not know what they are learning because it is just normal for them. I think we will know we are there when it becomes a normal thing and the kids do not know that they are learning through technology. It is where we are going to make it a part of their environment. To the dedicated staff here, wonderful students, and your equally dedicated board members, we express our thanks.

Board Member Ford – Please extend my thank you to the group of students who synced my phone to my computer so that I can listen to my book on tape on the way home, I would sure appreciate it.

Board Member Baxter – I want to add we meet in Oklahoma City and we come out three to four times a year, and we have just really begun that and want to continue it, but it is coming out to places like Howe that keep people like me on this board. You pass the bureaucracy and things to worry about and you see children getting a great education from committed leaderships and staff. I add my thanks and am so impressed by you all. You have the magic elixir somewhere and don't give it up. Thank you very much.

Board Member Price – I wanted to mention that we may be giving out Mr. Parks' phone number to those superintendents that sit there and say, "well, we can't afford the bandwidth, we can't afford the computers, we can't afford the training of teachers." Apparently, you have been able to do that and manage this school district in a way in which you have been able to achieve all those things. So when superintendents tell me that I may be giving them your phone number to find out how it can be done.

Board Member Price – I thank you for your hospitality it has certainly been an eye opener. I could not be more impressed.

Board Member Hofmeister – Thank you so much for having us. I look forward also to, I think we had a discussion about, gathering more information research about the impact of what you are doing, how we can take that information, and continue to provide compelling reasoning for doing what you are doing here. Thank you.

PERSONNEL

Employment, Hiring, Appointment, Promotion, Demotion, Disciplining or Resignation of Any Individual Salaried Public Officers or Employees – Appointment of Kalee Isenhour as Secretary of the State Board of Education Approved

Board Member Shdeed – I don't think we need to convene. I think we just proceed on this, if you do not mind.

Superintendent Barresi – Ms. Isenhour please stand and greet the Board.

Board Member Shdeed – She is replacing Connie? That's what you asked for?

Superintendent Barresi – Yes.

Board Member Hofmeister – I would actually like to go into Executive Session.

Convene Into Executive Session Approved

Board Member Hofmeister made a motion to Convene into Executive Session for this personnel issue at approximately 3:13 p.m. Board Member Shdeed seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Ms. Hofmeister yes; General Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Return to Open Session Approved

Board Member Baxter made a motion to reconvene to Open Session at 3:25 p.m. Board Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

Board Member Baxter made a motion to appoint Kalee Isenhour as the Secretary of the State Board of Education. Board Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following vote: Ms. Ford, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; General Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Board Member Ford made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:26 p.m. Board Member Hofmeister seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

The next regular meeting of the State Board of Education will be held on Thursday, February 28, 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