

**Minutes of the  
North Carolina State Board of Education  
Education Building  
301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825  
September 2, 2015**

The North Carolina State Board of Education met and the following members were present:

William Cobey, Chairman	Kevin Howell
A.L. "Buddy" Collins, Vice Chairman	Reginald Kenan
Dan Forest, Lt. Governor	Wayne McDevitt
Gregory Alcorn	Rebecca Taylor
Eric C. Davis	Patricia Willoughby

Also present were:

June St. Clair Atkinson, State Superintendent	Keana Triplett, Teacher of the Year Advisor
Rodney Shotwell, Superintendent Advisor	Grace Russell, Senior Student Advisor
Steve Lassiter, Principal of the Year Advisor	Yates McConnell, Junior Student Advisor
James Ford, Teacher of the Year Advisor	

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION**

State Board of Education Chairman William Cobey called the Wednesday session of the September 2015 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting to order and declared the Board in official session. After explaining that today's meeting was being audio-streamed and that the agenda and all materials are posted online, accessible through the State Board's website, he welcomed visitors, online listeners, and Twitter followers.

In compliance with the requirements of Chapter 138A-15(e) of the State Government Ethics Act, Chairman Cobey reminded Board members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest and appearances of conflicts of interest under Chapter 138A. He asked if members of the Board knew of any conflict of interest or any appearance of conflict with respect to any matters coming before them during this meeting. There were no conflicts of interest communicated at this time. The Chairman then requested that if, during the course of the meeting, members became aware of an actual or apparent conflict of interest that they bring the matter to the attention of the Chairman. It would then be their duty to abstain from participating in discussion and from voting on the matter.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

As the first order of business, Chairman Cobey drew attention to the full meeting agenda, which is available on eBoard. The Chairman asked if there were any changes to the agenda that Board members wished to

request. Hearing none, Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve the State Board of Education meeting agenda for September 2 and 3, 2015, as presented.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion made by Mr. Kevin Howell, and seconded by Mr. Gregory Alcorn, the Board voted unanimously to approve the State Board of Education meeting agenda for September 2 and 3, 2015, as presented.*

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

- **Incoming State Board of Education High School Junior Advisor**
  - ❖ **Mr. Yates McConnell (Raleigh Charter High School)**

Chairman Cobey asked Board members to welcome Mr. Yates McConnell as the new high school Junior Student Advisor. Mr. McConnell is a junior at Raleigh Charter High School in Wake County, and is the first charter school student to serve as a student advisor. Mr. McConnell is an active community and school volunteer, an Eagle Scout, Class Vice President last year, is part of student government for Raleigh Charter, and is an all-conference cross-country athlete. Mr. McConnell's other activities include work to renovate a playground, a scout trail at Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico, and has helped rebuild houses for impoverished families in Appalachia. Joined by his parents, Mr. McConnell was welcomed to his first official meeting, and was presented with a plaque and a crystal apple. The presentation was photographed.

**SBE ISSUES SESSION**

Chairman Cobey explained that Issues Sessions provide the Board with in-depth information on relevant education topics. These sessions are, in fact, a part of the Board's required Board member development.

- **Race to the Top Report: Overall Impact and Implementation Findings – Final Report**
  - ❖ **Dr. Trip Stallings (Director of Policy Research, Friday Institute, North Carolina State University)**
  - ❖ **Dr. Julie Marks (Research Associate, Education Policy Initiative at Carolina (EPIC) UNC Chapel Hill)**

Chairman Cobey recognized Dr. Trip Stallings and Dr. Julie Marks to provide the overall impact and implementation findings of the final Race to the Top (RttT) report. As the presenters were coming forward, Chairman Cobey explained that these evaluation reports are part of the process as we identify lessons learned over the grant period.

Dr. Stallings set the context for this presentation by reminding Board members that the RttT initiative was primarily about building capacity and infrastructure. As such, much of the work as evaluators has been focused on the formative nature of the project, noting that many of the outcomes specifically related to students is only now beginning to be revealed. Dr. Stallings shared that completing an overall evaluation of

so many different initiatives focused on principals, teachers and infrastructure is a challenging task, and that today's report provides several different cuts at how RttT has impacted the state overall. Dr. Stallings stated that this report highlights what the evaluators have been able to determine at this stage, noting that this is just the beginning of a lot of work going forward to determine long-term what the impact is. At this time, Dr. Stallings introduced Dr. Julie Marks to highlight the work of the evaluators.

Dr. Marks shared that the role of North Carolina's RttT evaluation is to document the activities of the 11 RttT initiatives, provide timely formative data analyses and recommendations to help the initiative leads improve their ongoing work, provide summative evaluation results to determine whether the RttT initiatives met their goals, and to inform future policy and program decisions. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Marks stated that there were the five major evaluation questions, noting that Dr. Stallings would speak about the limitations of having a quantitative analysis when there really isn't a valid comparison group when looking at across-state initiatives following her report. She noted, however, that the evaluators were able to do an intra-state evaluation looking at the change of some of the quantitative measures over time from pre-RttT to post-RttT, and an inter-state comparison looking at North Carolina in contrast to similar states that had received or had not received a RttT grant. Dr. Marks reviewed the evaluation questions and provided details about the methodology used in the evaluation process.

Prior to highlighting the overall impact and implementation findings below, Dr. Stallings shared that the news is pretty good – most things worked well and happened in a way that evaluators predicted.

## **QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS:**

### ***Evaluation Question 1: Exceeding Expected Performance***

- *Exceeded:* 1) Graduation rate (9.5 pct. point increase); and 2) Graduation attainment gap-narrowing (white/minority: from 13.9 to 7.0 pct. points; FRL/non-FRL: from 14.8 to 10.6 pct. points)
- *Met (no sig. change):* 1) Teacher effectiveness (overall and 1st year); 2) novice teacher value-added; 3) racial and economic achievement gaps
- *Declined:* 1) Student achievement, but decline attributable to adoption of new exams and higher proficiency standards
- *Mixed:* 1) Teacher practices targeted by RttT, such as knowledge-sharing and formative assessment, increased; 2) perceptions of RttT targeted services remained stable (PD) or declined (NCEES fairness)

### ***Evaluation Question 2: Exceeding Growth in Other States***

- Overall, inter-state comparisons suggest that RttT states performed similarly to non-RttT recipients during the period of the federal grant on most outcomes but may have improved faster on NAEP reading scores.
- RttT States (Rounds 1 & 2) gained more in NAEP reading than non-RttT states during 2011-13 (+2.6 [4th grade] & +1.6 [8th grade])
- NC posted greater gains than other states on: 1) NAEP reading scores; 2) 8th grade math scores; 3) SAT math scores; 4) graduation rates
- NC posted smaller gains on: 1) AP exam-taking; 2) SAT reading; SAT writing

**QUALITATIVE FINDINGS:*****Evaluation Question 3: Fidelity of Implementation***

- Nine of 11 state-level initiatives started on time or within a year of planned implementation  
(*NCTC, NCVPS started one year late*)
- Eight of 11 were implemented to scale  
(*NCTC, NCVPS, state strategic staffing fell short*)
- Eight of 11 met all of their implementation objectives  
(*NCTC, NCVPS met some; state strategic staffing met 0*)

***Evaluation Question 4: Enhanced Capacity***

- NC initiatives enhanced capacity in each of the four RttT pillars:
  - ❖ Statewide PD to enhance local capacity to transition successfully to new Common Core State Standards
  - ❖ Online Instructional Improvement System (Home Base)
  - ❖ Revised teacher and principal evaluation process that includes new measures of student growth
  - ❖ Effective expansion of school turnaround effort to improve proficiency in the state's lowest-performing schools

***Evaluation Question 5: Sustainability***

- Nine of 11 initiatives demonstrated at least three of four sustainability characteristics (*structure, personnel, infrastructure, and ongoing demand*)  
(*Performance-based incentives=1; state strategic staffing=0*)
- Five of 11 initiatives achieved all of their intended *immediate, intermediate, and longer-term* outcomes
- Four of 11 met at least some of their intended outcomes  
(*Performance-based incentives, state strategic staffing=0*)

**Important Limitations**

- Not possible to establish a *valid internal comparison group* to isolate the impact of the RttT reform efforts separate from those of non-RttT initiatives and other changes within NC
- Most RttT *interventions concentrated in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs*=alongside existing programs, masking or inflating the impact of RttT initiatives alone
- *Changes in leadership and economic conditions* across the state likely impacted outcomes independent of initiatives
- *Timeframe* from initial implementation to outcome measurement may not yet have been sufficient to capture many of the initiatives' eventual intended effects

In summary, Dr. Stallings reported the following top-level conclusions:

- Successes in program implementation, evidence of sustainability present, and large and significant improvements in graduation rates
- Faster gains than other states on important academic measures
- Infrastructure and key markers of educational attainment better now than before RttT

*Emerging Lessons Learned*

- Prioritize/promote collaboration throughout reform process
- Value simplicity
- Engage the broader community

Board member Greg Alcorn asked about funding related to infrastructure and ongoing demands. Dr. Stallings explained that the budget will determine which of the initiatives will be able to move forward. He added that their intent was to see what can move forward if funding was available.

State Superintendent Atkinson thanked the partners for their work as third-party evaluators, commending them for their excellent work. She noted that North Carolina was one of the few states engaging 100 percent of the local school districts in the RttT effort. Dr. Atkinson shared that staff within DPI have devoted untold hours ensuring that this report reveals the capacity building and improved student achievement. She publicly thanked all staff members who have worked with RttT, and asked those who were present in the audience to stand. Dr. Stallings added that many of these staff members have given generously of time they did not have to make the evaluation possible – 40-hour weeks became 50 and 60-hour work weeks. Dr. Stallings also reiterated Dr. Atkinson’s comments about North Carolina’s commitment to work with every LEA, providing examples of how some states did not work with every school identified over the past four years, but rather just started the process.

Board member Eric Davis asked Dr. Stallings to share an example of where collaboration would move North Carolina forward. In response, Dr. Stallings elaborated about the STEM initiative (the effort to develop four STEM anchor schools and attach each of those to other schools to work with them and learn from them). He explained that there was much collaboration with business and colleges in those areas to ensure that the work they were doing was supported – developing those relationships was important. On an internal note within DPI, Dr. Stallings shared that the collaboration they saw grow across the years among the different divisions within the Department mattered, too. He cited the professional development area, which has grown over the RttT years due to the different collaborative threads that have been joined at the Department. Dr. Stallings also cited collaboration among stakeholders (students and parents), noting initiatives where more parental involvement was noted.

At this time, the Board's committee meetings were held (with the exception of the special committee summaries, which are included in these minutes, see the separate committee meeting summaries for GCS, TCP, TCS and LFI).

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DIGITAL LEARNING**  
**(Lt. Governor Dan Forest, Chair; and Ms. Becky Taylor, Vice Chair)**

***NEW BUSINESS***

➤ **Digital Learning Plan Report**

- ❖ **Dr. Tracy Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer, Academic Services and Digital Learning)**
- ❖ **Dr. Glenn Kleiman (Executive Director, Friday Institute, North Carolina State University)**
- ❖ **Dr. Mary Ann Wolf (Director of Digital Learning Programs, Friday Institute, North Carolina State University)**

Lt. Governor Dan Forest (Chairman of the Special Committee on Digital Learning) recognized the presenters for this report, noting that this is a foundational document (located on eBoard) as we move forward with the Digital Learning Plan. He explained that this summary, prepared by the Friday Institute, is a prelude to what will become a 100-page document.

Dr. Weeks prefaced this report by reminding Board members that, in 2013, the General Assembly allocated funds to DPI to develop a Digital Learning Plan to determine exactly where North Carolina stands relative to digital learning and what it would take to get to a place where every teacher in every classroom has access to what is needed to truly leverage digital devices and content to personalize learning for all students. She pointed out that this is a unique effort in that it touches each one of the State Board's strategic goals. Dr. Weeks explained that DPI contracted with the Friday Institute to conduct research throughout North Carolina and develop a Digital Learning Plan. The plan focuses on Infrastructure and Devices, Human Capacity, Content, Instruction, and Assessment, Policy & Funding, Local Digital Learning Initiatives, and Regional State Support Systems. The Friday Institute has spent more than a year examining existing data, visiting schools and classrooms across the state, and speaking with countless educators to determine what digital learning looks like currently across the state. She noted that the Friday Institute has already provided the State Board with three interim reports, and the purpose of today's presentation is to provide key findings and recommendations. She recognized Dr. Glenn Kleiman and Dr. Mary Ann Wolf for the report.

Dr. Kleiman prefaced the presentation by acknowledging the Friday Institute Leadership Team and its responsibilities. He reminded Board members that this plan is about digital-age learning, i.e., mastery of the content and competency in applying what has been learned, anywhere and anytime learning, personalized learning, digital content, assessments integrated into learning activities, and providing parent portals. Dr. Kleiman reviewed North Carolina's foundations for digital learning, which include legislative actions to address preparing educators for digital learning, providing digital resources, and ensuring technology access in all schools; school connectivity, Home Base and K-12 Cloud Computing initiatives; the North Carolina Virtual Public School; virtual and blended professional development programs; and districts and schools throughout the state that are already deeply engaged in

innovative digital learning initiatives. In addition, Dr. Kleiman elaborated on the planning process and outreach activities. Using a PowerPoint map, Dr. Kleiman shared data from the North Carolina Digital Learning Progress Rubric completed by all LEAs and 120 charter schools in May 2015 to assess their overall progress toward readiness.

Dr. Kleiman stated that, throughout this work, the following guiding principles have been defined:

1. Focus on effective teaching and learning, enabled and enhanced by technology.
2. Leverage existing innovations, expertise, and resources from throughout North Carolina.
3. Build district and school leadership capacity throughout the state.
4. Engage teachers, administrators, students, parents, business leaders and other stakeholders.
5. Focus on equity of educational opportunities for all students throughout North Carolina.
6. Plan for long-term sustainability, continuous improvement, and educational return on investment.

In addition to reporting the data for each of the six major areas, Drs. Kleiman and Wolf presented the following recommendations:

### **Technology Infrastructure and Devices**

1. Expand the School Connectivity Initiative to provide broadband access, internal networks, and related services to all schools.
2. Provide guidance to inform local decisions about purchasing networks, supporting infrastructure, and devices.
3. Establish a statewide cooperative procurement service for networks, devices, and digital content.
4. Participate in multi-agency efforts to provide broadband connectivity to all homes.

### **Human Capacity**

1. Develop and implement digital learning competencies for teachers and administrators as required by SL 2013-11.
2. Provide professional development for school and district leaders, instructional support staff, and technical staff.
3. Develop a network of professional development facilitators to prepare teachers for digital learning.
4. Guide teacher and administrator preparation programs to ensure that their graduates are ready for digital-age schools.

### **Content, Instruction and Assessment**

1. Establish standards, review processes, and collaborative procurement for digital learning resources.
2. Support the use and sharing of high-quality open educational resources and teacher-created resources.
3. Provide tools that enable educators to use student data to improve student achievement.
4. Update Home Base tools and support systems to further meet the needs of educators, students, and parents.

### **Local Digital Learning Initiatives**

1. Guide and support local leadership teams in planning and implementing digital learning initiatives.
2. Provide grants to support the development and dissemination of local innovative digital learning models.

**Policy and Funding**

1. Update state policies to provide the support and flexibility needed for local digital learning innovations.
2. Provide guidance to help educators address privacy, security, copyright, and responsible use issues.
3. Develop new state and local funding models to support and sustain digital-age learning.
4. Provide additional supports to ensure equity of digital learning opportunities for all students.

**Regional and State Support Systems**

1. Establish the North Carolina Digital Learning Collaborative to manage the recommended state programs.
2. Establish Regional Digital Learning Networks to support digital learning initiatives and foster collaborations.
3. Implement a digital learning progress dashboard and data-informed continuous improvement processes.

The following budget considerations were shared:

- Investment will be required.
- Educational return on investment will be expected.
- Mix of state, local, foundation, private sector funding.
- Reallocation of existing funding plus new funding.
- Infrastructure: \$32M State, \$62M E-Rate.
- Devices: One model projects about \$100 per student per year, or \$155M million total, for K-12.
- Content: Projected \$60 per student, \$90M per year total.
- Professional development and support systems: \$12M state funding recommended to provide support to schools and districts.

In concluding remarks, Dr. Kleiman stated that North Carolina is positioned to be a national leader in digital learning. He stated that many local schools and districts are making good progress, and that the pace of progress will reflect the investments made. Major concerns include: The sustainability of initiatives and equity of educational opportunities across the state.

Lt. Governor Forest spoke briefly about the progress made thus far to position North Carolina to be a leader in this area. He commended the Friday Institute for its work, and reiterated that North Carolina is the example (the bright shining star) that the FCC is looking for North Carolina to do this well.

Board member Wayne McDevitt expressed appreciation to Lt. Governor Forest for his commitment to this initiative. He stated that this may be one of the real success stories for North Carolina. Mr. McDevitt elaborated on and emphasized the importance of addressing sustainability.

Board member Patricia Willoughby spoke briefly about return on investments as the reason that North Carolina is positioned to be the leader. Referring to Wake County's experiment with "bring your own device," Ms. Willoughby asked about how this would be managed, and if there are other school districts experimenting with this type of initiative. Dr. Kleiman stated that there are a number of districts experimenting with this model. He expanded on the complexity of issues related to kids using different devices, connecting to networks, security, etc. Dr. Kleiman shared that the Friday Institute is working directly with Wake County and will be collecting and sharing information as it becomes available.

**RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION**

After the Board committees concluded their work, Chairman Bill Cobey convened the State Board of Education meeting in Open Session and the following members were present:

William Cobey, Chairman

A.L. "Buddy" Collins, Vice Chairman

Dan Forest, Lt. Governor

Gregory Alcorn

Eric C. Davis

Kevin Howell

Reginald Kenan

Wayne McDevitt

Rebecca Taylor

Patricia Willoughby

Also present were:

June St. Clair Atkinson, State Superintendent

Rodney Shotwell, Superintendent Advisor

Steve Lassiter, Principal of the Year Advisor

James E. Ford, Teacher of the Year Advisor

Keana Triplett, Teacher of the Year Advisor

Grace Russell, Senior Student Advisor

Yates McConnell, Junior Student Advisor

**CLOSED SESSION**

Noting for the audience that the Board will immediately adjourn following its Closed Session, Chairman Cobey called for a motion to go into Closed Session.

*Upon motion made by Vice Chairman A. L. Collins and seconded by Mr. Kevin Howell, the Board voted unanimously to convene in closed session to discuss personnel matters and consult with its attorneys on attorney-client privileged matters, and to consider the handling of the following cases:*

*(1) Mergner v. NCSBE;*

*(2) PACE Academy v. NCSBE;*

*(3) Next Generation v. NCSBE;*

*(4) H.B. v. NCSBE;*

*(5) Kerrigan v. NCDPI;*

*(6) Huss v. NCDPI;*

*(7) TPS Publishing v. NCSBE; and*

*(8) Hoke County v. State of North Carolina and State Board of Education*

Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn the Wednesday Session of the State Board of Education meeting.

*Upon motion made by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, and seconded by Mr. Gregory Alcorn, the Board voted unanimously to recess the State Board of Education meeting until Thursday, September 3, at 9:00 a.m.*

**Minutes of the  
North Carolina State Board of Education  
Education Building  
301 N. Wilmington Street  
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825  
September 3, 2015**

The North Carolina State Board of Education met and the following members were present:

William Cobey, Chairman  
A.L. “Buddy” Collins, Vice Chairman  
Dan Forest, Lt. Governor  
Janet Cowell, State Treasurer  
Gregory Alcorn  
Eric C. Davis

Kevin Howell  
Reginald Kenan  
Wayne McDevitt  
Olivia Oxendine  
Rebecca Taylor  
Patricia Willoughby

Also present were:

June St. Clair Atkinson, State Superintendent  
Rodney Shotwell, Superintendent Advisor  
Steve Lassiter, Principal of the Year Advisor

James Ford, Teacher of the Year Advisor  
Keana Triplett, Teacher of the Year Advisor

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION**

State Board Chairman William Cobey called the Thursday session of the September 2015 State Board of Education meeting to order and declared the Board in official session. He welcomed onsite visitors, online listeners, and Twitter followers to the meeting, and explained to the audience that, in addition to holding its Committee meetings, the Board heard an Issues Session presentation on the overall impact and implementation findings of RttT, welcomed its new Student Advisor, Mr. Yates McConnell, and approved its August agenda on Wednesday.

**ETHICS STATEMENT**

In compliance with the requirements of Chapter 138A-15(e) of the State Government Ethics Act, Chairman Cobey reminded Board members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest and appearances of conflicts of interest under Chapter 138A. He asked if members of the Board knew of any conflict of interest or any appearance of conflict with respect to any matters coming before them during this meeting. There were no conflicts of interest communicated at this time. The Chairman then requested that if, during the course of the meeting, members became aware of an actual or apparent conflict of interest that they bring the matter to the attention of the Chairman. It would then be their duty to abstain from participating in discussion and from voting on the matter.

Board member Wayne McDevitt was recognized to lead the Board with the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### *Discussion/Comments:*

- Chairman Bill Cobey requested a motion to approve the minutes of the August 5 and 6, 2015, State Board of Education meeting and the August 20, 2015, conference call meeting.
- There was no discussion.

*Mr. Greg Alcorn made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 5 and 6, 2015, State Board of Education meeting and the August 20, 2015, conference call meeting. Seconded by Mr. Eric Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.*

## **STATE SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

### **Back to School in NC: By the Numbers**

An estimated 1,537,643 students kicked off a new school year in the last week of August while students at nearly 130 year-round schools jumped back into the swing of things earlier this month.

This number of students represents an increase of 17,000 from last year and an increase of more than 61,000 from 2008-09.

Among these students, an estimated

- 1,459 million attend NC traditional public schools
- 78,000 attend a public charter school
- 20,000 are enrolled to take at least one online course at the NC Virtual Public School

Highlights of the new year include a new pilot system of state testing for some 9,000 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders and implementation of a 10-point grading scale for all high school students.

School bus safety will again be a focus of the 2015-16 school year. The first week of school went smoothly with no serious episodes reported. A new hand signal system requiring bus drivers to indicate when it is safe for students to cross roads and highways will kick off in January after all drivers have received training.

### **Staff Gather for an All Agency Meeting**

DPI staff convened at the State Fairgrounds August 26 for the annual all agency meeting. The theme of the event was *A Morning with the Stars*, an event title focusing on the myriad tasks NC DPI employees perform every day to keep more than 2,500 public schools across North Carolina running smoothly.

Highlights included:

- Reflection by leadership on accomplishments and long-term impacts resulting from the multi-year Race to the Top project that is now winding down

- Review of the State Board of Education’s strategic plan and DPI’s implementation
- Remarks from Daniel O’Keefe, Regional Director of the Institute of Play, about incorporating game theory into classroom education
- Remarks (motivational) about the impact of DPI work at the school level from award-winning performing arts teacher Mr. Corey Mitchell. Mitchell is a teacher at Charlotte-Mecklenburg and is the 69<sup>th</sup> Annual Tony Award Winner and Excellence in Theatre Education Award
- Recognition of staff for years of service

### **Directors of Regional Education Services Alliances Meet in Raleigh**

Directors of North Carolina’s Regional Education Service Alliances (RESAs) met at DPI to discuss a range of issues, including:

- Home Base and Learning Management System
- Release of A-F school grades and NC Report Card
- Status of 2015-16 state budget discussions
- Legislative update
- Professional development delivery to the regions post-Race to the Top
  - EVASS Training
  - Home Base
  - Teacher/Principal
  - Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Implementation

The RESAs are locally funded regional agencies that work closely in delivering professional development and other services in the eight educational regions of North Carolina.

### **Special Recognitions and Awards**

#### **Green Hope High Student Wins Silver in World Microsoft Competition**

Mr. Ryan Catalfu, a junior at Green Hope High School, Wake County Public Schools, placed second in Microsoft Word 2010 world competition.

The Microsoft Office Specialist World Championship competition took place in mid-August in Dallas, Texas.

- Mr. Catalfu had already been named US Microsoft Office Suite champion.
- 145 students from 47 countries competed in the final round of competition.
- Catalfu’s second place finish won him \$3,750 in scholarship money, a medal, a trophy and Microsoft products.

### **Teacher Advisory Council Meets Virtually**

The Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council met virtually on August 18 to discuss Teacher of the Year summit program planning and issues related to the state budget.

### **New Additions Join DPI Team**

- Heidi Carico – Education Consultant II – Exceptional Children
- Robert McOuat – Education Program Administrator I – Exceptional Children
- Natasha Farrington – Accounting Technician – Financial and Business Services
- Iris Irving – Education/Accountability Consultant II – Accountability Services

- Amanda Danks – Education/Accountability Consultant II – Accountability Services
- Juliet Mauldin-Casanova – School Educator II – Office of Early Learning
- Anette Zaiontz – School Educator II – Office of Early Learning
- Nicole Galloway – Education Program Administrator I – Office of Early Learning
- Hunter Huffman – Education program Specialist – Academic and Digital Learning
- Tiffanee Seaberry – Office Assistant V – Exceptional Children
- Teresa Peterson – Education Program Assistant I - Exceptional Children
- Karen Little – Education Program Assistant I - Exceptional Children
- Heather Ouzts – Education Program Specialist – Exceptional Children

➤ **Recent Activities of the State Superintendent**

**Attended and/or delivered remarks/keynote address at**

- Council of State, Raleigh, NC
- A+ Schools 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Conference on Arts Education, Durham, NC
- Communities in Schools Impact Conference, Cary, NC
- Challenges Facing NC Public Education panel discussion, Randolph Community College, Asheboro, NC
- NC Works Commission, Raleigh, NC
- NC Chamber Conference on Education, Raleigh, NC
- Watauga County Schools’ Convocation, Boone, NC
- Gates County Schools’ Convocation, Gates, NC
- Asheville City Schools’ Convocation, Asheville, NC
- Women’s Equality Day Celebration, Raleigh, NC
- Northeast Academy of Aerospace and Advanced Technologies Opening Ceremony, Elizabeth City, NC

**Proposed Amendment to SBE Policy #TCS-C-013**

Dr. Atkinson presented the proposed policy revisions for SBE Policy # TCS-C-013 – Delegation of authority from the State Board of Education to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (See Attachment under the Superintendent’s Report on eBoard). The policy is revised to reflect changes as a result of the time-limited RttT positions. The Chairman called for a motion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Gregory Alcorn and seconded by Mr. Eric C. Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the revisions to SBE Policy #TCS-C-013 as presented by Dr. Atkinson. (See Rev. Policy Under State Superintendent’s Report)*

**Special Guests**

Dr. Atkinson recognized several visitors from the Hawaii Department of Education who were in North Carolina to study best practices in school nutrition administration. The representatives present in the audience were:

- Ms. Sue Uyehara, Director (Child Nutrition Division, Hawaii Department of Education)
- Ms. Jennifer Dang (Program Specialist, Child Nutrition Division, Hawaii Department of Education)
- Ms. Shaynee Moreno (Accountant, Child Nutrition Division, Hawaii Department of Education)

## Legislative Update

State Superintendent June Atkinson recognized Ms. Rachel Beaulieu to provide the legislative update.

Ms. Beaulieu drew attention to a one-page summary posted on eBoard, which highlights the budget, education bills that have become law, and bills to watch. Ms. Beaulieu explained that, according to leadership in both chambers, they are hoping to reach a budget agreement over the weekend. She elaborated on several of the bills to watch.

### A. Budget

### B. Education Bills That Have Become Law (since August SBE Meeting)

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. HB 13 – Amend School Health Assessment Requirement | Ch. SL 2015-222 |
| 2. HB 383 – Clarify Statutory Scheme/Sex Offenses     | Ch. SL 2015-181 |
| 3. HB 562 – Amend Firearm Laws                        | Ch. SL 2015-195 |

### C. Bills to Watch

1. HB 97 – 2015 Appropriations Act
2. HB 138 – Arts Education Requirement
3. HB 334 – Transfer Office of Charter Schools
4. HB 394 – Increase Options for Local Option Sales Tax
5. HB 482 – Employee Misclassification Reform
6. HB 561 – School System Auth. Re: Legal Proceedings
7. HB 792 – Privacy/Protection from Revenge Postings
8. HB 943 – Connect NC Bond Act of 2015
9. SB 15 – Unemployment Insurance Law Changes
10. SB 37 – Waive Tuition/Fallen Officer was Guardian
11. SB 95 – Performance Based RIF/School Policy
12. SB 97 – State Advisory Council on Indian Education
13. SB 101 – Omnibus Local Act
14. SB 298 – School Bus Cameras/Civil Penalties
15. SB 330 – Change Orders on School Construction
16. SB 400 – School Access for Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts
27. SB 561 – Career and College Ready Graduation

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

- **Presentation from the University of North Carolina Gillings School of Global Public Health**
  - ❖ **Dr. Anna Maria Siega-Riz (Professor of Epidemiology and Nutrition and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs)**
  - ❖ **Dr. Anna Schenck (Associate Dean for Public Health Practice and Director of the Leadership Program)**
  - ❖ **Dr. Dorothy Cilenti (Assistant Professor in Maternal and Child Health) and**
  - ❖ **Dr. Leah Devlin (Professor in Health Policy and Management)**

Chairman Cobey recognized HRS Committee Chair Patricia Willoughby to introduce this special presentation. In turn, Chair Willoughby welcomed Dr. Anna Maria Siega-Riz from the Gillings School of Global Public Health.

Dr. Anna Maria Siega-Riz prefaced this presentation by recognizing her colleagues who were present in the audience. Dr. Siega-Riz set the context by sharing a PowerPoint slide from the Virginia Commonwealth University Report that has three principles that are key to today's discussion:

1. Education can create opportunities for better health.
2. Poor health can put education at risk.
3. Conditions throughout people's lives can affect both education and health.

Dr. Siega-Riz shared the mission of the School of Public Health to improve public health, promote individual well-being and eliminate health disparities across North Carolina and around the world. She elaborated on how the mission connects to the whole school, whole community, whole child model adopted by the State Board, and specifically Goal 5 from the SBE Strategic Plan – Every student should be healthy, safe and responsible. Dr. Siega-Riz provided an overview of UNC Gillings, directing Board members to the one-pager in their Board materials. Related to some of what UNC Gillings does for pre-K-12 populations in North Carolina, Dr. Siega-Riz highlighted several examples, noting that Masters and Doctoral students have contributed over 3,100 hours to childcare programs and school systems in North Carolina through their practicums from 2009-15. In addition, Dr Siega-Riz also provided a list of examples of service to North Carolina by faculty, students and staff for children from preschool to adolescents, noting that the list was not exhaustive (see PowerPoint).

Dr. Siega-Riz also elaborated on the Evidence-Based Practice Implementation Center, which is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. This Center develops the methods to establish state, regional, and district capacity to provide critical content and foundation for large-scale, sustainable, high-fidelity implementation of effective education practices that maximize social and academic outcomes of all K-12 students, including students with disabilities.

In addition, in partnership with NC State University, Gillings is creating a tool for high schools in North Carolina to more easily and affordably comply with health education legislation regarding nutrition and sexual education. She explained that the tool aims to:

- increase health knowledge and skills among high school students in North Carolina
- decrease risky behaviors among high school students
- decrease rates of teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections
- increase academic achievement

- provide a safe space for students to learn more about their personal health by delivering the intervention in the classroom
- provide a tailored and unique learning experience for each student
- provide a common platform for parents, teachers and students to educate themselves about
- ways to encourage healthy behaviors among students

Other research includes:

Web-based Peer Mentoring for Asthma: Small Business Innovation Research Grant (SBIR). This SBIR aims to further develop an asthma intervention developed at Gillings into a web-based program to train peer mentors to guide parents of children with asthma on methods to reduce ER visits and hospitalizations. The goal is to reduce hospitalizations by 30 percent, and doing so would significantly reduce the number of missed days of school.

Another area that is a major problem for North Carolina is obesity, which is costing billions/year. Dr. Siega-Riz reported that faculty are working on numerous initiatives such as the Healthy Weight initiative. More than 50 food industries have committed to reduce the number of calories being offered to children under the age of 12. North Carolina was one of seven states that participated in a randomized clinical trial called The Healthy Start Project that was to prevent Type II Diabetes in middle school children. According to Dr. Siega-Riz, seven middle schools in North Carolina were part of the intervention project and actually saw a decreased rate of obesity problems through implementing better physical education activity classes, improvement school food service as well as providing resources to math and science teachers to talk about the importance of health and nutrition in the classroom.

Reiterating that Gillings School already has opportunities for student practicums – facilitate data gathering and analysis to answer questions of importance to the board and DPT, and increased opportunities for infusing public health concepts into training of teachers, Dr. Siega-Riz asked the State Board to consider potential collaborations to improve the health of schoolage children and their academic success. The following suggestions were made:

- Partnering related to global education, i.e. practical application research projects on worldwide issues
- Creating safe environments for children with food allergies
- Using graduate students as ambassadors to talk about their careers in public health
- Public policy work – dietary guidelines, resource sustainability, etc.
- State health plan – pre-diabetes
- Healthy food initiatives
- Students at work – making those connections (visiting health care facilities)

In closing comments, Chair Willoughby stated that this conversation will continue, and if anyone had further suggestions to please share them with her, Dr. Siega-Riz, and the others present today.

## **SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

- **Race to the Top Report – Additional Observations on Final Report on Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools**
  - ❖ **Dr. Gary Henry (Vanderbilt University)**

Chairman Cobey recognized Dr. Gary Henry to provide additional observations from the report on turning around the lowest-achieving schools RtT initiative.

Dr. Henry set the context by recapping last month's presentation about the impact of North Carolina's efforts to turn-around the lowest achieving schools. Dr. Henry highlighted the conclusions from the report, which include:

- Positive effects on proficiency and value-added
- Positive effects on graduation rates but not statistically significant due to small sample size (17 high schools)
- Teacher labor force (high turnover and limited experience), uneven capacity of North Carolina school districts, and large concentrations of economically disadvantaged and minority students in many North Carolina schools mandates school turnaround as permanent part of NCDPI activities
- Low-achieving schools and districts cannot sustain gains in student achievement
- Turnaround services, including Comprehensive Needs Assessments, School Improvement Planning, Instructional Coaching, School Leadership Coaching, District Leadership Coaching, and Professional Development will be required for the foreseeable future to ensure adequate education for all student in North Carolina

Dr. Henry announced a newly formed partnership between the State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction, Vanderbilt University, UNC-Chapel Hill and the RAND Corporation to develop a proposal for IES that will provide evaluation information (like RtT), and expand and improve that information that the court is currently overseeing. Dr. Henry stated that there are several new evaluation elements to help these schools move forward, and explained that the program has always had a Comprehensive Needs Assessment in each of the turnaround schools. In this proposal, the DPI would go into approximately 44 schools in the next round of turnaround and begin that with a Comprehensive Needs Assessment. He stated that there is new data to support the kinds of needs assessment that must be done such as the EVAAS score, which will help to target particular changes in a particular school, and intervention even with specific teachers because of the nature of the data currently available. A School Improvement Plan will then be developed. Dr. Henry stated that according to the research, the coaches at each level are extremely instrumental in ensuring achievement of the goals set out in the School Improvement Plan.

Dr. Henry explained that, while there are many intermediate outcomes, the focus will continue to be on student outcomes. He stated that teacher retention may have affected the ability of these schools to achieve more significant effects. Therefore, teacher retention will be one of those things that will be monitored carefully. In addition, the Department will implement a Student Survey because research shows that the student survey information is correlated with teachers making gains over and above what would be predicted by the prior value-added scores. This will provide more information available for the Department to tailor and focus efforts in these schools as well as to the schools themselves related to monitoring their own student and teacher performance overtime.

Dr. Henry recognized the partners on the Institute of Education Sciences Proposal – Dr. Henry and Mr. Martez Hill are Co-Principal Investigators, and Dr. Audrey Martin-McCoy was instrumental in putting together the proposal for IES. The project includes doctoral students from Vanderbilt – Mr. James Guthrie and Ms. Erica Harbatkin. The partnership also comprises RAND Corporation – Ms. Rebecca Herman (who is the national expert on school turnaround), and Dr. Andrew McEachin, along with UNC Chapel Hill's Education Policy Initiative at Carolina (EPIC) – Dr. Julie Marks and Dr. Cassandra Davis.

Dr. Henry explained that with the RttT grant, we were formally reporting annually, but as information came from the field we did not have a mechanism to inform District and School Transformation (DST), but we now do with this new partnership. The partnership will meet every other month to provide information on implementation, quality and fidelity. An expert Teacher and Principal Advisory Panel will be convened to help interpret findings and guide implementation improvements. Information on implementation and outcomes will be reported on an ongoing and frequent basis through bi-monthly meetings with the DST staff as well as all partners on the grant. Experts will be available to help troubleshoot any implementation issues. Dr. Henry explained that part of this grant was to help increase the capacity of the State Board for oversight and evaluation. He reported that a pre-award notification was received on July 27, 2015; the Award notification currently pending.

Chairman Cobey shared that he continually hears that teachers are not fully effective for five to six years, noting that no private business would ever tolerate that. Chairman Cobey stated that he would like to see some strong recommendations in the area of team teaching and teacher instructional leaders similar to those of the Opportunity Culture in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. He explained that when he visited Opportunity Culture he saw a model that made sense because teachers were being mentored and coached every day, and they are effective in that model. He stated that we have a national problem where schools of education are not getting student interest in teaching. He also called on the Schools of Education to graduate students that are ready to be effective. Dr. Henry noted Chairman Cobey's request, adding that it needs to be multi-faceted. He stated that there are several things we could do related to mentoring and feedback through the evaluation processes that are not necessarily being implemented.

State Superintendent Atkinson asked Dr. Henry if he could conduct a cost comparison of the Tennessee model vs. North Carolina's model. Dr. Henry indicated that this is definitely in the plan moving forward, and stated that there is some cost information available, but it is not comprehensive. He spoke briefly about Tennessee's model.

Referring to the 44 schools that Dr. Henry mentioned in the next round of turnaround schools, Board member Olivia Oxendine stated that she hopes due diligence will be given to ensure that those principals are knowledgeable about curriculum, understand instruction, and know how to provide feedback. Dr. Henry reported that, on average, when a school gets a new principal the achievement level in the school drops for the first year or two. Approximately 10 percent of North Carolina's principals are in their first year, which is a high average for the nation. He reminded Board members that the federal model required that the principal be replaced and that was done in most of the schools in their first two years of turnaround; however, that is not a requirement in the current model. Dr. Henry explained that the Department has put forth much effort and hopefully the evaluators will be able to capture whether teachers are getting more feedback in these schools. There is no one single policy or entity that will make all the changes that must be made for the student in North Carolina to be successful. That fidelity will be monitored all across the state to see what kinds of services principals and the teachers are receiving, according to Dr. Henry.

As part of the analysis and intervention, Teacher of the Year Advisor James Ford asked if there was any analysis for the students to help mitigate some of the negative effects poverty has on student achievement and from a cultural/racial standpoint. In addition, he asked if the bottom five percent of low-performing schools included charter schools. Dr. Henry explained that, until yesterday, the data were not available to do the analysis to identify the bottom five percent of schools; in the last round, there were no charter schools. Related to the students, Dr. Henry explained that one of Dr. Rebecca Garland's goals for the evaluation is to ensure that we are identifying the groups within the schools that were successful and those that were not, etc. In addition, we want to figure out a way to give students more of a voice – ultimately through the student survey. Dr. Henry stated that as researchers they are being pushed to ask the questions that go down to the student level and feed that back so that we can make the schools more effective for everyone. Mr. Ford asked if any of the research ties the correlation to socio-economic status and economic embedded as part of the thrust or only analyzed as part of the student survey. Dr. Henry stated that it is imbedded and built into the new study.

Board member Wayne McDevitt expressed support of Chairman Cobey's comments about support of teachers in their early years, stating that it is imperative to make the teaching profession so attractive that there is a long line of students wanting to be part of that profession. Then the induction process – the clinical experiences should have significant changes – look at stipends for student teachers, etc. He pointed out that the research is clear about the importance of mentoring. Mr. McDevitt suggested that as we move forward, that all of this be kept at the forefront. A brief discussion occurred about the evaluation system and the new standards based on student growth – that has changed the nature of the conversation and collaboration – none of the competition has seemed to occur. He stated that there could be some steps to increase mentoring in the evaluation process.

Board member Eric Davis asked Dr. Henry to share the key learnings from the RttT turnaround experience to be included in legislation. In response, Dr. Henry shared the following:

1. Basic process – very solid. Based on a Comprehensive Needs Assessment based on school-specific data and that is used to formulate a very targeted and focused plan for the school.
2. Put sufficient coaching into place where principals are supported in terms of implementing the plan.
3. Provide more Instructional coaches
4. District-level coaching resulted in more sustained and higher levels of success.

Teacher of the Year Keana Triplett commented on the veteran teachers that are so important to the novice teachers, noting the importance of support for veteran teachers as well. Specifically, what can be done to keep them in the classroom and to empower them to be mentors, teacher leaders and the voices that they can be. Dr. Henry spoke about how providing data regularly could be helpful to focus on those issues.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION****➤ Race to the Top (RttT) Report: Evaluation of the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System and the Student Achievement Growth Standard: 2010-11 through 2013-14****❖ Dr. Gary Henry (Vanderbilt University)**

Chairman Cobey recognized Dr. Gary Henry to present this special report.

Dr. Henry prefaced this report by noting that this is the last official evaluation of Race to the Top (RttT). He recognized that the evaluation was completed in partnership with the Friday Institute at NC State University, the SERVE Center at UNC-Greensboro, and the Education Policy Initiative at UNC-Chapel Hill. Dr. Henry shared that Dr. Doug Leuen assisted in this evaluation, specifically the Teacher Quality Distribution Report and is available in the audience for questions.

Dr. Henry set the context for this presentation by explaining that the mandates for the evaluation of RttT is that we evaluate what has happened in reaction to having the sixth standard added to the original five standards for teacher evaluation.

Using a PowerPoint presentation with tables, graphs, etc., Dr. Henry shared key findings from the evaluation, and fielded questions for clarification.

**1. How many teachers need improvement according to NCEES?****Key Findings:**

- 18.4% of teachers were categorized as “in need of improvement”
- 80% of “needs improvement” teachers did not meet EVAAS growth but were proficient or above on principals’ ratings

Dr. Henry explained that from 2010-11 through 2013-14, principals’ ratings assigned between 5.2 and 5.9 percent of teachers with full evaluations to the needs improvement category (only teachers with individual EVAAS scores). In addition, for initially licensed teachers, the EVAAS scores and principal rating agree (Green) that approximately 2.0 percent need improvement. For fully licensed teachers, the two types of ratings agree that 0.2 percent of teachers need improvement. Dr. Henry explained that one of the implications may be that more systematic data in the evaluation is needed to help identify these teachers if principals are not going to identify teachers to be identified as in need of improvement – we need a broader base.

**2. Do principals provide teachers with information on their strengths and weaknesses?****Key Findings**

- Principals rate teachers either Proficient or Accomplished 90 percent of the time, which provides limited information on individual teachers’ strengths and weaknesses, including beginning teachers who need this information for developmental purposes.
- Principals’ ratings have not varied over time, indicating little refinement in using NCEES ratings to provide teachers with feedback on strengths and weaknesses.
- Principals rate teachers globally rather than providing meaningful distinctions on teachers’ performance on each standard.

3. Are EVAAS scores related to principals' ratings of teachers' performance?

Key Findings

- Principals' ratings of teachers' overall performance and facilitating student learning are loosely correlated.
- Principals do not appear to be influenced by teachers' EVAAS scores, North Carolina's official measure of the teachers' contributions to the achievement growth of their students.
- Correlations between principal ratings and EVAAS scores are higher for science and substantially lower for reading/English/language arts and the mClass, and career and technical assessments.

4. Can other measures provide information to teachers improving student learning?

Key Findings

- Both teachers and principals want more information on how teachers can improve their practices, especially in ways that increase their value-added scores.
- Using measures from principals' ratings, student surveys, and classroom observations, we found several measures associated with higher value-added scores than were predicted by their previous value-added score alone.

5. What are teachers' views about their evaluations?

Key Findings

- Teachers view NCEES as fair.
- From 2011-12 to 2013-14, teachers' views of the fairness and effectiveness of their evaluations have declined significantly.
- The largest declines relate to the developmental use of the evaluation.
- Contrary to some expectations, teachers engage in more knowledge sharing about students and teaching now than in the past and do not feel competitive with one another.

Evaluation Conclusions

1. Most teachers designated "in need of improvement" based on the value-added score (EVAAS) alone
  - Value-added effectively acted alone to determine teachers' evaluation status
  - Judgments of principals on all other aspects of teaching and teachers' performance rendered much less important
2. Other direct measures of teaching performance, such as student surveys and classroom observations, should be added into NCEES.
  - Provides more evidence for teachers who also have EVAAS scores
  - Teachers who do not have EVAAS scores could then have direct measures of their individual performance incorporated into their evaluations
3. Teachers are being rated globally and disappointed with developmental aspects of NCEES
  - Neither the ratings nor evaluation feedback are providing them with enough actionable information for them to improve
  - More systematic information on effective teachers practices and training for principals to use the information needed
4. The NCEES process seems to have been accepted by teachers and principals.
  - Teachers and principals feel that NCEES is fair
  - NCEES has not produced negative side effects, such as decreasing teachers' willingness to share information or increasing competition between teachers

Board member Patricia Willoughby suggested this conversation be added to the Board's planning agenda in October. Vice Chairman Collins pointed out that one of the presentations is Dr. Foster's research regarding teachers with respect to high-poverty schools, noting that this is an excellent segway to that discussion, which will include a panel discussion.

### CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Cobey moved to the Consent Agenda which is reserved for items that generally create little or no debate such as routine appointments, items that come for information purposes only, routine reports, and final approval of reports that the Board has already discussed. Board members have always seen these materials prior to the Board meetings, and may ask that items be removed from the Consent agenda to be discussed on an individual basis.

Chairman Cobey noted a total of seven items for consideration on the consent agenda. He asked if any Board members wanted to remove any item from the Consent Agenda. Hearing no requests, Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve TCP 5, TCS 3, TCS 4, GCS 7, GCS 8, GCS 9, and GCS 10.

*Upon motion by Mr. Gregory Alcorn and seconded by Mr. Eric C. Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the slate of Consent Agenda items as presented. (See Attachments TCP 5, TCS 3, TCS 4, GCS 7, GCS 8, GCS 9, and GCS 10.)*

## 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY PROFESSIONALS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT (Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Chair; Mr. Eric Davis, Vice Chair)

### *CONSENT*

#### **TCP 5 – Race to the Top Report: An Evaluation of the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System and the Student Achievement Growth Standard**

**Policy Implications:** N/A

#### **SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 3:** Every student, every day has excellent educators.

**Objective 3.1:** Increase the percentage of effective or highly effective teachers in schools with a performance composite below 60% and not meeting or exceeding academic growth.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Audrey Martin-McCoy (Policy Analyst, SBE Office), Dr. Trip Stallings (Director of Policy Research, Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, NC State University)

#### **Description:**

In 2011, as a part of the State Board of Education's implementation of North Carolina's Race to the Top (RttT) initiative, a sixth standard – a measure of student growth, the Educational Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) – was added to the existing five standards for evaluating teachers. The purpose of this report, prepared by the Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation North

Carolina (CERE NC), is to describe the outcomes of teacher evaluations that have occurred since the sixth standard was added and trends in those outcomes through 2013-14.

#### Evaluation Questions and Key Findings

1. *How many teachers needed improvement, according to the NCEES? To what extent did principals rate teachers below proficient (Not Demonstrated or Developing) or did teachers not meet expected growth according to their EVAAS scores?*

One of the most important purposes of teachers' evaluations is to identify teachers who need improvement so leadership can intervene in ways that help ensure that students have access to high-quality teaching. Between 2010-11 and 2013-14, for all teachers with both individual EVAAS growth scores and principals' ratings, 18.4 percent were found to need improvement, but this percentage varied between initially licensed teachers (21.4 percent) and fully licensed teachers (13.5 percent).

#### Key Findings

- *Over 80 percent of teachers in each of the past two years who were assigned to a "Needs Improvement" category (Not Demonstrated or Developing) were assigned by their EVAAS score alone.*
  - *Approximately 5 percent of beginning teachers who received ratings on all five standards received one or more ratings below Proficient from their principals.*
  - *The percentages of teachers who received at least one rating by their principals below Proficient was 7.7 percent for teachers who did not meet expected growth according to EVAAS, 3.2 percent for teachers who met expected growth, and 1.2 percent for teachers who exceeded expected growth.*
2. *Did principals provide teachers with information on their strengths and weaknesses by making distinctions in performance between the standards?*

Another important purpose for the NCEES evaluations was to provide teachers, especially initially licensed teachers who are, on average, less effective and more likely to turnover than more experienced teachers, with clear information about their strengths and weaknesses. Value-added scores, including but not limited to EVAAS scores, provide objective measures of the outcomes of teachers' instructional practices but, unfortunately, do not provide information about which practices are strengths and weaknesses for individual teachers.

#### Key Findings

- *Principals rated teachers either Proficient or Accomplished 90 percent of the time, which provided limited information on individual teachers' strengths and weaknesses.*
- *Principals' ratings have not varied over time, indicating little refinement in using NCEES ratings to provide teachers with feedback on strengths and weaknesses.*
- *Principals rate teachers globally rather than providing meaningful distinctions on teachers' performance on each standard.*

3. *Were the EVAAS scores for teachers' contributions to student achievement growth related to principals' ratings of teachers' performance, especially the ratings for facilitating student learning?*

To enhance credibility of NCEES with teachers and to provide consistent information, the agreement between the principal ratings that teachers received and their student growth ratings (EVAAS) should be related. The objective measure of their students' achievement growth could reasonably be expected to relate to principals' ratings of teachers on the NCEES standards, especially the "teachers facilitate learning for their students" standard, which most closely has a bearing on student growth.

#### Key Findings

- *Principals' ratings of teachers' overall performance and of their ability to facilitate student learning were loosely correlated with teachers' EVAAS scores. On average, principals' ratings of their teachers were not influenced by the state's official measure of the teachers' contributions to the achievement growth of their students.*
- *The correlations between principal ratings and EVAAS scores varied across individual course subjects. Correlations with EVAAS were higher with science and substantially lower with reading/English/language arts, the mClass, and career and technical assessments.*

4. *What instructional practices or teacher behaviors predicted gains or improvements in teachers' EVAAS scores?*

Teachers need actionable evidence about effective instructional practices that can improve their EVAAS scores. In interviews, most teachers reported receiving immediate and constructive feedback regarding their evaluations; however, some reported a lack of feedback from their administrators. Overall, teachers expressed an interest in receiving a higher quality and greater quantity of feedback.

In order to support principals and teachers in the development of more effective teachers, the Evaluation Team examined measures of teachers' instructional practices and behaviors that relate to improvements in their EVAAS scores – that is, related to higher EVAAS scores than predicted based on their prior EVAAS scores alone. Practices found to be effective and ineffective at improving EVAAS scores, as well as practices associated with teachers' capacity to improve their EVAAS scores over time, as referenced in the full report.

#### Key Findings

- *Both teachers and principals want more information about how teachers can improve their practices, especially in ways that increase their value-added scores.*
- *Using measures from principals' ratings, student surveys, and classroom observations we found several measures associated with higher value-added scores than were predicted by teachers' previous value-added scores alone.*
- *These measures can be (1) directly incorporated into the feedback provided by principals to teachers, and (2) periodically tested for their relationship to value-added if student surveys and/or observation protocols for classrooms are conducted in the future.*

5. *What were teachers' views about their evaluations and related topics during the period in which the NCEES evaluation with six standards has been implemented?*

When the student achievement growth measure was added to the original five NCEES standards, two concerns surfaced. The first concern was that the overall fairness of the evaluations would be eroded – that the protocols designed to promote teacher development would be undermined. Second, concerns were raised that the high-stakes evaluations would inhibit teachers from supporting one another and working together to improve student learning.

From 2011-12 to 2013-14, the favorability of teachers' views of their evaluations has declined significantly. Overall, teachers' rating of the evaluation process as measured by survey items declined from approximately 5.2, which indicated slight agreement with the items, to about 4.8, which moved them toward neither agreement nor disagreement with the items. Contrary to some expectations, teachers engaged in knowledge-sharing more in 2013-14 than in earlier years. Overall, their knowledge-sharing activities increased from once or twice per week to almost daily.

### Conclusions

Along with approximately two-thirds of other states, North Carolina adopted value-added scores for individual teachers as an additional, sixth standard to supplement the pre-existing five-standard NCEES teacher evaluation system.

- *Because almost all identifications of a need for improvement were based on the value-added score, value-added effectively acted alone to determine teachers' evaluation status, rendering the judgments of principals on all other aspects of teaching and teachers' performance much less important.*
- *Consideration should be given to systematically adding other direct measures of teaching performance into the NCEES in addition to the EVAAS scores that are currently included. In addition to providing more evidence for teachers who also have EVAAS scores, teachers who do not have EVAAS scores could then have direct measures of their individual performance incorporated into their evaluations.*
- *The second main conclusion from this evaluation is that teachers are being rated globally, and neither the ratings nor evaluation feedback are providing them with enough actionable information for them to improve.*
- *The NCEES process seems to have been accepted by teachers and principals. On the whole, they feel that the system is fair. Also, teachers' survey responses indicated that the implementation of the NCEES process has not produced negative side effects, such as decreasing teachers' willingness to share information. In fact, the opposite has occurred – teachers have engaged in more knowledge-sharing across the first four years of expanded NCEES implementation.*

The main issue with the NCEES appears to be that the current system includes only one systematic data source – EVAAS – and, while EVAAS is an important objective measure of teachers' effectiveness, the inclusion of additional systematic measures may point out the strengths and weaknesses of individual teachers, increase the accuracy of identifying those who need improvement, increase the favorability of teachers' attitudes toward the evaluation system, and provide direct information about practices that can be used for improvement for all teachers.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept this report.

**TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY SYSTEMS  
BUSINESS/FINANCE AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
(Mr. Gregory Alcorn, Chair; Mr. Kevin Howell, Vice Chair)**

**CONSENT****TCS 3 – JLEOC Report: Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services**

**Policy Implications:** Senate Bill 744/Session Law 2014-100, Sec. 8.19

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 4:** Every school district has up-to-date financial, business, and technology systems to serve its students, parents and educators.

**Objective 4.3:** Use state and federal funding according to state and federal laws and State Board of Education policies.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Donna Brown (Director, Program Monitoring and Support Division)

**Description:**

In the summer of 2014, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated five million dollars (\$5,000,000) in state funds for the After-School Quality Improvement Grant Program to be administered by the Department of Public Instruction as part of the Competitive Grants to Improve After-School Services Act [Session 2013-Section 8.19.(a-e)]. According to the legislation, the purpose of the program is to pilot after-school learning programs for at-risk students that raise standards for student academic outcomes by focusing on the following:

- Use of an evidence-based model with a proven track record of success.
- Inclusion of rigorous quantitative performance measures to confirm its effectiveness during the grant cycle and at the end-of-grant cycle.
- Alignment with state performance measures, student academic goals, and the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*.
- Prioritization of programs to integrate clear academic content, in particular, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) learning opportunities or reading development and proficiency instruction.
- Emphasis on minimizing student class size when providing instruction.
- Expansion of student access to learning activities and academic support that strengthen student engagement and leverage community-based resources, which may include organizations that provide mentoring services and private-sector employer involvement.

Organizations are eligible to receive two-year grants of up to (\$500,000) a year, based on the proposed number of students served, with an option for a third year of funding. To determine the level of funding eligibility, organizations utilized the Wallace Foundation Out-of-School Time Cost Calculator and the NC

Department of Commerce's 2014 Tier Designations. In accordance with the law, grant funds must be matched on the basis of (\$3.00) in grant funds for every (\$1.00) in non-grant funds.

For 2014-15, (41) applications were submitted by the due date. Based on the final ratings for the applications, (17) are recommended for approval for a total of \$4,784,539.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept this report.

**CONSENT**

**TCS 4 – North Carolina Race to the Top: Overall Impact and Implementation Findings**

**Policy Implications:** N/A

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 4:** Every school/district has up-to-date financial, business, and technology systems to serve its students, parents, and educators.

**Objective 4.3:** Use state and federal funding according to state and federal laws and State Board of Education policies.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Audrey Martin-McCoy (Policy Analyst, SBE Office) and Dr. Trip Stallings (Director of Policy Research, Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, NC State University)

**Description:**

This report completes the Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation North Carolina (CERE NC) Race to the Top (RttT) evaluation the implementation of Race to the Top.

**North Carolina's Race to the Top Plan**

The ultimate goal of North Carolina's Race to the Top (RttT) plan was to build statewide capacity that could support sustained, long-term improvements in public education; namely, increases in student achievement, reductions in achievement gaps, and increases in graduation rates. To address these outcomes, North Carolina's proposal focused on strengthening the education workforce by providing great teachers for every student and a great principal for every school. Initiatives were designed to provide a coherent approach with mutually-reinforcing components across multiple reform pillars. The strategies funded by RttT were required to address the federal grant program's four targeted pillars of reform:

1. Ensure the state standards and accountability system reflects internationally benchmarked standards;
2. Establish advanced data systems that measure student success and inform educator practice;
3. Increase teacher and principal effectiveness; and
4. Turn around the state's lowest-achieving schools, so that all students get the support they need to be successful.

**North Carolina's Race to the Top Evaluation**

North Carolina's RttT proposal included a commitment to an independent external evaluation of individual initiatives and of the overall impact of the reform efforts across the state. For this evaluation, NCDPI contracted with the Consortium for Education Research and Evaluation-North Carolina (CERE-NC) to provide formative and summative feedback on implementation and outcome findings. As of July 2015, the Evaluation Team has completed over 50 evaluation reports across 13 state and local initiatives.

### Evaluation Questions

The purpose of this report is to assess the overall, statewide impact of North Carolina's RttT efforts over the course of the four-year grant period. Achieving this goal in full is somewhat limited by the nature of the implementation of the initiatives, which in most cases prevented our ability to identify valid comparison groups – groups who are like the group impacted by RttT initiatives in almost every way except that they were not exposed to RttT initiatives. Despite this key limitation, the Evaluation Team was able to use a three-pronged mixed-methods approach to chart the performance of North Carolina's education system during the years of RttT implementation (2010-11 through 2013-14). First, intra-state changes were assessed for key outcomes before and after RttT implementation by using North Carolina's rich data to determine whether North Carolina exceeded anticipated performance based on prior data. Second, inter-state comparisons were made between North Carolina and selected non-RttT states on common national education measures. Finally, implementation findings and recommendations were synthesized from previous reports with input from members of the Evaluation Team in order to provide qualitative information about implementation and potential sustainability of individual-level initiatives.

Taken together, these strategies were used to address the following five quantitative and qualitative evaluation questions:

#### Quantitative

- Evaluation Question 1: Exceeding Expected Performance: How are North Carolina public schools performing after the implementation of RttT in relation to their expected performance based on pre-RttT data?
- Evaluation Question 2: Exceeding Growth in Other States: How does North Carolina perform on common measures of educational outcomes compared to selected groups of states.

#### Qualitative

- Evaluation Question 3: Fidelity of Implementation: To what extent was each RttT initiative implemented as intended with regard to timeline, scale, and objectives?
- Evaluation Question 4: Enhanced Capacity: To what extent has RttT enhanced North Carolina's capacity to support the four RttT pillars of reform and strengthen the education workforce?
- Evaluation Question 5: Sustainable Capacity: What initiatives demonstrate the capability to sustain implementation and promise toward ultimately impacting student and teacher perceptions, behaviors, and achievement?

#### Data and Methods

**Quantitative Analysis** – To determine whether and the extent to which North Carolina's performance exceeded expected performance, the Evaluation Team used prior data on schools, teachers, and students to establish the state's trajectories on multiple important outcomes (teacher effectiveness, student achievement, and the achievement gap). By comparing these pre-RttT trajectories to trajectories of the same measures during the RttT years, we generated one estimate of the effects of RttT.

To determine the North Carolina's performance relative to other states, growth on ten national education measures was compared for North Carolina and several other groups of states, including other RttT grant recipients, all other non-RttT awardees, seven neighboring states in the southeast, and the ten non-RttT recipients with scores closest to North Carolina on each outcome prior to RttT.

### Qualitative Analysis –

RttT evaluation leads were surveyed to gauge (based on their initiative-level evaluations) their perceptions of the extent to which each initiative met identified targets for the three qualitative evaluation areas of interest: Implementation, Sustainability, and Outcomes. Leads were asked to rate objectively elements in each of the three categories as well as to provide narrative justification and/or clarifications of those ratings.

In addition, findings from the initiative-level evaluation reports were used to assess the extent to which each initiative showed promise for achieving immediate, intermediate, and longer-term outcomes and for enhancing the state's capacity to support the four RttT reform pillars.

### Findings

#### Evaluation Question 1: Exceeding Expected Performance

Exceeded expected performance: Overall, North Carolina exceeded its expected performance in two of six education outcomes: 1) student graduation rates continued an upward trend that began before RttT implementation for an overall increase of 9.5 percentage points over the last three years of the grant; and 2) graduation attainment gaps narrowed. The graduation attainment gap between white students and minority students was cut in half, from 13.9 percentage points for the graduating class of 2009 to 7.0 points for the class of 2014, and the graduation attainment gap between economically disadvantaged students and their less-disadvantaged peers narrowed from 14.8 to 10.6 percentage points over the same time period.

Met expected performance: There were no significant differences found in teacher effectiveness as measured by principal evaluation ratings, teacher value-added, or in the narrowing of the racial and economic achievement gaps.

Declined in performance: Only one outcome – student achievement – decline over the RttT period, but the decline may reasonably be attributed to North Carolina's adoption of new achievement exams aligned with the Common Core State Standards, along with adoption of higher proficiency standards.

Outcomes with mixed results: Teachers' perceptions of their work environments and practices were mixed. Responses on the Omnibus Teacher and Leader survey administered annually by the Evaluation Team indicate that teachers felt that they improved in areas targeted by the state (knowledge-sharing and formative assessment), but that they did not perceive positive changes in the actions or services provided by the state, such as professional development opportunities or teacher evaluations.

#### Evaluation Question 2: Exceeding Growth in Other States

Overall, findings from inter-state comparisons across 10 national scholastic outcomes suggest that RttT states performed similarly to non-RttT recipients during the period of the federal grant on most outcomes but may have improved faster on NAEP reading scores. North Carolina posted greater gains than other states on NAEP reading and 8th grade mathematics scores, SAT mathematics scores, and cohort graduation rates but posted smaller gains on AP exam-taking and saw SAT reading and writing scores decline.

### Evaluation Question 3: Fidelity of Implementation

Out of the 11 state-level initiatives evaluated, eight started on time or within a year of planned implementation, eight were implemented to scale, and nine met their implementation objectives.

### Evaluation Question 4: Enhanced Capacity

Over the course of the grant, North Carolina implemented initiatives that enhanced capacity in each of the four RttT pillars, including: statewide professional development to enhance local capacity to transition successfully to new Common Core State Standards; an online Instructional Improvement System; a revised teacher and principal evaluation process that includes new measures of student growth; and an expanded school turnaround effort to improve the proficiency of the state's lowest-performing schools.

### Evaluation Question 5: Sustainability

Nine initiatives met at least three of four sustainability characteristics (structure, personnel, infrastructure, and ongoing demand). In addition, initiative-by-initiative progress toward attaining immediate, intermediate, and longer-term outcomes was encouraging, with five initiatives achieving all of their intended outcomes and four at least partially meeting all outcomes.

### Limitations

There are several key limitations to an evaluation of this scope that should be considered when assessing the estimations in this report of the impact of this multi-year state-level intervention comprised of multiple initiatives: 1) the absence of valid comparison groups precluded the ability to establish causality, 2) the presence of competing or conflating initiatives may have influenced outcomes of interest, 3) other external factors such as changes in leadership and the economic climate also may have influenced outcomes, and 4) the length of time between initial implementation and measurement of some outcomes may not be sufficient to capture the eventual effects of some initiatives.

### Conclusions

This overall impact evaluation of North Carolina's RttT plan revealed notable successes in program implementation, the presence of key sustainability factors, and improvements in the critical education outcome of increased student graduation rates. The comparison between North Carolina and other states also demonstrated that North Carolina posted faster gains than other states on some important academic measures.

While analyses of other key education outcomes (such as teacher effectiveness) did not result in significant positive findings, and some measures of student achievement declined in the wake of adoption of new standards, taken as a whole, the evaluation data support the conclusion that North Carolina's education infrastructure and important markers of educational attainment are better off now than they were before the start of RttT.

### Emerging Lessons Learned

Not everything worth learning about North Carolina's RttT efforts can be gleaned from analyses of data alone. For this final overall evaluation, the Evaluation Team also reviewed the findings and recommendations in all of the individual initiative evaluation reports that preceded this final report and identified several emerging lessons learned – potentially of use not only to implementers but also to Grantors – that cut across multiple initiatives:

- Prioritize and actively promote collaboration throughout the reform process. A complex reform agenda like North Carolina's Race to the Top funded initiatives increases the likelihood of conflicting agendas and implementation challenges
- Value simplicity. Usually, the most successful initiatives are those with the fewest moving parts.
- Engage the broader community. A comprehensive education reform agenda attends to in-school and out-of-school stakeholders at multiple levels.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept this report.

**GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE STUDENTS**  
(Mr. Eric C. Davis, Chair; and Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Vice Chair)

**CONSENT**

**GCS 7 – Read to Achieve Guidebook Update**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-83.1, SBE Policy #GCS-J-002

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 2:** Every student has a personalized education.

**Objective 2.5:** Increase the percentage of schools with a performance composite at or above 60% and meeting or exceeding growth.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Carolyn Guthrie (Director, K-3 Literacy)

**Description:**

General Statute §115C-83.1 outlines components of the North Carolina Read to Achieve Program that became effective with the 2013-14 school year. The goal of this program is “to ensure that every student read at or above grade level by the end of third grade and continue to progress in reading proficiency so that he or she can read, comprehend, integrate, and apply complex texts needed for secondary education and career success.” There are seven major components of this program that include:

- a comprehensive plan for reading achievement,
- a developmental screening and kindergarten entry assessment,
- the facilitation of early-grade reading proficiency,
- the elimination of social promotion,
- the successful reading development for retained students,
- notification requirements to parents and guardians, and
- accountability measures.

In February 2013, the State Board of Education approved a *Read to Achieve Guidebook* that gave an overview of the legislation and details of responsibilities of the state, the LEA, the school, and the teacher regarding the Read to Achieve legislation. The *Read to Achieve Guidebook* has been updated. Recent legislation eliminated the requirement for Personalized Education Plans (PEPs), so all references to PEPs have been removed. Other changes include replacing Responsiveness to Instruction (RtI)

information with Multi-Tiered System of Support guidance and updates to the Kindergarten Entry Assessment page.

**Recommendations:**

The State Board of Education is asked to approve the updates to the *Read to Achieve Guidebook*.

**CONSENT**

**GCS 8 – Dropout Exit Conference and Referral Process**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-47(32), SBE Policy #GCS-Q-000, APA #16NCAC 6G.0312, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.

**Goal 5:** Every student is healthy, safe, and responsible.

**Objective 5.3:** Decrease the number of students who are chronically absent, dropout, or suspended out of school.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Debora Williams (Special Assistant, Graduation and Dropout Prevention Initiatives)

**Description:**

In March 2015, the State Board of Education approved a new policy (GCS-C-039) directing the Department of Public Instruction to include in the four-year and five-year cohort any student who receives a standard diploma awarded in collaboration with a community college and signed by a local superintendent or charter.

To implement this new policy, the Department is presenting a revision to GCS-Q-000 to align with GCS-C-039. GCS-Q-000, as currently approved, states that North Carolina students who leave the public school system and enter a community college Adult High School (AHS) diploma program must be withdrawn using a code that identifies them as a dropout. It is proposed that this policy be revised to allow districts to code students transitioning from a public school to a community college Adult High School (AHS) diploma program as W2(T)\* indicating the local district verification of enrollment in an AHS program.

The W2(T) code may be repeated (with verification) until the end of the academic year for which the student's cohort is scheduled to graduate. At that time, local education agencies must adjust the W2(T) code to W1\*\* for verified AHS graduates or the transition code will default to W2\*\*\*. The State Board of Education will annually review the number of students coded as W2T.

\*W2T signifies a student who has withdrawn from a public school to attend a community college Adult High School program. Local Education Agencies must document verification of enrollment.

\*\*W1 signifies a transfer withdrawal.

\*\*\*W2 signifies a student who was enrolled in school at some time during the reporting year and not enrolled on day 20 of the current school year.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the revision to GCS-Q-000 to align with GCS-C-039.

**CONSENT****GCS 9 – Replacement of Compliance Commission Members**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #TCS-B-000

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.

**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Objective 1.4:** Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

**Description:**

The State Board of Education (SBE) established the Compliance Commission for Accountability in July 1996. The Commission was charged with making recommendations to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and SBE related to accountability issues. In June 2015, three members resigned from the Commission. Attached is the current list of Commission members. The names and resumes of the proposed new members were provided at the August meeting and are being presented for Action at the September meeting.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the recommendation for the new members to the Compliance Commission for Accountability.

**CONSENT****GCS 10 – Race to the Top Evaluation Report: Outcomes and Impacts of North Carolina's Initiative on Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools**

**Policy Implications:** N/A

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of -Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Audrey Martin-McCoy (Policy Analyst, SBE Office) and Dr. Trip Stallings (Director of Policy Research, Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, NC State University)

**Description:**

This report completes the Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation North Carolina (CERE NC) Race to the Top (RttT) evaluation of the turnaround of the state's lowest-achieving schools. Through its Race to the Top (RttT)-funded initiative to Turn Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (TALAS), North Carolina has carried out an effort to transform low-performing schools that is more ambitious than those of all other states that received RttT funding. The District and School Transformation (DST) Division of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) continued its work on the transformation of North Carolina's 118 lowest-achieving schools through the 2014-15 school year. DST also worked with 12 of the state's lowest-performing school districts to support and sustain transformation implementation.

DST services began with a Comprehensive Needs Assessment in each TALAS school, which served as the basis for the School Improvement Plan. The implementation of each plan was supported through leadership coaching, instructional coaching, and district-level coaching in the 12 districts that received direct DST services. DST also provided professional development for school leaders, and other educators received professional development offered through other NCDPI interventions and RttT initiatives.

*Outcomes*

From 2009-10 to 2013-14, 75% of TALAS schools increased their graduation rates more than the average increase in similar comparison schools. In terms of student *proficiency* on achievement tests during the transition to assessments based on the Common Core State Standards, 60% of TALAS schools outperformed the average change in the comparison schools. TALAS schools and comparison schools registered similar gains in school *growth* as measured by value-added scores (provided through the Education Value-Added Assessment System [EVAAS]) during the study period.

This final TALAS evaluation report focuses on the impact of school transformation on students, teachers, and schools. Throughout this summary and the report, we present the effect estimates in standardized units, known as standard deviation units (sdu). This allows for the effect sizes to be directly comparable to each other and to prior studies. For example, in class-size experiments, the effect of reducing classes from 25 or more students to about 15 students was 0.22 sdu.

*Overall Impacts*

Throughout the three years of full program implementation, TALAS raised school proficiency rates by an average of 0.18 sdu. The estimates of the effects on schools closest to the fifth percentile of performance (the percentile used as the cutoff for identifying TALAS schools) were not significant, which seems to indicate that the positive effects were concentrated on the lower of the lowest-performing schools in the state. TALAS was estimated to have had positive effects on graduation rates as well, but these effects were not statistically significant – most likely due to the small number of high schools (17) participating in TALAS. When examining effects by level of schooling, all but one of the

effects were positive, and most were substantial, but only the effect on teacher value-added at the middle school level was statistically significant – again, likely due to the small number of schools at each level of analysis.

#### *Immediacy of the Impacts*

According to an Institute of Education Sciences report (Herman et al., 2008), one of the keys to successful school turnaround efforts is “quick wins” – visible improvements early in the turnaround process, which result in immediate increases in student outcomes. These initial changes can set the tone for transformation by creating educator buy-in and by establishing a climate for long-term change (p. 22). When compared with other low-performing schools in 2011-12 (the first full year of the implementation of the intervention), TALAS schools increased school-wide achievement growth as measured by EVAAS by a significant 0.34 sdu. When data from the second year were added, this trend continued into 2012-13 at 0.26 sdu. School-value-added increases were positive and sizeable but no longer significant in 2013-14, perhaps due to the fact that the gains for 2013-14 were measured on top of the gains posted during the first two years of TALAS.

Improvement in student proficiency in TALAS schools took slightly longer to achieve but did improve by a significant 0.16 and 0.18 sdu through 2012-13 and 2013-14, respectively. Estimates of the effects of TALAS on graduation rates were uniformly positive and increased as more years of data were added (0.15 to 0.27 to 0.29 sdu), but as in the previous analyses of graduation rates, the effects were not statistically significant, likely due to the limited number of high schools (17) in TALAS.

#### *Subject-Matter Impacts*

Averaging across all TALAS schools, proficiency in mathematics and science improved more than in comparison schools (0.21 sdu in both subjects). Consistent with the TALAS emphasis on literacy, English language arts (ELA) gains were positive and significant in elementary schools and middle schools where reading was directly assessed each year; gains on high school English tests also were positive, though not significant. In addition, proficiency gains in elementary science (0.23 sdu) and middle school mathematics (0.37 sdu) were larger in TALAS schools than in the comparison schools.

#### *Teacher Turnover*

Throughout the TALAS intervention, teacher turnover was higher in TALAS schools than in the comparison schools, although the difference was not statistically significant. It appears that the lower levels of teacher retention in the TALAS schools may have suppressed some positive effects of transformation.

#### *District-Level Transformation*

The 12 districts with the lowest proficiency rates received additional support services, which the Evaluation Team evaluated separately. The district-level transformation produced statistically significant effects on school-wide growth in student achievement in TALAS schools (0.44), while the gains were positive but not statistically significant in TALAS schools in districts that did not receive district transformation services. This finding may indicate the value of district coaching for increasing attention to and support for increasing student achievement growth in the lowest-performing districts – perhaps through leadership and teacher recruitment and placement, providing resources focused on student performance, or creating a structure for discipline and safety.

*Sustainability*

Sustainability of the effects of TALAS is particularly important as RttT funds run out. The Evaluation Team examined the differential effects on schools that participated in the state's first transformation efforts (2006 to 2010) as well as the TALAS transformation. First, the gains in proficiency were larger and statistically significant in the schools that participated in TALAS but not in the state's prior turnaround program (2006-2010), which speaks to the immediacy of positive effects from the TALAS intervention. In addition, gains in both graduation rates (0.69 sdu) and school achievement growth (0.37 sdu) as measured by EVAAS were large and statistically significant in schools that both participated in the prior turnaround initiative and received TALAS services, which may indicate that the turnaround program supports sustained in both initiatives (e.g., coaching and professional development) are needed to maintain positive effects. The finding that graduation rates decreased (-0.60 sdu) in the schools that participated in the prior turnaround program but not TALAS raises concerns about the ability of the lowest-achieving high schools to sustain positive effects without continued support from DST.

*Summary and Conclusion*

The findings clearly indicate that North Carolina's lowest-achieving schools in 2009-10 improved their performance during the four years of TALAS. In addition, DST efforts to emphasize literacy have paid dividends in increased proficiency on reading and Language Arts tests in elementary and middle schools when compared to other low-performing schools. Further, it does not appear that these gains in literacy came at the expense of other subjects, since both elementary science and middle school mathematics proficiencies also increased in TALAS schools more than in the comparison schools.

Many TALAS high schools made large gains in their graduation rates. Comparisons to other low-performing high schools indicated that gains were larger in TALAS schools, but the effects were seldom statistically significant. While this may be attributable to the limited number of high schools in TALAS (17) and in the comparison schools (18), it also may be that the effects of TALAS are difficult to distinguish from the nearly 10-percentage-point increase in the statewide graduation rate during the RttT period.

It appears that the effects of TALAS are larger when district-level coaching and support are included with school leadership and instructional coaching. The schools that participated in both the earlier transformation program and TALAS registered the largest gains during the RttT funding period. This may indicate that services sustained over a longer time contribute to greater growth. The fact that TALAS school-wide student growth began to improve in the first year of TALAS and was sustained throughout the duration of the program may indicate that the Comprehensive Needs Assessments and School Improvement Plans that were developed in the first year of TALAS were more effective in producing immediate school-wide student achievement growth and sustaining the growth throughout the study period than in the first round of school transformation in North Carolina. However, if all students are to receive an adequate education, the conditions in North Carolina schools, turnover in the educator workforce, and the variable capacity of school districts to foster and maintain satisfactory levels of student proficiency and achievement may mandate that the state find resources and continue to intervene to transform low-performing schools on an ongoing basis for the foreseeable future.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept this report.

**ACTION AND DISCUSSION AGENDA****LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT****(Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Chair; Mr. Wayne McDevitt, Vice Chair)*****NEW BUSINESS***

Under New Business, LFI Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor reported that the LFI Committee received two updates. The first was from Dr. Eliz Colbert (Executive Director of NCVPS) who provided a status update on current enrollment numbers for NCVPS; student enrollments come from 115 LEAs and 59 charter schools. Halifax County Schools has nearly 500 student enrollments. The second new business item was status updates from the two pilot virtual charter schools. Chair Taylor stated that the updates from the virtual charter schools were informative and led to great discussions. Questions were provided to the representatives that the Board wants to continue monitoring.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DIGITAL LEARNING****(Lt. Governor Dan Forest, Chair; and Ms. Becky Taylor, Vice Chair)*****NEW BUSINESS***

Under New Business, Lt. Governor Dan Forest, Chair of the Special Committee on Digital Learning shared that the Committee received a report from the Friday Institute to roll out the summary of the Digital Learning Plan; the full plan will be rolled out within the next week in order to meet the General Assembly's deadline of September 15. Lt. Governor Forest requested that the Department distribute the full report once completed to State Board of Education members. Chairman Cobey directed Mr. Martez Hill to ensure Board members receive the final Digital Learning Plan.

*Upon motion by Lt. Governor Dan Forest, and seconded by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the summary report presented by the Friday Institute and authorize the Department of Public Instruction to submit the full report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (JLEOC) on behalf of the State Board of Education by the September 15, 2015, deadline.*

**TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY SYSTEMS  
BUSINESS/FINANCE AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
(Mr. Gregory Alcorn, Chair; Mr. Kevin Howell, Vice Chair)**

***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

**TCS 1 – Funded Average Daily Membership for Charter Schools with Approved Dropout Prevention and Recovery Programs**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #TCS-M-003

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 4:** Every school district has up-to-date financial, business, and technology systems to serve students, parents, and educators.

**Objective 4.3:** Use state and federal funding according to state and federal laws and State Board of Education policies.

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip Price (Chief Financial Officer, Financial and Business Services) and Mrs. Alexis Schauss (Director, Division of School Business)

**Description:**

Charter schools are funded based on the average daily membership of the first 20 instructional days of the school year, according to State Board of Education (SBE) Policy #TCS-M-003 – The Allotment Policy Manual. For most charter schools, the first month average daily membership fairly represents the membership at the school for the year.

Charter schools that are approved with a sole mission to provide a dropout prevention and recovery program to high school students in grades 9 through 12 may request the State Board of Education to be funded on 5<sup>th</sup> month average daily membership. These schools have specialized programs to encourage students who have dropped out of school to re-enroll in school, and to provide an alternative for students who are at risk of dropping out of a traditional high school. Due to the nature of these programs, the 1<sup>st</sup> school month may not be a fair representation of the number of students served during the year because as the year goes on the school is accepting students who have previously dropped out or are transferring from another school.

In order for these schools to be funded based on a fair representation of the students served, the funded average daily membership is recommended to be after the second semester has begun (i.e. 5<sup>th</sup> month).

Attached is the section of the Allotment Policy Manual indicating the proposed change.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve to fund the school based on the 5<sup>th</sup> month average daily membership at the September 2015 SBE meeting.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCS Committee Chair Greg Alcorn noted a thorough discussion of this item during the TCS Committee meeting on Wednesday.
- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Greg Alcorn, and seconded by Mr. Kevin Howell, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve to fund the school based on the 5<sup>th</sup> month average daily membership. (See Attachment TCS 1)*

### ***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

#### **TCS 2 – Approval of Grant – Title V State Abstinence Education (AEGP) Grant**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #TCS-O-001, Title V AEGP Grant

#### **SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 4:** Every school district has up-to-date financial, business, and technology systems to serve students, parents, and educators.

**Objective 4.3:** Use state and federal funding according to state and federal laws and State Board of Education policies.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Tracy Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer, Academic Services and Digital Learning), Dr. Tiffany A. Perkins (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instruction Division), and Dr. Ellen Essick (Section Chief, NC Healthy Schools)

#### **Description:**

The Title V State Abstinence Education (AEGP) Grant Program was extended through Fiscal Year 2015 under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (Pub.L.111-148.). The purpose of the State Abstinence Education Program is to support student decisions to abstain from sexual activity by providing abstinence programming as defined by Section 510(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C 710(b) with focus on those groups that are most likely to bear children out-of-wedlock, such as youth in or aging out of foster care. As a condition of receiving this grant, North Carolina must certify that all abstinence education materials that are presented as factual are medically accurate and grounded in scientific research. This also pertains to any materials presented by sub-awardees of the state. In the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families (ACF), a guideline of up to 30 sub-awardees was given. The bulk of funding awarded to North Carolina will be distributed to 19 LEAs, two Universities, the North Carolina School Health Training Center and other partners.

The Title V State Abstinence Education Grant Program (AEGP) initially awarded \$1,585,347 to DPI and was accepted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in May 2011 (FY2010). This action addressed the Year 1 funding allotments and criteria of a five-year total grant award. Year 2 (FY2011) funding in the amount of \$1,652,476 was presented to the SBE as a continuation item during the October 2011 meeting. Year 3 (FY2012) funding was in the amount of \$1,714,293. Fiscal Year 2013 (Year 4) was reduced due to the federal sequestration. For Year 5, NCDPI received an award of \$1,603,856. The upcoming fiscal year will be Year 6, an extension to the grant program. For Year 6, NCDPI was awarded \$1,701,589, as well as a supplemental amount of \$502,395. This provides North Carolina with a total award of \$2,203,984 during Year 6, which will begin October 1, 2015, and will conclude on September 30, 2016.

#### **Recommendations:**

The State Board of Education is asked to grant approval of providing funding to up to 19 of the 115 LEAs.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCS Committee Chair Greg Alcorn noted a thorough discussion about this recurring program during the TCS Committee meeting on Wednesday.
- Board member Reginald Kenan recused himself from discussion and voting on this item.
- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Greg Alcorn, and seconded by Mr. Kevin Howell, the State Board of Education voted to approve funding to up to 19 of the 115 LEAs. Mr. Reginald Kenan recused himself from voting on this item. (See Attachment TCS 2)*

**UPDATE ON CONTRACTS**

(See Attachment in book)

TCS Committee Chair Greg Alcorn noted a good conversation about contracts during the TCS Committee meeting on Wednesday, which resulted in action items for the committee.

**21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY PROFESSIONALS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**  
**(Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Chair; Mr. Eric Davis, Vice Chair)**

***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

**TCP 1 – Recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Requests for Exceptions from Teacher Licensure Requirements**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #TCP-A-021, TCP-B-009

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 3:** Every student, every day has excellent educators.

**Objective 3.1:** Develop and support highly effective teachers.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Olivia Oxendine (State Board of Education), Susan Ruiz (Section Chief, Licensure), Nadine Ejire (Licensure)

**Description:**

In April 2006, the State Board of Education adopted a policy to allow individuals who have not met licensing requirements due to extenuating circumstances to request an exception from the requirement or an extension of time. The request must include documents from the teacher, the principal, the superintendent, and the chair of the local board of education. In June 2006, a similar policy was approved to allow colleges and universities to submit requests for exception to Praxis I testing requirements on behalf of students seeking admission to teacher education programs. Requests are evaluated by a panel chaired by a member of the State Board. Panel recommendations will be presented in closed session.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the recommendations of the Appeals Panel related to each request be approved.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine noted that discussion and voting for this item occurred during Closed Session on Wednesday.
- There was no further discussion.

This item was presented for Action on First Reading during the September 2015 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment TCP 1)

***DISCUSSION***

**TCP 2 – Global Educator Digital Badge Criteria**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #GCS-H-001

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 2:** Every student has a personalized education plan.

**Objective 2.3:** Increase the number of schools designated as STEM or Global Education ready.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director, Educator Effectiveness), Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director, K12 Curriculum & Instruction Division) and Ms. Helga Fasciano (Special Assistant for Global Education)

**Description:**

This policy amendment provides the criteria and process for educators to earn the Global Educator Digital Badge. The recommendation builds upon the current policy criteria for teachers and expands the opportunity for other educators in alignment with their annual evaluation process. Educators may choose to voluntarily complete the criteria for the Global Educator Digital Badge as part of their personal growth goals or as a part of a school or district initiative.

Educator categories included in this policy amendment are Teacher, Teacher Leadership Specialist, Library Media Coordinator, Instructional Technology Facilitator, School Counselor, Career Development Coordinator, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, Speech Pathologist, Instructional Central Office Staff, Principal/Assistant Principal, and Superintendent. Guidance and technical assistance documents will provide information on LEA implementation.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the Global Educator Digital Badge Criteria.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine noted wide interest in this initiative beyond the teachers, stating that this is going to be made accessible to other educators in the school systems. This item will return to the Board in October for action.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment TCP 2)

**DISCUSSION****TCP 3 – Credits Required for the Renewal of a Standard Professional 2 License**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-296(b)(1)b, SBE Policy #TCP-A-005, APA #16NCAC 6C-307

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 3:** Every student, every day has excellent educators.

**Objective 3.1:** Develop and support highly effective teachers.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director, Educator Effectiveness), and Ms. Susan Ruiz (Section Chief, Licensure)

**Description:**

During its 2014 session, the General Assembly increased the number of renewal credits required for a teacher to renew a Standard Professional 2 license. The number of renewal credits was increased from 7.5 to 8.0, and specified that standards for continuing licensure shall include at least eight continuing education credits with at least three credits required in a teacher's academic subject area. Standards for continuing licensure for elementary and middle school teachers shall include at least three continuing education credits related to literacy. This change is effective for renewals beginning July 1, 2016.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the proposed policy revisions for TCP-A-005.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine explained that the number of renewal credits required for a teacher to renew a Standard Professional 2 license is increasing from 7.5 to 8.0 credits. In addition, elementary and middle school teachers will need continuing education credits related to literacy education.
- Dr. Oxendine expressed interest in future discussions to collaborate with the General Assembly to consider renewal credits in the area of child growth and development.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment TCP 3)

**DISCUSSION****TCP 4 – Policy Revisions – TCP-A-004: Beginning Teacher Support Programs**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #TCP-A-004

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 3:** Every student, every day has excellent educators.

**Objective 3.1:** Develop and support highly effective teachers.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director, Educator Effectiveness) and Dr. Yvette Stewart (Assistant Director, Educator Effectiveness)

**Description:**

Currently each LEA develops a comprehensive program for beginning teachers, which is reviewed and monitored. The plan is approved by the local board of education. The policy has been reformatted to streamline the language for clarity, separating policy language from procedural language. A handbook for procedures and best practices will now be a separate document from the policy requirements; the handbook will be available online.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the proposed revision to the Beginning Teacher Support Program.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine noted a thorough discussion of the proposed policy changes presented by Dr. Yvette Stewart during the TCP Committee meeting on Wednesday.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment TCP 4)

**HEALTHY RESPONSIBLE STUDENTS**

(Ms. Patricia Willoughby, Chair; and Mr. Reggie Kenan, Vice Chair)

***DISCUSSION*****HRS 1 – Return-to-Learn After Concussion**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-12(23)

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 5:** Every student is healthy, safe, and responsible.

**Objective 5.2:** Promote healthy and active lifestyles for students.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Tracy S. Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer), Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instruction Division) and Dr. Ellen Essick (Section Chief, NC Healthy Schools)

**Description:**

In 2011, the North Carolina General Assembly passed into law the Gfeller-Waller Concussion Awareness Act. The Act addressed return to play for student athletes participating in practices or games. It did not address return-to-learn guidelines for all students who might experience concussions regardless of where the concussion was experienced. This policy provides guidelines for safe and appropriate return to the classroom after concussion.

**Recommendations:**

State Board of Education members are requested to review, discuss, make recommendations and/or approve the proposed new policy.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- HRS Committee Chair Patricia Willoughby noted a thorough discussion of this item during the TCP Committee meeting on Wednesday, noting that this is an effort to provide guidelines for safe return to classrooms following concussions. She reminded Board members to share their input concerning this issue with her in an email.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment HRS 1)

**GLOBALY COMPETITIVE STUDENTS**  
(Mr. Eric C. Davis, Chair; and Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Vice Chair)

***ACTION ON FIRST READING*****GCS 1 – Read to Achieve Local Alternative Assessments**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #GCS-J-003

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.

**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Objective 1.4:** Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

**Description:**

The Read to Achieve requirement (G.S. §115C-83.1C) may be fulfilled by providing third grade students with an alternative assessment approved by the State Board of Education (SBE). The alternative assessments available to LEAs for the 2015-16 school year are being presented for approval at the September meeting. The recommended list includes all of the alternative assessments approved for use in the 2014-15 school year. There are not any new assessments being recommended.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approves the Read to Achieve local alternative assessments.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis noted a thorough discussion of this item during the GCS Committee meeting on Wednesday. He explained that the Committee received a proposal from staff on maintaining flexibility afforded by local alternative assessments while at the same time keeping standards high and consistent across the state.
- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis and seconded by Mr. Reginald Kenan, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the proposed Read to Achieve local alternative assessments as recommended. (See Attachment GCS 1)*

***ACTION ON FIRST READING*****GCS 2 – Release of 2014-15 Accountability and School Performance Grades Reports**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-105.20.40 (Article 8B), No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.

**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Objective 1.4:** Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

**Description:**

Achievement data, growth data, and School Performance Grades (A-F) for the 2014-15 school year will be presented for approval at the September SBE meeting. Included are data on end-of-grade tests, end-of-course tests, The ACT, ACT WorkKeys, math course rigor, graduation projects, and annual measureable objectives. Results for the state, districts, and schools will be available at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/>.

Following this release, districts will be able to request data corrections until September 10, 2015. Once the data is finalized, it will be recommended that the Board approve any changes at the October SBE meeting.

**Recommendations:**

The State Board of Education is asked to approve the data results for the 2014-15 school year.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis explained that GCS 2 and GCS 3 were discussed in tandem on Wednesday, and that voting would be combined in the same manner. Chair Davis stated that the Accountability staff provided informative reports on Accountability and School Performance Grades and the Cohort Graduation Rate for the 2014-15 school year. Both continue to show progress, according to the data. Chair Davis stated that the Board remains committed to improve the performance even further.
- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the Accountability and School Performance Grades Reports and the Cohort Graduation Rate for the 2014-15 school year. (See Attachment GCS 2 and GCS 3)*

***ACTION ON FIRST READING*****GCS 3 – Cohort Graduation Rate for the 2014-15 School Year**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-105.20.40 (Article 8B), No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

**SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.

**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Objective 1.4:** Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in postsecondary education.

**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

**Description:**

The 2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate will be presented for approval at the September meeting. The summary results will be published electronically at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgradrate> on September 2, 2015. The report includes both a four-year and a five-year cohort graduation rate for all schools and districts.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the cohort graduation rate for the 2014-15 school year.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- Action on this item was combined with GCS 2 (above).
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Action on First Reading during the September 2015 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment GCS 3)

### ***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

#### **GCS 4 – Career and Technical Education Credentials Report**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2013-360

#### **SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Tracy S Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer) and Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt (Director, Career and Technical Education)

#### **Description:**

The North Carolina Career and Technical Education 2014-15 Credentialing Data Report offers an accounting of information collected from the administration of different assessments in which students earned credentials. The raw data is disaggregated by local education agency, district, state, and industry credential. This data will be used to improve instruction.

This Credentialing Data report is also required pursuant to Session Law 2013-360. The 2014 budget allotted funds to enable secondary students to participate in credential exams and requires NCDPI to report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the number of CTE students that (i) earn community college credit and (ii) related industry certifications and credentials.

#### **Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the reports as submitted.

#### **Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis explained that the GCS Committee had hoped to have Representative Blackwell who is a major supporter of this item present for the discussion and voting on this item today. He recognized Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt to present the CTE Credentials Report for consideration.
- Ms. Honeycutt set the context by stating that this report is a fairly heavy lift on behalf of the Department and CTE staff. She expressed appreciation to staff members, Dr. Daniel Smith for his leadership in the process and compiling the report, and Ms. Rhonda Welfare for analyzing the data. The North Carolina Career and Technical Education 2014-15 Credentialing Data Report offers an accounting of information collected from the administration of different assessments in which students earned credentials. The raw data is disaggregated by local education agency, district, state, and industry credential. This data will be used to improve instruction.
- Ms. Honeycutt announced that 130,611 is the number of credentials earned by CTE students in 2014-15. Ms. Honeycutt directed Board members to page 14 in their materials (Attachment 1 on eBoard) to show phenomenal growth since 2010-11 (when the Department began collecting this data) through this last academic year. She explained that North Carolina continues to be one of the very few states in the nation that attempts to collect this data at the secondary level.

- Ms. Honeycutt reminded Board members that the State Board had a goal for the 2014-15 school year of 131,205 credentials. While 600 credentials shy, Ms. Honeycutt expressed commitment to making up that ground. According to Ms. Honeycutt, it is important to note that last year at 115,000 credentials, we trailed the Board's goal by 10,000 credentials. She stated that gains have been made by supporting teachers and students to achieve those credentials, not by accepting less than valuable credentials to boost the number.
- Ms. Honeycutt publicly thanked the General Assembly members for their commitment to this effort in providing \$1.2 million that are allocated to schools districts to help pay for the exams. While some exams do not have an associated charge, some are expensive, and can be a barrier for students who come from economically disadvantaged situations. Ms. Honeycutt stated that this funding likely attributes to the increase in credentials.
- There was no further discussion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis and seconded by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the Career and Technical Education Credentials Report as presented. (See Attachment GCS 4)*

## ***DISCUSSION***

### **GCS 5 – Career and Technical Education Revisions to Essential Standards**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy #GCS-F-005

#### **SBE Strategic Plan:**

**Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.

**Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Tracy S Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer) and Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt (Director, Career and Technical Education)

#### **Description:**

Career and Technical Education (CTE) is requesting revision to the CTE Essential Standards to add five new courses and remove five courses.

#### **Courses Being Added:**

In Family and Consumer Sciences Education: Principles of Family and Human Services, students learn core functions of the human services field; individual, family, and community systems; and life literacy skills for human development. Emphasis is placed on professional skills, human ecology, diversity, analyzing community issues, and life management skills. Activities engage students in exploring various helping professions, while building essential life skills they can apply in their own lives to achieve optimal wellbeing. English/language arts, social studies, mathematics, science, technology, interpersonal relationships are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include service learning and job shadowing. Family, Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

\*For safety and sanitation reasons, enrollment should not exceed 20 in this course.

In Trade and Industrial Education: Advanced Manufacturing I and Advanced Manufacturing II:

**Advanced Manufacturing I** - This course is the first part of a two-part sequence on the basic functional knowledge and skills needed in the advanced manufacturing environment. This course covers introduction to manufacturing, safety, and quality and is based upon the Manufacturing Skills Standards Council's (MSSC) Certified Production Technicians certification (CPT). CPT is recognized by manufacturers in NC and the USA as a fundamental certification needed by advanced manufacturing production workers. Topics included in this course include 21st century skills, working in manufacturing, understanding customers' needs, communication strategies, how to develop and deliver training, manufacturing safety, personal protective equipment, fire and electrical safety, blueprint reading, basic measurements, precision tools, quality systems, corrective action process, and verification processes. English/language arts are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include job shadowing. Apprenticeship and cooperative education are possible for this course (age limits may apply). SkillsUSA competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

**Advanced Manufacturing II** - This course is the second part of a two-part sequence on the basic functional knowledge and skills needed in the advanced manufacturing environment. This course covers manufacturing processes, production and maintenance and is based upon the Manufacturing Skills Standards Council's (MSSC) Certified Production Technicians certification (CPT). CPT is recognized by manufacturers all over NC and the USA as a fundamental certification needed by advanced manufacturing production workers. Topics included in this course are identifying customer needs, determining resources available for production process, equipment setup, setting team production goals, perform and monitor the process to make a product, document the process and determine product shipping or distribution, and performing routine maintenance of electrical, pneumatic, hydraulic, and machine automation. English language arts are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include job shadowing. Apprenticeship and cooperative education are possible for this course (age limits may apply). SkillsUSA competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

In Trade & Industrial Education: Law and Justice I and Law and Justice II:

**Law and Justice I**: Students desiring to pursue a career in Law and Justice will examine the basic concepts of law related to citizens' rights and officers' responsibilities to maintain a safe society. This course begins with a study of various careers in public safety. The course will explore the history and development of law enforcement in the United States. Students will then examine the components of the criminal justice system, including the roles and responsibilities of the police, courts, and corrections. Additionally, students will learn the classification and elements of crimes. Students will receive instruction in critical skill areas including communicating with diverse groups, conflict resolution, the use of force continuum, report writing, operation of police and emergency equipment, and courtroom testimony. Career planning and employability skills will be emphasized. English/language arts are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include job shadowing. Apprenticeship and cooperative education is not possible for this course. SkillsUSA competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

Law and Justice II: This course emphasizes the structure of the American legal system while examining constitutional legal issues. Students will explore the difference between common and statutory law in the context of how legal precedent is established. The course will explore the rights of citizens guaranteed by the United States and North Carolina constitutions. Students will also evaluate the powers granted to the police and the restrictions placed upon them by the respective constitutions and their amendments. Specific topics of discussion will include search and seizure, arrests, interviews, interrogations, and confessions in the context of criminal prosecution. Major emphasis will be placed on the role and decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Students will utilize reading, writing, and critical thinking in the analysis of cases in a mock trial. In addition to legal issues, students will be exposed to advanced law and justice skills. Activities include tactics, methods, and skills utilized in the law enforcement field. Students will attain skills for dealing with disasters and emergency situations. The course culminates with students demonstrating their skills through participation in a simulated disaster scenario. The students are required to meet both national and intrastate professional guidelines as designated by applicable regulatory agencies such as Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and North Carolina Emergency Management. Upon completion of the course requirements and the final disaster simulation, students may be eligible to obtain certifications in American Heart Association's (AHA) Basic Life Support, and/or American Red Cross (ARC) First Aid and CPR.

English/language arts are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include job shadowing. Apprenticeship and cooperative education are possible for this course. SkillsUSA competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

Courses being removed:

From Family and Consumer Sciences: Teen Living is being deleted and Principles of Family and Human Services will serve as a substitute.

From Trade and Industrial Education four courses in Automotive are being removed: Brakes, Computer System Diagnostics, Electrical, and Advanced Electrical.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education provide feedback and input on the proposed changes and return the item for approval at the October 2015 State Board meeting.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis noted a thorough discussion of proposed changes to the Essential Standards involving Advanced Manufacturing, Law and Justice, Family and Consumer Sciences, etc. during the GCS Committee meeting on Wednesday. He shared that the Committee heard a great example from Superintendent Advisor Rodney Shotwell about collaboration that schools in Rockingham County are having with community colleges to increase opportunities for their students.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment GCS 5)

**DISCUSSION****GCS 6 – Guidelines for Academically or Intellectually Gifted (AIG) Programs****Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-150.5-8, Article 9B, SBE Policy #GCS-U-000**SBE Strategic Plan:****Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).**Goal 2:** Every student has a personalized education.**Objective 2.1:** Increase the number of students who graduate from high school with postsecondary credit.**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Sneha Shah-Coltrane (Director, Advanced Learning)**Description:**

Based on General Statute §115C-150.5-8, the State Board of Education sets the guidelines for the development of local AIG plans for all NC school districts. Local AIG Plans are developed every three years. Once developed at the district level, each local board of education approves the official AIG plan and SBE/DPI provides feedback. Based on recommendations from the Office of the State Auditor in 2008, SBE adopted the NC AIG Program Standards in July 2009 as a mechanism to create a statewide framework for quality programming while honoring local context and flexibility. These standards encompass all of the required components and further guidance from the SBE. The NC AIG Program Standards have been used by the LEAs as a guide for local AIG plans since the 2010-13 plan cycle. The next cycle of Local AIG Plans are due summer 2016 for the 2016-19 cycle.

In order to prepare for the 2016 updates of the Local AIG Plans, DPI is recommending revisions to the current NC AIG Program Standards. The changes do not change any content of the NC AIG Program standards but provide further clarity to support continuous program improvement. These revisions are based on implementation reviews of the current plans and direct feedback from districts and volunteer AIG regional leadership from across North Carolina. The NC AIG Program Standards are the official guidelines for the development of Local AIG Plans.

**Recommendations:**

State Board of Education members are asked to review and discuss the proposed changes to the NC AIG Program Standards as the official guidelines for Local AIG Plans.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis noted a thorough discussion about the guidelines for Academically or Intellectually Gifted Programs during the GCS Committee meeting on Wednesday.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the September State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in October 2015. (See Attachment GCS 6)

### ***NEW BUSINESS***

Under New Business, GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis reported that the GCS Committee received a status update from Dr. Tammy Howard about the NC Department of Public Instruction's Proof of Concept Study, which included updates on the sample report and on the professional development we are providing to teachers to successfully implement the Proof of Concept Study; the first testing window will occur in October. In addition, the GCS Committee received a report from the Residential Schools, which included a long list of "to dos" from Ms. Barbria Bacon.

### **CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

Under the Chairman Remarks, Chairman Cobey reiterated that the Graduation Rate is up to 85.4 percent, which speaks for itself and will resound throughout the life of each student who might have dropped out had it not been for focusing on strategies and methods to keep children in school through graduation.

Chairman Cobey also reminded Board members that we also have 72.2 percent of our traditional public schools and 70.4 percent of our charter schools with a Performance Grade C or better. In addition, math scores in elementary and middle schools showed improvement in percentage proficient at every grade level, noting that the reading results are up some, but are not up as consistently as the math scores. Chairman Cobey stated that the Board continues to be concerned for our schools with high poverty rates and its impact on achievement. He expressed confidence that the Board and the Department will work together to identify places for direct assistance as we work to strengthen all schools.

### **Announcements**

Chairman Cobey reminded Board members that the October meeting will be a one-day meeting on October 1 and will be held in Winston-Salem on the campus of Winston-Salem State University in the Anderson Center. The Board meeting will be preceded by the Board's semi-annual planning and work session on September 29 and 30. Details will be forthcoming. The Chairman briefly described the Board's activities during the planning and work session.

Chairman Cobey noted that Vice Chairman A.L. Collins is the Board member host, and expressed appreciation for all of his advance work to make this planning and work session a valuable experience in the Board's continuing efforts to improve public education. Vice Chairman Collins elaborated about the Board's hosts and provided a snapshot of the Board's planned activities, which includes school visits.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **State Board of Education Interagency Advisory Committee**

Chairman Cobey reminded Board members of the plan entitled the Constitutional Mandate to Provide an Opportunity for a Sound Basic Education that we submitted and defended before Judge Howard Manning. Notably, level 3 of the plan calls for an interagency advisory committee to be established by

the State Board. Chairman Cobey explained that a policy has been established for the Board's review and consideration to establish the interagency advisory committee. Prospective committee members are to be nominated by various agencies and stakeholder groups; ultimately, the State Board of Education will appoint the members. The Committee will advise the State Board of Education, and its purpose is to meet and identify challenges of at-risk school-age population such as poverty, safety, health and other non-academic barriers. In addition, the committee will make recommendations to the State Board of Education, other state agencies, and education stakeholder groups as to how best to facilitate access to all public school children to receive the opportunity for a sound basic education. Chairman Cobey called for a motion.

*Upon motion by Mr. Gregory Alcorn and seconded by Mr. Eric Davis, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the State Board of Education Interagency Advisory Committee policy as presented. (See Chairman's Notes)*

### **Resolution Thanking the Members of the Special Committee on Summative Assessment**

Chairman Cobey offered the following resolution and asked Vice Chairman Collins to read the resolution acknowledging the work of the members of the Special Committee's Task Force on Summative Assessment.

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
A Resolution Thanking the North Carolina  
State Board of Education's Task Force on Summative Assessment**

**WHEREAS**, the North Carolina State Board of Education takes pride in the extraordinary qualities and dedication of the citizens who serve public education through advisory bodies to the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, the members of the State Board of Education Task Force on Summative Assessment have reflected these qualities in an exemplary manner during service as an advisory body to the State Board of Education; and

**WHEREAS**, the North Carolina State Board of Education recognizes that the public service of such citizens is essential to supporting the work of the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, the leaders and the members of the Task Force dedicated their time in examining student assessment to offer recommendations on the best courses of action to maximize classroom instruction and measure student learning; and

**WHEREAS**, the Task Force worked diligently and with a sense of fairness to ensure that its recommendations would reflect sound research and would offer improvements to current practice; now

**THEREFORE, BE IT,**

**RESOLVED**, that the North Carolina State Board of Education thanks each member - Chairman Buddy Collins, Vice Chair Olivia Oxendine, State Superintendent June Atkinson, Erin Beale, Pam

Biggs, Lisa Chapman, Todd Davis, Ilina Ewen, Wayne Foster, Krystal Harris, Butch Hudson, Anna Jarrett, Michael Landers, Joe Maimone, Larry Obeda, Jennifer Robinson, Roberta Scott, Robert Taylor, Frank Till, Miriam Wagner, Hannah Youngblood of the North Carolina State Board of Education Task Force on Summative Assessment for unselfish service to the State Board of Education and the Great State of North Carolina; and

**RESOLVED**, that the Board expresses publicly its sincere appreciation and gratitude to these citizens who answered the call to participate in public service through this Task Force; and

**RESOLVED**, that Board members direct the Secretary to the State Board of Education to enter a copy of this resolution into the official minutes of the North Carolina State Board of Education.

William C. Cobey  
NC State Board of Education

September 3, 2015

June St. Clair Atkinson  
NC Department of Public Instruction

*Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the resolution thanking members of the Special Committee on Assessment as presented.*

Following the motion, Vice Chairman Collins expressed appreciation to everyone who served on this special committee, noting that this task has been handed over to the GCS Committee under the direction of Chair Eric Davis.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

No old business was brought before the Board.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

*Indicating no other business, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn. Upon motion by Ms. Patricia Willoughby and seconded by Mr. Gregory Alcorn, Board members voted unanimously to adjourn the September 2 and 3, 2015, meeting of the State Board of Education.*