

**Minutes of the  
North Carolina State Board of Education  
North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching  
NCCAT Drive  
Cullowhee, North Carolina 27601-2825  
October 3, 2013**

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

William Cobey, Chairman	Wayne McDevitt
A.L. "Buddy" Collins, Vice Chairman	Olivia Oxendine
Dan Forest, Lt. Governor	Marcella Savage
Janet Cowell, State Treasurer	John Tate
Gregory Alcorn	Rebecca Taylor
Kevin Howell	Patricia Willoughby

Also present was:

June St. Clair Atkinson, State Superintendent

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION**

State Board Chairman William Cobey called the Thursday session of the October 2013 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 reminded the audience that the Board was meeting in Cullowhee, North Carolina, at the North Carolina Center for Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT). He noted that Dr. Richard Thompson (Interim Executive Director, NCCAT) and staff have been extremely accommodating hosts since Monday evening when the Board began its semi-annual Planning and Work Session. Beginning Tuesday, the Board began developing its plan of work for the immediate future as well as the next couple of years. The Board's advisors and external partners will vet this work over the next few months and provide the Board with feedback. Chairman Cobey also shared that Dr. David Belcher (Chancellor of Western Carolina University), along with his wife, Susan, hosted a reception for the Board on Wednesday evening, which provided the Board an opportunity to interact with some of their Education Department and administrative staff. On behalf of the Board, Chairman Cobey thanked Dr. and Mrs. Belcher for their gracious hospitality.

Prior to beginning the meeting, Chairman Cobey explained that while the agenda is compressed for this one-day meeting, the presenters would be given the same amount of time to present the issues as they would in regular committee presentations.

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

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.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION - WELCOME**

- Dr. Michael Murray (Superintendent, Jackson County Schools) and Ms. Alie Laird-Large (Vice Chairman, Jackson County Board of Education)

On behalf of Jackson County Public Schools, Dr. Murray and Ms. Laird-Large welcomed the State Board of Education to Jackson County, and invited Board members to participate in a tour of Jackson County Schools following today’s Board meeting. At the request of Board member Tate, Dr. Murray spoke briefly about the K-8 configuration of his district, and elaborated on how they are addressing the needs of their middle school population. Dr. Murray also spoke about the two early college high schools in Jackson County.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the September 4-5, 2013, State Board of Education meetings.

***Discussion/Comments:***

- There was no discussion.

*Mr. John Tate made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 4-5, 2013, State Board of Education meetings. Seconded by Treasurer Janet Cowell, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.*

**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. Consent items will be adopted as a whole.

Chairman Cobey noted 12 items for consideration on the consent agenda. He asked if any Board members wanted to remove any of the items from the Consent Agenda. Hearing no requests, Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

*Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, and seconded by Ms. Marcella Savage, the Board voted unanimously to approve GCS 5 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on the Department of Public Instruction’s Implementation of the Founding Principles Act; GCS 6 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Educational Performance of Children with Disabilities; GCS 7 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Students with Disabilities – Definition of Residence (Annual Child Count); GCS 8 – Race to the Top Evaluation Report: North Carolina Virtual Public Schools Blended Learning STEM Courses: Participant Experiences from the First Year of Implementation (First-Year Formative Assessment, Part II); TCP 4 – Initial Teacher Licensure Exam Requirements; TCP 5 – Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) Annual Performance Report; TCS 3 – Governor’s School Board of Governors; TCS 4 – Individual Class Size Waiver Request Process; TCS 5 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Use of Mobile Communication Devices; TCS 6 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Public School Procurement of Information Technology; LFI 1 – Revision of Policies Related to Charter Schools (TCS-U); and LFI 2 – Repeal of Policy TCS-B-006, as presented.*

### **GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE STUDENTS**

**(Ms. Marcella Savage, Chair; Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Vice Chair)**

#### **CONSENT**

#### **GCS 5 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on the Department of Public Instruction’s Implementation of the Founding Principles Act**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute § 115C- 81 (g); SBE Policy # GCS-F-003 and GCS-N-004

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Ms. Fay Gore (Section Chief, Social Studies)

#### **Description:**

On June 23, 2011, the North Carolina General Assembly passed The Founding Principles Act (SL 2011-273) that directs local boards of education to require, as a condition of high school graduation, students to complete successfully a semester course, "American History I - The Founding Principles." Additionally, the Department of Public Instruction and local boards of education, as appropriate, are directed to provide "curriculum content" to support this course. Lastly, the Act directs the State Board of Education to align "any curriculum-based tests developed and administered statewide" to include the content expressed in the Act.

With the passage of The Founding Principles Act, the 2010 North Carolina Essential Standards for American History I: The Founding Principles have been aligned to reflect all of the content enumerated therein. Because the American History I: The Founding Principles Essential Standards have a 100% alignment with the content outlined in The Founding Principles Act, the standards were not revised. However, members of the NC DPI K-12 Social Studies section modified the 2010 NC Essential Standards document for American History I: The Founding Principles to demonstrate this alignment. This modification included changing the name of the course to reflect the name identified in the Act. The Civics and Economics course was also aligned to the content enumerated in The Founding Principles Act because this course provides a more in-depth study of the content outlined in The Founding Principles Act and will serve as reinforcement for American History I: The Founding Principles.

In March 2011, House Bill 48 was signed into law and eliminated statewide standardized testing in the public schools, except as required by federal law or as a condition of a federal grant. This included the elimination of the United States History End-of-Course test as well as the Civics and Economics End-of-Course test, both of which could have been used to measure student competence regarding the content outlined in The Founding Principles Act. Teachers may use the resources developed by the Bill of Rights Institute to access their students' progress.

In September 2013, NC DPI engaged in a contract with the Bill of Rights Institute (BORI) to develop course content to support implementation of The Founding Principles Act. The course content will consist of ten (10) complete instructional units that contain the following: pre-assessment; primary source analysis; written reflection; and document-based assessments. Specific details of the units are contained in Appendix E. The units will be ready for use during the 2014-15 school year. Once the units are completed, NC DPI will work to provide professional development for teachers.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is requested that State Board of Education members accept the report that will be submitted to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee regarding implementation requirements outlined in The Founding Principles Act.

**CONSENT**

**GCS 6 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Educational Performance of Children with Disabilities**

**Policy Implications:** SL 2006-69, General Statute § 115C-127.5 (HB 1908)

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support), and Mr. William J. Hussey, (Director, Exceptional Children Division)

**Description:**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) requires each state to submit a State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). The SPP is a six-year performance plan, which evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements of the IDEA and improve its results for students with disabilities. It describes how North Carolina will improve its performance on 20 prescribed indicators. Fourteen of the SPP indicators (Indicators 1-14) focus on educational outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as compliance with the IDEA. The last six SPP indicators (Indicators 15-20) review the State Education Agency's general supervision authority under the IDEA. North Carolina established measurable and rigorous targets for each indicator and must report annually through the APR on the performance of the state.

The SPP and APR were submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) on February 1, 2013. Attached is the North Carolina Part B Annual Performance Report.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the SBE accept this report for submission to the General Assembly.

**CONSENT**

**GCS 7 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Students with Disabilities –  
Definition of Residence (Annual Child Count)**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2007-292 (House Bill 18)

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Mr. William J. Hussey, (Director, Exceptional Children Division)

**Description:**

This item is submitted to the State Board of Education to comply with the following legislative mandate: the SBE shall require an annual census of all children with disabilities residing in the state. The census shall be conducted annually and shall be completed by October 15, submitted to the Governor and General Assembly, and made available to the public by January 15.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the SBE accept this report for submission to the Governor and the General Assembly.

**CONSENT**

**GCS 8 – Race to the Top Evaluation Report: North Carolina Virtual Public Schools Blended Learning STEM Courses: Participant Experiences from the First Year of Implementation (First-Year Formative Assessment, Part II)**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2007-292 (House Bill 18)

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

**Description:**

The Consortium for Educational Research and Evaluation – North Carolina (CERE-NC) is conducting an independent external evaluation of North Carolina’s Race to the Top (RttT) initiatives. CERE-NC is a partnership of the Carolina Institute for Public Policy at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Friday Institute for Educational Innovation at North Carolina State University, and the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The roles of the CERE-NC are to (1) document the activities of the RttT initiatives; (2) provide timely formative data, analyses, and recommendations to help the initiative teams improve their ongoing work; and (3) provide summative evaluation results toward the end of the grant period to determine whether the RttT initiatives met their goals and to inform future policy and program decisions to sustain, modify, or discontinue initiatives after the grant-funded period.

Evaluation reports have been submitted to the State Board of Education since September 2011. The following evaluation reports are being submitted for review and approval this month.

North Carolina Virtual Public Schools Blended Learning STEM Courses: Participant Experiences from the First Year of Implementation (First-Year Formative Assessment, Part II – This report focuses on the use of RttT funds to develop a series of STEM-based courses to be delivered to underserved students

through the Virtual Public School (NCVPS) via a blended-learning model. The evaluation’s goals are to assess the extent to which this initiative contributes to: (a) the enrollment of underserved students targeted by the initiative; (b) the success of those students in the STEM courses offered; and (c) an increase in the availability of effective STEM teaching to students in high-need schools. This report – the second part of a two-part report on the first year of implementation – presents participant feedback from the second semester of implementation (January-June 2013). This feedback supplements baseline measures from the first semester, provides data for additional first-year formative feedback to NCVPS in support of the growth and development of this initiative, and informs future evaluation of the NCVPS blended still-developing initiative in order to inform ongoing initiative improvements; it is not intended to serve as a statement about the anticipated quality of the final form of this initiative.

**Recommendation(s):**

The State Board of Education is asked to accept this report.

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

**CONSENT**

**TCP 4 – Initial Teacher Licensure Exam Requirements**

**Implications:** General Statute § 115C-296; SBE Policy # TCP-A-003

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support), Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director of Educator Effectiveness) and Dr. Rachel McBroom (Director of Educator Preparation, Academic Services and Instructional Support)

**Description:**

Per Session Law 2013-360, the State Board of Education shall require applicants for initial bachelors or graduate degree teaching licenses to pass the appropriate licensure exam. Currently, teacher education candidates seeking middle or high school licenses are not required to pass licensure exams prior to the initial licensure recommendation by the college or university.

**Recommendation(s):**

The State Board of Education approve the recommended policy change for university/college teacher education program completers to pass the appropriate licensure exams prior to the initial teaching license recommendation. This change would go into effect July 1, 2014.

**CONSENT**

**TCP 5 – 2013 IHE Performance Report**

**Implications:** General Statute § 115C-296(b1); SBE Policy # TCP-B-008

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support), Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director of Educator Effectiveness Division, Academic Services and Instructional Support), and Dr. Rachel McBroom (Director of Educator Preparation, Academic Services and Instructional Support)

**Description:**

General Statute § 115C-296(b1) requires an annual IHE performance report to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs. The Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) summary performance report for the 2012-13 school year is presented to the SBE for consent. Upon SBE approval, the IHE performance report is forwarded to Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee (JLEOC). Separate institutional reports for each IHE will be uploaded on the NCDPI website.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended the State Board approve the IHE performance report as written.

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

***CONSENT***

**TCS 3 – Governor’s School Board of Governors**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy # HSP-D-009

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Mr. William J. Hussey (Director, Exceptional Children Division)

**Description:**

The Board of Governors of the Governor’s School of North Carolina is established as an advisory body in federal and state law as an Advisory Council to the State Board of Education. Its establishment is set forth in HSP-D-009 of State Board of Education policies.

The policy requires that a state associate superintendent serve on the Board and that the other nine members shall include a local superintendent, a teacher, a local director of gifted programs, the president or president’s designee of the Alumni Association of the Governor’s School, and lay persons, and shall be selected so as to represent the eight education districts of the state. Presidents (or their designees) from each of the host institutions (i.e., Salem College and Meredith College) serve in an ex officio non-voting capacity.

The term of appointments for all members appointed is three years, with no person serving more than two consecutive three-year terms. State Board of Education members nominate individuals from their respective districts to fill Board of Governors’ vacancies. Currently, not all required positions are filled. The following individuals have been identified for nomination to fill at-large vacancies:

- District 1 – Ms. Taylor is nominating Ms. Debra A. Sommer to begin a three-year term. Ms. Sommer is the Regional Director of Sylvan Learning Centers of Eastern North Carolina and previously taught academically gifted students in Edgecombe County Schools.
- District 6 – A nominee has yet to be identified; it is hoped a nominee will be brought forward in November.

- District 7 – Mr. Alcorn is nominating Dr. Jeff Cox to begin a three-year term. Dr. Cox has been Superintendent of Alleghany County Schools since 2005. He has witnessed the success of Governor’s School with many of his students and is eager to help contribute to the program’s tradition of excellence.

**Recommendation(s):**

The State Board of Education is asked to approve the two nominations (one each from Districts 1 and 7), each for a three-year term beginning July 1, 2013.

**CONSENT**

**TCS 4 – Individual Class-Size Waiver Request Process**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute § 115C-301(g); SBE Policy # TCS-L-000; School Attendance and Student Accounting Manual

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip W. Price (CFO/CIO, Financial, Business, and Technology Services) Mrs. Alexis Schauss (Director, School Business Division), and Mr. Andrew Cox (Section Chief, School Financial Reporting)

**Description:**

House Bill 112 (Session Law 2013-363) Section 3.3 re-written General Statute § 115C-301(g) “Waivers and Allotment Adjustments” and 115C-301(h) related to class size. This session law changes the law in the following ways:

- Eliminates class size in grades 4 through 12;
- Eliminates maximum teaching loads in grades 7 through 12;
- Eliminates alternative maximum class size for classes such as music, physical education, etc.;
- Eliminates the State Board of Education’s ability to allot additional positions;
- Removes the criteria that the State Board of Education shall use to determine a waiver from class size maximums; and
- Eliminates the penalty for willful non-compliance.

In addition, the legislation directs the State Board of Education to adopt rules regarding General Statute § 115C-301. Attached are the recommended rules.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the waiver process.

**CONSENT**

**TCS 5 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Use of Mobile Communication Devices**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2013-360 (SB 402 Budget Bill) Section 7.18(b)

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip W. Price (CFO/CIO, Financial, Business, and Technology Services)

**Description:**

This item is submitted to the State Board of Education to comply with the following legislative mandate: Beginning October 1, 2013, each state agency shall submit a quarterly report to the Joint Legislative



Oversight Committee on Information Technology, the Fiscal Research Division, and the Office of the State Chief Information Officer (CIO) on the use of mobile electronic communications devices within the agency.

The report shall include the following information:

- (1) The total number of devices issued by the agency.
- (2) The total cost of mobile devices issued by the agency.
- (3) The number and cost of new devices issued since the last report.
- (4) The contracts used to obtain the devices.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the SBE accept this report for submission to the Governor and the General Assembly.

**CONSENT**

**TCS 6 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly on Public School Procurement of Information Technology**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2013-360 (SB 402 Budget Bill) Section 7.6(c)

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip W. Price (CFO/CIO, Financial, Business, and Technology Services)

**Description:**

This item is submitted to the State Board of Education to comply with the following legislative mandate: By October 1, 2013, and quarterly thereafter, the Office of the State CIO and DPI shall report on the establishment of public school cooperative purchasing agreements, savings resulting from the establishment of the agreements, and any issues impacting the establishment of the agreements. The reports shall be made to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Information Technology, the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee, and the Fiscal Research Division.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the SBE accept this report for submission to the Governor and the General Assembly.

**LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
(Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Chair; Mr. Reginald Kenan, Vice Chair)**

**CONSENT**

**LFI 1 – Revision of Policies Related to Charter Schools (TCS-U)**

**Implications:** General Statute § 115C-238.29; SBE Policy # TCS-U

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip Price (Chief Financial Officer, Financial and Business Services) and Dr. Joel Medley (Director, Office of Charter Schools)

**Description:**

With significant changes in the Charter School law since the charter cap was lifted in August 2011, many of the State Board of Education policies found in TCS-U are in need of revision. The Office of Charter Schools is bringing forward several policy change recommendations. These modifications include statutory updates, repeal of outdated policies, clarification based upon past State Board practice, and simple structural changes for purposes of flow.

The affected policies are listed below:

- (1) TCS-U-000: Enrollments in Charter Schools
- (2) TCS-U-001: Charter School Accountability Requirements
- (3) TCS-U-002: Criminal History Checks in Charter Schools -- to be repealed
- (4) TCS-U-003: Student Admission
- (5) TCS-U-006: Financial and Governance Noncompliance
- (6) TCS-U-008: Definition of a Charter School -- to be repealed
- (7) TCS-U-012: Application and Review Process
- (8) TCS-U-013: Preliminary Planning Year

A chart that outlines the proposed modifications and the explanation for those changes is included as an attachment for the State Board's review. The actual policy proposals are also attached utilizing the underline and strikethrough method for easy identification of policy revisions.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the recommendations of the Department of Public Instruction approving these modifications to the policies related to charter schools.

**CONSENT**

**LFI 2 – Repeal of Policy TCS-B-006 - Governor’s School Board of Governors**

**Implications:** General Statute § 115C-238.29; SBE Policy # TCS-B-006

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip Price (Chief Financial Officer, Financial and Business Services) and Dr. Joel Medley (Director, Office of Charter Schools)

**Description:**

On August 4, 2011, the State Board of Education adopted policy TCS-B-006 to create a Public Charter School Advisory Council (PCSAC). Since the legislatively-imposed cap had been lifted, the State Board recognized the need to create a body to assist them in the review of charter applications and offer recommendations related to charter school renewals. The PCSAC worked diligently to process the 160 applications and make numerous recommendations to the State Board.

With recent revisions to the Charter School Act specifically creating a new Charter School Advisory Board, this policy is no longer needed by the State Board of Education. To remove a duplicative committee and prevent any confusion, the policy should be repealed

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the recommendations of the Department of Public Instruction to repeal SBE Policy # TCS-B-006.

**BOARD MEETING AND COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS****INFORMATION AGENDA****21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY PROFESSIONALS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
(Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Chair; Mr. John Tate, Vice Chair)*****INFORMATION*****TCP 3 – Analysis of Student Work Process**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy # TCP-C-006; APA #16 NCAC 61.0504

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support), Ms. Jennifer DeNeal (RttT Project Coordinator for Teacher and Leader Effectiveness) and Dr. Robin McCoy (RttT Standards and Assessment)

**Description:**

North Carolina's Race to the Top plan and waiver from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act require that each educator's evaluation include an explicit measure of student growth, which is the rating on the sixth standard. To measure student growth in the grades/subjects and courses without End of Course assessments, End of Grade assessments, NC Final Exams, Career and Technical Education assessments, or K-3 Checkpoint, the Department of Public Instruction has partnered with teachers to design measures of student learning. The Analysis of Student Work (ASW) Process is the proposed measure of student learning for select Arts Education, Healthful Living, World Language, Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate educators.

In the ASW Process, teachers collect multiple samples of student work from two points in time. These samples will be submitted for blind review by content experts and assessed for growth in relation to objectives from the North Carolina Essential Standards or other appropriate standards. Collections of student work samples will be evaluated each year and averaged over three consecutive years to form a Standard 6 rating on the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System.

The Department of Public Instruction conducted an initial pilot of the ASW Process in spring 2013 with 100 educators in Arts Education, Healthful Living and World Languages. The pilot participants represented various program configurations within these content areas as well as North Carolina's eight educational regions. The Department received a great deal of helpful feedback from the pilot participants, which it has used in refining the ASW Process.

Based on the feedback from the initial pilot, the Department is planning a larger pilot for spring 2014. The upcoming pilot will include educators from the original pilot areas as well as educators who teach Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses.

**Recommendation(s):**

N/A

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Savage recognized Dr. Garland and Ms. DeNeal to present this item.
- Dr. Garland set the context for this presentation by speaking about Standard 6 in the Teacher Evaluation System. She explained that North Carolina emulated the process of gathering student work from Tennessee, a state that has been a leader in this work and received national attention on the model they are implementing. The person leading this effort in Tennessee has been a consultant to North Carolina. Dr. Garland introduced Ms. Jennifer DeNeal, who has been working on the Analysis of Student Work process for the Department, to lead this discussion.
- Using a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. DeNeal explained that the Analysis of Student Work (ASW) Process is the proposed measure of student learning for select Arts Education, Healthful Living, World Language, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate educators. After speaking briefly about the background of the process, Ms. DeNeal shared that the Department conducted a pilot of the ASW Process in spring 2013, representing all regions in North Carolina and gathered helpful feedback from pilot participants to refine the ASW Process. The Department is planning a larger pilot for spring 2014, which will include educators from the original pilot areas as well as educators who teach Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses. The response to the pilot has been overwhelmingly positive. According to Ms. DeNeal, 88 percent of the respondents to the survey either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: Analysis of Student Work is an authentic measure of student learning for performance-based classes.
- Ms. DeNeal shared a diagram of a standard example of the ASW Process to show what it would look like for a world language educator on a traditional calendar.
- In addition, Ms. DeNeal reviewed the proposed timeline for the ASW Process, which includes communication strategies, training materials, staff development, the larger pilot launch, the implementation schedule, etc.
- In response to Dr. Oxendine's question, Ms. DeNeal explained the Department is currently interviewing vendors that can support this integration in Home Base.
- Vice Chairman Collins asked Ms. DeNeal to explain the role of the principal in the evaluation. Ms. DeNeal stated that the role of the principal in the beginning of the process is to ensure that teachers are selecting the objectives represented in the coursework. The content area reviewers evaluate the artifacts. In response to Mr. Collins' follow-up question about how this relates to teacher contracts, Dr. Garland explained that, in terms of teacher evaluation on the instrument, there are six standards. Standard six is the data standard in which we provide information around student growth. The principal or his/her designee has total control and responsibility for evaluating teachers using Standards 1-5. As it relates to the contracts, the Department has tried to encourage school districts to use all available data in order to determine the 25 percent; however, the LEA has responsibility as to how those decisions are made. She shared that the evaluation instrument should be one of the main criteria, but the principal may consider other information. The Department has hosted webinars to provide guidance for the LEAs.
- Dr. Garland explained that ASW would be used for certain teachers that do not have a final exam. The current measures of student learning should cover about 95 percent of teachers. For those that cannot be covered by any existing measures of student learning, the Department will work with LEAs to develop guidance for how they can determine growth for those teachers.

- State Superintendent Atkinson shared that, for several sessions, the intent of the General Assembly when the evaluation system is fully implemented has been to include student growth. Until that time, for the student growth component LEAs have the flexibility to determine how to award contracts to teachers based in part on the teacher evaluation instrument for Standards 1-5. There are two reasons we are moving in this direction, 1) state law and 2) NCLB/ESEA. She added that the Department's guiding principle is to make ASW a reliable and valid process that fits smoothly and efficiently into the educator evaluation system.
- Lt. Governor Forest stated that he assumed that all teachers would be trained on how to evaluate. He added that he also assumed students would be randomly selected to participate. He asked Ms. DeNeal to elaborate about how many evaluations a teacher would potentially have to do in a year as well as how much time it would take them, and when, within the timeframe of a school year, those evaluations would take place. In response to Lt. Governor Forest, Ms. DeNeal explained that the evaluators will have to go through specific evaluation training and that all teachers will have an understanding of the evaluation process so that they know what they will be evaluated on. Since the first pilot was small, the Department did not have the opportunity to scale up and determine how many evaluators would be needed in the process, which is part of the reason for the larger pilot, which will occur in spring 2014. As it relates to the time required to review, the research from Tennessee shows that to look at an entire evidence collection, the evaluator needs approximately one hour per evidence collection. Ms. DeNeal also noted that, because the process is online, it can be completed during planning periods, before and after school, or whenever it is most convenient and does not interfere with what the evaluators are already doing. The Department will share the results of the spring 2014 pilot with the Board in early summer 2014.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for information only. (See Attachment TCP 3)

### **ACTION AND DISCUSSION AGENDA**

#### **GLOBALLY COMPETITIVE STUDENTS**

**(Ms. Marcella Savage, Chair; Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Vice Chair)**

#### ***ACTION***

#### **GCS 1 – Academic Achievement Standards (Cut Scores) and Achievement Level Descriptors**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute § 115C.174.1; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Dr. Tammy L. Howard (Director of Accountability Services)

#### **Description:**

At the September 2013 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting, a motion was approved to make the recommended academic achievement standards (cut scores) effective for the 2013-14 school year and to consider transitional cut scores for the 2012-13 school year. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction is presenting options for transitional cut scores to be adopted for implementation in 2012-13

only. The achievement level descriptors (ALDs) are recommended to be effective with the 2012-13 school year.

The cut score options being presented for the 2012-13 school year include the following four options:

Option 1 (no transitional cut scores):

Adopt the recommended cut scores presented in September

Option 2 (transitional cut scores):

Weigh equally the teacher-panel standard setting results (recommended cut scores presented and adopted in September) and all teachers' input from the 2012-13 test administration data collection of all students' anticipated achievement level

Option 3 (transitional cut scores):

Apply a standard error of measure to the recommended cut scores presented and adopted in September

Option 4 (transitional cut scores):

Adjust the percent of students at each achievement level by one-half the difference between the cut scores presented and adopted in September and the previous assessments' (2011-12) percentages

Attachment 6 presents the pros and cons of each of the options. The impact data for each of the options will be presented to the SBE.

The academic achievement standards (cut scores) and ALDs adopted will quantify student performance on the End-of-Course (EOC) tests in Biology, English II, and Math I; the End-of-Grade (EOG) tests in English Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics at grades 3–8 and Science at grades 5 and 8; the *NCEXTEND2* EOC alternate assessments in Biology, English II, and Math I; the *NCEXTEND2* EOG alternate assessments in English Language Arts/Reading and Mathematics at grades 3–8 and Science at grades 5 and 8; and the *NCEXTEND1* alternate assessments at Grades 3–8, 10 and 11.

### **Recommendation(s):**

The Department recommends that the State Board (1) affirms the September action of approving the recommended academic achievement standards (cut scores) effective with the 2013-14 school year data, (2) adopts academic achievement standards (cut scores) effective for the 2012-13 school year data, and (3) adopts the achievement level descriptors effective with the 2012-13 school year.

### **Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Marcella Savage recognized Drs. Quick and Howard to present this item.
- Based on feedback from the September Board meeting, Dr. Quick explained that the purpose of this presentation is to highlight information requested about the academic achievement cut scores and achievement level descriptors.
- Using a PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Quick set the context of the presentation by providing background information about how we have reached this place. She explained that the State Board of Education adopted more rigorous content standards several years ago for Common Core

Mathematics and English/Language Arts along with the Essential Standards. As a result, the expectations for students increased, and the new tests were aligned to these expectations.

- Dr. Quick noted that we are also seeing increased rigor with other national measures within the context of this discussion point. For example, she noted that, in 2011, at the national level, in grade 4, only 39 percent of the students were proficient in Math and 32 percent were proficient in reading. In grade 8, 34 percent were proficient in Math and 32 percent were proficient in reading on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). She explained that this is showing that we are moving toward higher expectations not only in North Carolina but also across the nation. Dr. Quick also shared the national 2013 graduate data, which showed that only 26 percent of students in the nation met all four benchmarks of the ACT.
- Dr. Quick shared that the ultimate goal is to provide students options and to ensure that we have students who are prepared for a more demanding job market.
- Dr. Quick stated that it is important to remember that we have raised expectations significantly in the 2012-13 school year. In summary, she explained that, in the past, North Carolina has looked at grade-level proficiency only, but, with this work, we have moved toward the idea of grade-level proficiency and college and career readiness.
- Using a PowerPoint graph, Dr. Quick shared a historical look at the data when content standards have been changed (increase in rigor) since 1992-93 to 2011-12 in both reading and mathematics.
- Also using a PowerPoint graph provided by Metametrics, Dr. Howard shared recent data that highlights the change in expectations. She explained that Metametrics analyzed the North Carolina growth in reading by achievement level (for End of Grade assessments) relative to Common Core State Standards text complexity ranges.
- In addition, Dr. Howard revisited the information that was covered in September with respect to the New York and Kentucky's State Assessments. She stated that it has been difficult in those states as well, particularly when communicating with stakeholders, parents and communities. She reminded Board members that North Carolina's proficiency levels are more in line with Kentucky's levels.
- Dr. Howard reviewed the status of the standard-setting process. She reminded Board members that, at the September meeting, they adopted the recommended cut scores effective with the 2013-14 school year with results reporting in August 2014. Also, in September, the State Board requested that the Department provide options for 2012-13 to allow a transitional year to the more rigorous cut scores. Dr. Howard shared that input from stakeholders has been mixed. Some have endorsed the option of set cut scores for a minimum of three years while others endorsed a transitional implementation with phased-in cut scores in effect for 2012-13 and the September recommended cut scores in effect for 2013-14.
- Dr. Howard spoke briefly about the implications of transitional and fixed cut scores. She also provided a timeframe for applying cut scores.
- In addition, Dr. Howard spoke about each of the options and directed Board members to Attachment 6 for the overview/description of each option as well as a comparison of the different attributes of each option.
- In response to Dr. Oxendine's question about text complexity, Dr. Howard stated that text complexity is part of the Common Core English Language Arts Standards and is one output and one measure. When developing the assessments, several readability formulas are used. A brief discussion ensued about the types of questions that teachers will have. For example, teachers will need to know when they should focus on fluency vs. comprehension as it relates to text complexity. Dr. Howard stated that the Department's curriculum division partners with the Testing Division in the

development of assessments. Dr. Quick explained that focusing on fluency or comprehension would depend on the grade level.

- In response to Board member Alcorn's question about how we will know if we are accomplishing the goals of increasing the graduation rate and increasing the percentage of students going to college, Dr. Quick explained that this data will come from many sources such as community colleges, business and industry, and the workforce in general. She reminded Board members that this is an important conversation with institutions of higher education and community colleges as well as other states so when we reach this pinnacle, we have data to support the findings. National data that will be tracked include the NAEP data, ACT, and remediation rates, as well as college completion rates. Dr. Quick stated that, from a research perspective, State Boards across the nation would likely prioritize the metrics they want to use to say that they have reached a particular point. Dr. Howard added that the WorkKeys assessment is also administered in North Carolina, which is comprised of math and reading assessment measures - skills needed in the workplace. She noted that the Common Core State Standards support those skills as well. We expect to see an increase in the number of students who receive a WorkKeys certificate at the silver or higher level, which then qualifies the students for certain jobs.
- Board member Tate asked Dr. Howard to share the Department's recommendation. Dr. Howard explained that the Department fully supports Option 1; the options are in rank order of technical soundness. She noted that Options 2 and 3 are more equal; however, the Department's preference is Option 2 over Option 3. Dr. Howard reminded the State Board that her division's role is a technical role and to provide options that can withstand scrutiny by national technical experts, the U.S. Department of Education, and by the American Psychological Association. She stated that the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction is a test producer (test publisher) and the Department is held to the same standards as those of NAEP, ACT, etc.
- In response to Vice Chairman Collins' question, Dr. Howard provided explanatory comments about what the data tell a teacher about his/her students, and possible next steps for increasing proficiency. She also spoke briefly about subsequent programmatic decisions at the school level and/or data-driven decisions. Dr. Howard shared that it is important to remember that growth information is also available for schools. However, she reminded Board members that growth is not related to these cut scores.
- Also in response to Vice Chairman Collins, Dr. Howard clarified the differences between proficiency and growth.
- Mr. Collins stated that when he sees a 45 percent proficient rating, it raises the question: "did the teacher do what we asked them to do?" Should we expect teachers to be more than 50 percent proficient? Referencing Dr. Garland's earlier remarks, Dr. Howard reminded Mr. Collins that she referred to looking at all points of data. Dr. Howard shared that she recognizes that proficiency data is a very important piece of data, and would be ranked close to the top while having a conversation. However, it is important to remember that there are other factors occurring in that teacher's classroom such as growth, which is huge. Mr. Collins wanted to know what would be done differently next year so that we are not having this same conversation when the stakes are higher. He stated that, from a policy standpoint, if the State Board accepts these scores as correct and they reflect what went on in the classroom, then something different needs to happen next year to ensure better results. Dr. Quick stated that as it relates to the high stakes and/or consequences for teachers, the option does remove the consequence for this year. She added that the growth value is what the consequences will be based on. Data show an upward trend in growth even though the cut scores are different, the rigor and expectations have been raised, and the proficiency scores are down, which means teachers are teaching and working with their students to meet higher academic standards. She explained that from a



principal's perspective, if she saw a teacher that had low proficiency scores as well as low growth in the classroom, that would be alarming. She explained that it is important to balance proficiency with the growth component. Students may not reach the proficiency levels because they start at different levels, but the growth aspect will tell you if teachers are moving students forward by the end of the semester or year. If not, the teacher and principal need to look at what is not occurring in the classroom to meet the needs of the students to provide interventions, differentiate that content, etc. As it relates to what will be different in the future, Dr. Quick explained that, as a state, the Department is providing intervention tools and suggestions for interventions along the way with Home Base, and providing instructional resources on how to differentiate for different populations of students, etc. A brief discussion ensued about the A-F performance grades. Dr. Howard stated that the Department recognizes the importance of conversations including proficiency and growth. North Carolina was a leader in being one of the first states, if not the first state, to integrate growth into its accountability model. Many schools across the state are doing a fantastic job and have done enormous work, but it is also important to remember that one can grow and not meet that proficiency level. Meeting that proficiency is what makes one college and career ready.

- Noting sensitivity toward the Vice Chairman's question, Board member Tate stated that this is the price to pay to elevate standards and the level of rigor under the premise that students are well served and better prepared when they graduate. He stated that if North Carolina finds itself stalemated at 49 percent in the growth category, then this issue would need to be revisited. This is about teachers continuing to learn and using data well to find out why students are proficient and provide customized learning.
- Board member Oxendine stated that she would like the Board to develop an action plan as it relates to next steps toward fixing the issues.
- Board member Willoughby shared that the decision to raise standards was not created in a vacuum at the Board table. There was great effort and input from higher education and business leaders. She stated that everyone agreed that students need more rigor to be successful in today's society. In addition, she added that third grade reading proficiencies are important, and we should see great gains in response to the law, which mandates that no student will leave third grade without being able to read. According to Board member Willoughby, the State Board needs to communicate that this is a message about Pre-K, child nutrition, and providing services around a child, and that there are many other things that society can do to make a difference in proficiency; it's not just a teacher's job and we all have responsibility.
- Lt. Governor Forest stated that this is a perfect storm for morale issues across the state, which has been addressed by the State Board in the past. In response to his request, Dr. Howard provided a refresher on how performance, growth and the options impact the A-F performance grading system. She explained that the school performance grades call for the proficiency to be 80 percent of the grade and growth at 20 percent of the grade. Legislation states that schools that are at 80 percent or above proficiency will have growth included in the final grade (1) if the school has not met expected growth or (2) are "held harmless" if including growth would lower their grade (as long as they were at met or exceeded). Lt. Governor Forest asked where the state stands based on projections. Dr. Howard explained that it is important to remember that for 2012-13, North Carolina will not have school performance grades. The first performance grades will be in 2013-14 and will be reported to the State Board in August 2014. The Department has not done any preliminary analysis. State Superintendent Atkinson stated that the Department could not make projections until the State Board determines the cut scores. Once the cut scores are set and DPI has the data for this year, the

Formulas will be run, which will be available for every school. She reiterated that this is a year of transition with no consequences.

- After the Board approves the cut scores, the data will be made available at the November Board meeting, according to Dr. Atkinson.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Marcella Savage, and seconded by Mr. John Tate, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to adopt implementation of Option 1 in calculating the cut scores. For 2012-13, these cut scores will be reported; however, there will be no state-imposed consequences to students, schools or teachers. State-imposed consequences will become effective with the cut scores reported from the performance in the 2013-14 year. (See Attachment GCS 1)

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

#### **GCS 2 – Compliance Commission Recommendations for Field Testing and Special Studies Appeals for the 2013-14 School Year**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute § 115C-174.12 (b1); SBE Directive

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Dr. Tammy L. Howard (Director of Accountability Services)

#### **Description:**

On August 14, 2013, LEAs were notified of participation in field tests and special studies for the 2013-14 school year. LEAs were permitted to file an official appeal requesting that a school be excluded from a specific field test sample based on a written justification submitted by the LEA superintendent along with a Request for Appeals form. Requests for Appeals were collected by the Division of Accountability Services and presented to the Compliance Commission for Accountability at a conference call meeting held September 12, 2013.

#### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the SBE approve the Compliance Commission's recommendations regarding the appeals.

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

- GCS Committee Chair Marcella Savage recognized Dr. Tammy Howard to present this item.
- Dr. Howard reminded Board members that, in August, the Department submitted to the State Board the list of field tests and special studies for the 2013-14 school year. She provided an overview of the process given to LEAs to appeal participation. The purpose of today's item is to act on the Compliance Commission's recommendation regarding the appeals.
- Dr. Howard provided some background information related to the appeals; they can be due to things such as technology accessibility. She noted that the Department has committed to work with schools and if schools have difficulties administering field tests due to technology, the Department, at some point, will have the school stop the field-testing because we do not want the schools to lose valuable instructional time trying to struggle through technology issues for a field test. She noted that these appeals are generally denied because the Department will contend with those as we go through the process. Another issue is that of year-round schools because they have four tracks, which extends

their field-test window, according to Dr. Howard. The Department agrees (for all year-round schools) that they will have one window to administer the test. Dr. Howard explained that it is important to remember that field tests do not have makeup days as field tests are a one-time opportunity on a specified day.

- In response to Board member Willoughby’s question about embedding questions, Dr. Howard explained that the Department does embed on the End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments to greatly minimize field-testing for that population. Dr. Howard spoke briefly about learning maps and a consortium of states that is working on a new assessment for our most severely cognitive disabled students. There are high hopes that this assessment will enable us to provide a growth measure for those students, according to Dr. Howard. Currently, that student population does not get growth information.
- In addition, we are a governing state with Smarter Balanced and as such, we are committed to the field-testing. The Department submitted to the Compliance Commission that, if that were to change, we would make the appropriate adjustments.
- In response to Dr. Oxendine’s comments about alignment with the Common Core, Dr. Howard shared that there have been fewer field-test appeals this year than in past years. Dr. Howard added that the Department believes schools are interested in seeing the Smarter Balanced items because one of the advantages of a field test is that participating schools get to see the items and be more familiar. Smarter Balanced is targeted to be an online assessment.
- Dr. Oxendine asked about the timeline for administration. State Superintendent Atkinson stated that this is a decision that the Board must make.
- Dr. Howard shared that the Compliance Commission’s recommendation is to deny the appeals.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Marcella Savage, and seconded by Dr. Olivia Oxendine, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the Compliance Commission’s recommendations regarding the appeals, as recommended. (See Attachment GCS 2)

***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

**GCS 3 – Implementation of the North Carolina General Assembly’s Read to Achieve Portfolio Process**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute § 115C.83-1

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Ms. Carolyn Guthrie (Director, K-3 Literacy)

**Description:**

General Statute § 115C-83.1 of the 2012-13 budget law outlines components of the North Carolina General Assembly’s Read to Achieve Program that is 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.

Under the component that addresses the elimination of social promotion, there are five Good Cause Exemptions from retention if a student is not proficient on the third-grade EOG reading test. One of the exemptions is the completion of a Student Reading Portfolio. The law requires that the State Board of Education establish the Student Reading Portfolio and the review process. The portfolio can be used to show proficiency after the first administration of the third-grade reading EOG, after participation in a summer reading camp, or at mid-year promotion of the school year following summer reading camps.

A copy of the Implementation Guidebook for the Portfolio process is presented to the State Board of Education for approval.

**Recommendation(s):**

State Board of Education members are asked to approve the North Carolina General Assembly's Read to Achieve portfolio process.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Marcella Savage recognized Ms. Carolyn Guthrie to present this item.
- Ms. Guthrie explained that in this presentation she would provide information about the student portfolio process, which is another component of the Read to Achieve law. She reminded Board members that the goal of Read to Achieve is to ensure that every student can read at or above grade level by the end of third grade. Ms. Guthrie spoke briefly about those students who are not proficient on the third-grade EOG reading test. The student portfolio is an opportunity for children to show their proficiency in another way other than the one-day EOG reading test. In addition, the portfolio provides formative assessment opportunities to the teachers. The portfolio is a semester-long process in which a teacher can gain information about which standard(s) they need to concentrate on for the child. This is an equitable and uniform process, which will be used across the state.
- Ms. Guthrie explained that there are three components of the portfolio. Component 1 is evidence of benchmarking and progress monitoring with the mClass Reading 3D System. Component 2 is evidence of a personal education plan, if applicable. Ms. Guthrie explained that some LEAs have decided to have a portfolio for all of their third-grade children, but a portfolio is not required for children who are at or above grade level. Component 3 is completion of 36 reading passages.
- Ms. Guthrie shared that the main purpose of this presentation is to talk about Component 3. The Department looked at the Florida legislation and how Florida officials implemented the portfolio process in their state. Ms. Guthrie explained that much of what Board members will see has already been tried and proven successful in Florida.
- Component 3 begins in January of the third-grade year. Ms. Guthrie explained that there will be secured passages from which teachers can choose, and each passage will have five questions. Ms. Guthrie noted that these passages are approximately one page in length. The passages are based on 12 reading standards that come from the third-grade Standard Course of Study for Reading. There will be ten examples of each standard. A student must meet proficiency by completing three passages for each standard and get four out of five questions correct for mastery of a passage. She noted that this last language comes straight from the Read to Achieve law.
- Ms. Guthrie reviewed the following portfolio guidelines:
  - Only three passages per week
  - Must be a cold read
  - Must be completed independently

- Cannot be sent home for homework
- All attempts must be documented, dated, recorded, stored in portfolio
- A brief discussion occurred about the availability of funds to support the Summer Reading Camps. Concern was mentioned for districts with respect to the price tag for providing remediation for the children who are required to attend the Summer Camps. Mr. Price stated that there are resources that the LEAs have access to in order to address remediation, summer school, and other needs, i.e., at-risk funding, DSSF, etc., not to mention federal funding that may also be used. The Department has not determined the actual allocation process at this time. Board member Tate requested a report in the future about this issue. He stated that while he applauds the intent of the legislation, he is concerned about sufficient funding. Noting the request, State Superintendent Atkinson shared that, anecdotally, she knows that some districts are concerned about having sufficient dollars to be able to support the extension of learning with the Summer Camps for third graders. A brief discussion ensued in response to Board member Alcorn's comments about digital devices and the possibility of volunteers to support the effort and keep the costs down.
- In response to Board member Oxendine's question, Ms. Guthrie explained that this is not a timed assessment. She has personally reviewed all 120 passages, and, in her opinion, the most it should take even a struggling reader is about 10 minutes. Students are given as much time as they need to complete them, and any accommodations they have for identified children would also apply. A brief discussion occurred about the EOG timed assessment, which has a maximum time limit of four hours. Ms. Guthrie shared that the same entity (NC TOPS) that created the EOG passages created these passages. Board member Willoughby stated that it would be helpful to receive, in a Friday Update, the hard data that shows the difference in at-risk pre-K children receiving services and the correlation to third-grade reading. She would also like to have an answer to Mr. Alcorn's question about digital devices. Dr. Atkinson stated that there is a need to change the school calendar in order to address summer loss, especially for at-risk students who go home to a lack of books, which would help minimize the number of students who need extra help in the summer in third grade.
- Ms. Guthrie also reviewed the following timeline:
  - Portfolios can be completed by the end of school year. The Department is requesting that the portfolio stop on Day 174. (The testing window opens on Day 175.)
  - Good Cause Exemption
  - Incomplete portfolios can be continued and completed in Summer Reading Camps
  - Incomplete portfolios can be completed and used to show proficiency for mid-year promotion
- In addition, Ms. Guthrie spoke briefly about the following procedures:
  - Teacher documents evidences for completed portfolio, which includes all of the components
  - Second reader (instructional staff) verifies completion of portfolio
  - Principal certifies – sends school list to superintendent of children that qualify for Good Cause Exemption
  - Superintendent approves Good Cause Exemption
- In response to Vice Chairman Collins' question, a clarifying discussion occurred about the successful completion of the portfolio. If a student completed three or more passages at 80 percent or better, he or she will be deemed as completing that standard. The student must complete 36 passages, which is straight from the law, according to Ms. Guthrie.
- Ms. Guthrie also spoke about those children placed into a transitional class in response to Ms. Taylor's question. A child placed in a transitional or accelerated class would be in a fourth grade

class (fourth grade curriculum and fourth grade standards) but will receive 90 minutes of uninterrupted instruction. At midyear, if the student does not complete the portfolio or pass the Read to Achieve test, he/she will continue to stay in the fourth grade class and receive 90 minutes of instruction until the end of the year. At the end of the year, that student would take a fourth grade EOG because we know that Common Core Standards spiral. Ms. Guthrie explained that students have an opportunity to have a retention label removed because there is a fourth grade portfolio that begins in January, which must be completed successfully by the end of fourth grade. If a student does not pass the fourth grade portfolio, the retention label stays on their record (even though the student is not physically retained). If a student does not pass the EOG, the principal makes the decision about whether to send them to fifth grade or retain them in fourth.

- Chair Savage shared that she spoke with the Chief Academic Officer in one of the schools that piloted Read to Achieve in 2012-13, and they were very pleased with the program. In addition, she shared comments from a 30-year veteran teacher who liked using the program, and her students enjoyed it as well.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Marcella Savage, and seconded by Mr. Greg Alcorn, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the North Carolina General Assembly’s Read to Achieve portfolio process, as recommended. (See Attachment GCS 3)

Prior to recognizing Chair Savage for GCS 4, Chairman Cobey stated that the GCS 4 has been previously discussed; therefore, without objection he moved the item to Action on First Reading.

**MOVED FROM DISCUSSION TO ACTION ON FIRST READING**  
**GCS 4 – Policy Delineating Use of State-Designated Assessments for the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process**

**Policy Implications:** Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Dr. Tammy L. Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

**Description:**

In summer 2011, the State Board of Education (SBE) voted to require an annual evaluation for every teacher in North Carolina. SBE Policy # TCP-C-004 states, “The intended purpose of the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process is to assess the teacher’s performance in relation to the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards and to design a plan for professional growth.” Annual evaluation is required for school districts that accepted funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (all districts in North Carolina) and for all school districts and charter schools that accepted funding from Race to the Top (all districts and a group of charter schools).

Standard 6 is the student growth component for the teacher evaluation process. To populate Standard 6, the following assessments are used to measure the amount of growth students make as the result of a teacher’s instruction: End-of-Grade (EOG) English Language Arts/ Reading grades 3-8, EOG Mathematics grades 3-8, EOG Science grades 5 and 8; End-of-Course (EOC) Math I, EOC Biology, EOC English II; NC Final Exams (formerly called Measures of Student Learning: NCs Common

Exams); Career and Technical Education Post Assessments, and Analysis of Student Work for Performance-Based Courses.

The Department recommends that the assessments used to measure student growth for Standard 6 of the teacher evaluation process follow administrative policy and procedures that are in line with those of the EOG and EOC state-designated assessments. The Department also recommends that the Measures of Student Learning: NCs Common Exams are renamed NC Final Exams.

**Recommendation(s):**

The Department recommends that the SBE approves the administrative policies and procedures for the administration of the state-designated assessments to be used in the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process and accepts the name change from the Measures of Student Learning: NCs Common Exams to NC Final Exams.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- GCS Committee Chair Marcella Savage recognized Dr. Howard to lead this discussion.
- Dr. Howard explained that this item is in response to the presentation given to the Board at its September meeting about the Measures of Student Learning and more specifically around the Common Exams.
- In response to feedback, the Department is presenting a policy that, at the Board’s request, standardizes the administration of the Common Exams across the state. In addition, based on feedback from the September presentation, ongoing work is occurring in the Department within the Test Development Section to redesign the Common Exams, which are now recommended to be renamed the NC Final Exams.
- Dr. Howard stated that the purpose of this presentation is to present the policy delineating the use of state-designated assessments for use in the North Carolina teacher evaluation process.
- Dr. Howard directed Board members to Attachment 1 in their materials and provided a comprehensive review of the proposed policy.
- Dr. Howard thanked the Board for moving this item to Action on First Reading so that the schools can be notified in a timely manner.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Marcella Savage, and seconded by Mr. John Tate, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the administrative policies and procedures for the administration of the state-designated assessments to be used in the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Process and accepts the name change from the Measures of Student Learning: NCs Common Exams to NC Final Exams, as recommended. (See Attachment GCS 4)

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

***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

**TCP 1 – Changes to Policies on Educator Effectiveness Status**

**Policy Implications:** SBE Policy # TCP-006; APA # 16 NCAC 61.0504

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support)

**Description:**

Change to Definition of Educator Status

In May 2013, the State Board of Education approved the components of the sixth standard of the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation System and the eighth standard of the North Carolina School Executive Evaluation System for school year 2012-13. The Department of Public Instruction and SAS Institute will release student growth values from the 2012-13 school year in October 2013. Under the State Board of Education's current policy, these values will represent the first of the three years of data required for a teacher or school executive to receive an overall status of in need of improvement, effective, or highly effective as long as they meet all necessary criteria (for example, they represent the growth of a teacher's own students and not the growth of an entire school). Data from school years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 would constitute the three years of growth data used to assign an overall status to educators in the fall of 2015.

Based on feedback from teachers, administrators, central office staff members, superintendents, and other stakeholders, the recommended revisions to TCP-C-006 require the use of only the best two of three years of student growth data from 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 to assign an overall status to educators in the fall of 2015. This policy revision acknowledges that the State implemented new standards in school year 2012-13, and that, as a result, teachers and school executives have requested additional time to adjust to these more rigorous expectations. At the same time, there are teachers and school executives who exceeded expectations for student growth in 2012-13, and these data can be used as one of the best two of three years.

Addition of Local Options for Measuring Student Learning

Several districts have requested flexibility to measure student growth with assessments and processes other than the statewide measures. The recommended changes to TCP-C-006 allow districts to submit plans for local assessments and methods for measuring growth to determine the sixth standard rating for teachers of particular grades/subjects and courses. Upon approval by the State Board of Education, districts will be able to administer these local assessments in the 2014-15 school year. School districts can also elect to use school-wide growth values to determine sixth standard ratings for teachers of particular grades/subjects and courses. Districts will be able to use the school-wide growth values to determine sixth standard ratings in the 2013-14 school year.

End-of-Grade assessments and End-of-Course assessments must be used in determining the sixth standard ratings for teachers who administer those assessments and in determining the eighth standard ratings for school administrators.

Change to Implementation of Required Steps for Improvement

The Department of Public Instruction is recommending a delay in the implementation of required steps for improvement due to an educator's overall effectiveness status. In the State's Race to the Top plan and approved waiver for flexibility with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, North Carolina committed to requiring steps for improvement for educators identified as in need of improvement beginning in the fall of 2015. The United States Department of Education has extended an additional offer of flexibility to states by allowing them to apply to delay the implementation of required steps for



improvement until the 2016-17 school year. North Carolina submitted an application for this flexibility by the deadline of September 30, 2013.

The State Board of Education will have more time to consider and discuss the appropriate required steps for educators who are in need of improvement. However, the U.S. Department recommends that TCP-C-006 be revised to acknowledge formally the delay.

**Recommendation(s):**

The State Board of Education approves the recommended changes to TCP-C-006.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Oxendine explained that this is a three-part item that was discussed at a previous State Board meeting. She shared that the first part deals with changes to the definition of educator status, the second part is the addition of local options for measuring student learning, and the third part deals with changes to implementation of required steps for improvement.
- Chair Oxendine recognized Dr. Garland to lead the discussion.
- Dr. Garland prefaced the presentation by explaining that this is a continuation of the policy delineating use of state-designated assessments for the North Carolina teacher evaluation process, which the Board just adopted (GCS 4). She noted that the difference is that the policy just adopted applies to the assessments and how they affect children, and this partner policy speaks to how they affect teachers.
- Using a PowerPoint graph, Dr. Garland provided a comprehensive review of the proposed Educator Effectiveness Timeline Shifts, based on stakeholder feedback from the field following the presentation in September, as well as guidance from the U.S. Department of Education.
- Dr. Garland explained that the Department is asking the Board to amend the policy as it relates to teacher effectiveness. One of the other recommendations coming from stakeholders in the field is to allow local school systems flexibility for developing their own measures of student growth. Dr. Garland reminded Board members that other states have given local flexibility. When developing this process, our superintendents wanted a statewide model to use if that is their preference. However, at this point, several school systems have expressed an interest in having local options; therefore, the Department recommends that the State Board amend its policy to allow LEAs to submit their own plans to the State Board. She noted that districts can use a combination of school-wide data, some state final exams, but at a minimum, they must include any growth including growth on any federally mandated tests. Therefore, a school system cannot omit using EOG or EOC testing that is required for federal reporting, which is part of the ESEA waiver.
- In addition, Dr. Garland reviewed recommendations for local options for measuring growth.
  - Option One: Use of school-wide growth for teachers of specific grades and subjects. Can be requested and approved for school year 2013-14.
  - Option Two: Development of district-wide assessments and method for measuring growth. Can be requested in spring 2014 and approved for implementation in school year 2014-15.
- In response to Board member Alcorn's question about if size matters as it relates to an LEA's ability to conduct analysis, Dr. Garland stated that the Department feels that size will matter in their ability to do the statistical analysis. She provided an example to provide the explanation. Mr. Alcorn expressed concern about statewide consistency.

- Chair Oxendine asked Dr. Garland to speak about what the Department is doing to provide guidelines to LEAs to ensure validity and reliability. Dr. Garland shared that other states have been doing this work for a couple of years, and Ms. Jennifer Preston is currently researching the processes that those other states are using to make those determinations. Superintendent Atkinson added that when the Department received survey data from 85 of the 115 school superintendents, four or five of those superintendents expressed interest in these options.
- In response to Board member McDevitt’s question, Dr. Garland clarified that school districts that choose to develop their own plans will need State Board approval. The Department is requiring that the local board of education chairs, superintendents, and a teacher representative sign local plans. This mirrors the requirement of local school districts in submitting their RttT plans. The same signatures were required on their intent to participate in RttT and their local plan submission.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Dr. Olivia Oxendine, and seconded by Ms. Patricia Willoughby, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the recommended changes to State Board Policy # TCP-C-006, as presented. (See Attachment TCP 1)

***ACTION ON FIRST READING***

**TCP 2 – Duties of School Counselors – Indicated by General Statute 115C-316.1, Section 8.35**

**Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-316.1; Session Law 2013-360, Senate Bill 402: Section 8.35. (a) Duties of School Counselors

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Angela H. Quick (Deputy Chief Academic Officer, Academic Services and Instructional Support) and Mrs. Linda Brannan (Consultant, K-12 Student Support Services)

**Description:** Implementation/transition document to assist LEAs with implementation of Section 8.35 “Duties of school counselors” of Session Law 2013-360 (SECTION 8.35(a) Article 21 of Chapter 115C of the General Statutes is amended by adding: “§ 115C-316.1. Duties of school counselors.

**Recommendation(s):** Immediate action is requested to be compliant with the legislation of the NC General Assembly.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCP Committee Chair Oxendine noted that the details of the transition guidelines are included in the attachment materials. She recognized Dr. Quick to lead the discussion.
- Dr. Quick directed Board members to Attachment 1, which provides guidance to LEAs on how to implement the new duties outlined in General Statute § 115C-316.1 related to the School Safety legislation, clarifying the Duties of Counselors.
- A clarifying discussion occurred related to the 80 percent requirement. Dr. Quick explained that the legislation indicates that school counselors shall spend at least 80 percent of their work time providing delivery of comprehensive school counseling program to offer direct support services to students. She noted that, in the past, one of the criticisms around the school counseling program is that school counselors spend a lot of time on test administration at the school level. This legislation

relates to national standards for school counselors in which 80 percent of a school counselor's time should be spent on delivery of the comprehensive school counseling program that supports student achievement including collaboration with school staff and community resources as well as direct services with students.

- A brief discussion occurred about who would be responsible for testing. Dr. Quick stated that it would be a local decision on how to manage test coordination, and that it could differ from district to district or even school to school.
- In addition, a discussion ensued about the low ratio of counselors to students and the heavy challenges they face on a day-to-day basis. This law removes some of the administrative duties from counselors, according to Dr. Quick. Chair Oxendine shared a recent disturbing comment by an elementary school principal who did not know how elementary counselors would validate the importance of their jobs now that this legislation has been enacted. She stated that a major mindset must be shifted regarding the importance of the guidance counselor's role in schools, and she expressed concern that the law will not be followed without oversight. Dr. Quick stated that this comment is disturbing as it relates to school mental health and having all hands on deck to help students, school psychologists as well as guidance counselors and nurses. It is very important to accomplishing the community support of our students since we are raising expectations and rigor. With the School Safety legislation, it is important that we do not forget about school mental health in general.
- Chair Oxendine thanked Ms. Linda Brannan who was instrumental in developing this document to provide guidance to the LEAs regarding the process of implementing the law.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Dr. Olivia Oxendine, and seconded by State Treasurer Janet Cowell, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to be compliant with the legislation of the NC General Assembly pursuant to this law. (See Attachment TCP 2)

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

***DISCUSSION***

**TCS 1 – Digital Learning Funds**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2013-360, Section 6.11(g)

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip Price (CFO/CIO, Financial, Business, and Technology Services) and Mrs. Alexis Schauss (Director, School Business Division)

**Description:**

Senate Bill 402 (Session Law 2013-360) Section 6.11 (g) appropriates \$11,928,735 in 2013-14 and 2014-15 for Digital Learning.

These funds shall be used to support grants to local education agencies for

- (i) Delivering educator professional development focused on using digital and other instructional technologies to provide high-quality, integrated digital teaching and learning to all students and
- (ii) Acquiring quality digital content to enhance instruction.

Up to \$1,000,000 may be used by the Department of Public Instruction to

- (i) Develop a plan to transition from funding for textbooks, both traditional and digital, to funding for digital materials, including textbooks and instructional resources and
- (ii) Provide educational resources that remain current, are aligned with curriculum, and are effective for all learners by 2017. The plan shall also include an inventory of the infrastructure needed to support robust digital learning in public schools.

The Board will discuss the allotment process for the funds to be distributed to the local education agencies.

The discussion on the funds that may be used by the Department of Public Instruction will be brought to the State Board of Education in October.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the process for the grant funds to be allocated to the local education agencies.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCS Committee Chair Gregory Alcorn explained that the digital learning funds are available for delivering educator professional development focused on using digital devices and other instructional technologies as well as acquiring quality digital content to enhance instruction.
- Chair Alcorn stated that the recommendation is to allocate the funds based on Average Daily Membership (ADM) to the LEAs. He noted that the Department would also discuss an RFP process, which will be explored between now and the November State Board meeting.
- In response to Vice Chairman Collins' question about allocating the funds based on ADM, a brief discussion ensued related to low-wealth schools. Mr. Price explained that the request from the last Board meeting was to try to find a way to get the funding to the school districts that were the furthest away from connectivity (the Board had received a presentation on Connectivity). The Department was trying to look at ways of capturing which school districts had the furthest to go toward connectivity, but we were unable to isolate that information from the 2,600 schools to determine mathematically or formula wise doing an allotment. Without going into every school and performing an analysis, it would be difficult to do, according to Mr. Price. He stated that it is important to reiterate that the funding is for staff development activities and materials related to digital learning, not for equipment or wireless network infrastructure. Mr. Price spoke briefly about the criteria used in developing a funding formula. He shared that a legal opinion may be needed regarding a matching requirement because that language was not in the legislation. The State Board does have authority to go beyond what legislation states, according to Mr. Price.
- Because Board members were unable to access the attachments at their places, State Superintendent Atkinson provided examples of the range of allotments by small and large districts. There were concerns raised about the small low-wealth districts that already do not have the equipment. Board members asked Mr. Price to explore possible options, in addition to the RFP process, for equity purposes. Chair Alcorn asked Mr. Eric Guckian to work with the Department on this issue.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion at the October 2013 meeting and will return for Action in November. (See Attachment TCS 1)

***DISCUSSION***

**TCS 2 – Career and Technical Education Credential Allotments**

**Policy Implications:** Session Law 2013-360 (SB 402), Section 8.28 (b)

**Presenter(s):** Mr. Philip Price (CFO/CIO, Financial, Business, and Technology Services) and Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt (Director, Career and Technical Education)

**Description:**

Session Law 2013-360 allocated funds (\$1,252,157.00) to increase the number of industry-recognized technical credentials that can be earned by high school students by exempting students from paying fees for one administration of examinations leading to industry certifications and credentials according to rules to be adopted by the State Board of Education.

A portion of the allotted funds will be used to purchase statewide licenses for Microsoft Office Specialist certifications since that is the single largest credential earned by North Carolina students. The remaining funds will be allotted to LEAs based on enrollment in CTE courses that lead to credentials. Attachment 1 identifies the alignment of CTE courses to industry credentials. Attachment 2 details the amount of funding to be allotted to each school district.

**Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the allotments as presented.

**Discussion/Comments:**

- TCS Committee Chair Gregory Alcorn recognized Mr. Price to lead this discussion.
- Mr. Price explained that, in the last legislative session, there was a special provision in the Budget Bill (Section 8.28) that provided \$1,252.157.00 to increase the number of industry-recognized technical credentials that can be earned by high school students by exempting students from paying fees for one administration of examinations leading to industry certifications. However, this allocation is not substantial enough to cover the costs of all of the current certifications in our public schools, according to Mr. Price.
- Mr. Price described the method used to calculate each LEA's allotment as outlined in the Board materials.
- Chairman Cobey expressed concern about the amount of some of the allotments, citing one district's allotment of \$5.00. He suggested that it might be better to determine a minimum allotment since \$5.00 would not be of much help to any school or district. Mr. Price explained that the state law is clear that any funding that is allocated to school districts must also be shared with charter schools, which can be done with a direct appropriation or a portion of the amount of funding that goes specifically to the LEAs. He also explained that any time a base-funding formula is established the size of the district is factored in, and charter schools are significantly smaller than an LEA. Therefore, a base-funding formula could be established for charters that is different from that of the school districts.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion at the October 2013 meeting and will return for Action in November. (See Attachment TCS 2)

### ***UPDATE ON CONTRACT***

(See Attachment in book)

- TCS Committee Chair Greg Alcorn encouraged Board members to review the contracts listed for information in the Board book.

At this time, Board member John Tate asked the Board to consider a resolution related to moving teacher pay toward the national average. He elaborated on the disparity between the national average and North Carolina as well as the fiscal note necessary to move North Carolina to the national average. Mr. Tate asked that the Board go on record advocating for teachers through the passage of the following resolution:

Therefore, Be it Resolved: That this State Board of Education is in favor of and advocating moving our teachers toward the national average in pay by the year 2018.

Acknowledging that it is unlikely that anyone on the Board would disagree with the motion, Chairman Cobey and others agreed that there is a proper way of entertaining such ideas. Board members also agreed that more data and research would go a long way in supporting the resolution. Chairman Cobey summarized the conversation stating that Board consensus was that this particular request was out of order. He suggested postponing action until the resolution is placed on the Board's agenda. In addition, Chairman Cobey suggested that the resolution contain additional detail.

<p>Mr. John Tate made a motion for the State Board of Education to adopt a resolution advocating to move our teachers to the national average in pay by the year 2018. State Treasurer Janet Cowell seconded the motion as a point of discussion. The motion was ruled out of order.</p>
--

### **STATE SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

#### **Graduation Awards Announced – Ten Districts and 46 Schools Earn State's Top Graduation Rates in 2012-13**

Ten school districts and 46 high schools have been honored for having the highest four-year cohort graduation rates among all districts and schools in the state in 2012-13.

- North Carolina's statewide graduation rate increased to 82.5 percent while students and teachers transitioned to new state standards and assessments and many schools faced significant financial challenges.
- Representatives from the districts and schools received plaques at a luncheon held in Durham.
- To receive an award, schools must have been open for at least four years.
- High schools that achieved a graduation rate of at least 95 percent but did not qualify for a categorical award will also be recognized with a letter and a plaque.

The full report on the state's cohort graduation rates, as well as previous years' reports, is available online at [www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgradrate](http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/reporting/cohortgradrate).

**UNC-TV Program Targets Public School Parents – North Carolina Schools and You**

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) partnered with UNC-TV to produce *North Carolina Schools and You* – an hour-long show in a "town hall meeting" format that aired twice in September.

The program offers information and discussion around recent important changes in public schools and how parents can be more productively engaged in their children's success.

Specific topics included:

Teaching and Learning: What Students Are Learning and How  
Measuring Performance: New Assessments and Accountability Model; and  
Parent Engagement: How Parents Can Support Learning

The program featured a studio audience of public school parents who asked questions of senior officials from the NCDPI, along with video segments taped in North Carolina classrooms. The program aired September 19 and September 27 and may be viewed online at

<http://video.unctv.org/video/2365082029/>

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=9ri5f9Mjeks\\_2bj8t9XILaCrrc1lRkgDcfonyNFKI1eDE\\_3d](https://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=9ri5f9Mjeks_2bj8t9XILaCrrc1lRkgDcfonyNFKI1eDE_3d)

**SAT Scores Climb – NC's SAT Score Increases While Nation's Remains the Same; More NC High School Students Participate in AP Program**

In 2013, North Carolina seniors had an average combined SAT score of 1,479, which is a 10-point increase from the previous year, according to The College Board's annual SAT report released this morning. The national average combined score remained the same at 1,498.

- North Carolina seniors posted an average Critical Reading score of 495, which is an increase of four points from 2012.
- Their average Mathematics score of 506 remained the same as last year.
- The average writing score for North Carolina's class of 2013 was 478, which represents an increase of six points.
- Nationally, the average Critical Reading score was 496, the average Mathematics score was 514 and the average Writing score was 488.

While the 10-year trend shows no change in the Critical Reading and Mathematics scores for North Carolina seniors, the five-year trend shows an 11-point increase in Critical Reading and a two-point decrease in Mathematics.

The participation rate for seniors taking the SAT dropped 8 percent in 2013, with 58,100 students taking the college entrance examination.

**AP Participation Rate Increases – AP Exam Scores Also Climb**

In addition to SAT college admissions test results, the College Board also released summary results for the state's Advanced Placement (AP) program.

- North Carolina students showed a 5.8 percent increase in the number of test takers, a 6.2 percent increase in the number of exams taken and a 6.7 percent increase in the number of scores in the 3-5 range.
- AP exams are scored on a five-point scale with scores of 3, 4 or 5 being considered high enough to qualify for college credit or placement at most colleges and universities.

A total of 57,120 test takers took 107,317 exams with most students taking more than one AP course and exam.

### **Home Base Implementation Highlights**

Statewide implementation of Home Base is well underway, and considerable resources are being devoted to making this transition from NC WISE as smooth as possible while providing support where needed.

- A list of known incidents in Home Base, by application, is available on the Home Base website at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/homebase/updates/issues/>
- The list is updated daily and includes responses underway and remedies for each incident.
- A number of online training materials are available to help practitioners become more proficient in using Home Base.
- These include creating lesson plans, locating materials to support instruction, taking attendance, creating assessment items, sharing assessments with grade books and accessing the Schoolnet training environment.
- To view these, and other training materials, please visit <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/homebase/training/materials/>
- The October calendar of Home Base events for district and school administrators is now available, and includes online and face-to-face instructional opportunities.
- To see what's available in October, please visit <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/homebase/calendar/>
- A Home Base weekly newsletter also is now available to provide the latest news about Home Base.
- To view the editions for Sept. 6 and 13, please visit <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/homebase/updates/biweekly/?year=2013>.

### **Teacher and Principal Advisory Councils Meet**

The State Superintendent's Teacher and Principal Advisory Councils met at the Education Building on September 27. Topics of discussion included

- The NC Business Committee for Education's Teachers at Work initiative
- State legislation on educator effectiveness
- Home Base implementation
- Recommendations on NC Final Exams

### **Governor's Education Cabinet – Progress Made Toward Fine-Tuning Focus**

The Governor's Education Cabinet met September 18 in Raleigh and took steps toward fine-tuning the focus of the Cabinet under the leadership of Governor Pat McCrory.

The Cabinet heard preliminary recommendations from five volunteer work groups on

- The recommended composition of the Education Cabinet



- Shared budgeting between the public schools, community colleges and universities
- Potential shared efficiencies and effectiveness
- Talent and workforce development
- Branding

The Cabinet's volunteer work groups are to have final recommendations to the Education Cabinet by December 13.

### **Technology and Learning – Superintendent's Study Tour Launched**

DPI, the Friday Institute's Digital Learning Collaborative and local LEAs are teaming up to launch a Superintendent's Study Tour titled *Keeping Teaching and Learning at the Forefront of Your Technology Initiatives*.

The first tour stop was September 18 in Rutherford County. Additional tour stops are planned for the Asheboro City Schools and Perquimans County Schools.

Topics and activities included

- A panel discussion on local efforts to integrate technology and instruction
- An overview of the North Carolina Learning Technology Initiative
- A tour of technology at work in the classroom.

### **GALE/Library TEAMS Award – Rockingham County School Wins Prestigious Award**

Draper Elementary School, Reidsville, NC, has been awarded a GALE/Library TEAMS award for a multi-disciplinary project on endangered animals.

Each winning school receives \$2,500 in cash, Gale products, and a one-year subscription to Library Media Connection and the Educator's Professional Bookshelf from Linworth Publishing/Libraries Unlimited.

### **Recent Activities of the State Superintendent**

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

- NC Economic Development Board, Raleigh, NC
- NC Economic Development Board, Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee, Raleigh, NC
- Greater Raleigh Chamber annual meeting, Raleigh, NC
- Raleigh/Wake Reading Association, Raleigh, NC
- Retirement reception for Rowan Superintendent Judy Grissom, Salisbury, NC
- Public Education Forum, Belmont, NC
- Large District Superintendents' Consortium, Raleigh, NC
- Monroe Rotary Club, Monroe, NC
- New Superintendents' Orientation, Raleigh, NC
- Early Childhood Development Center ribbon cutting, Asheboro, NC
- Duplin County Education Forum, Beulaville, NC
- Career and Technical Education Annual Fall Conference, Asheville, NC

- All-Agency Meeting, Raleigh, NC
- Harnett County Delta Kappa Gamma group, Buys Creek, NC
- Principal/Teacher Advisory Councils, Raleigh, NC
- Center for International Understanding presentation to China delegation, Raleigh, NC

☐ **Visited**

- Rock Rest Elementary School, Monroe, NC
- Monroe High School, Monroe, NC
- Horizons Unlimited Supplementary Education Center, Salisbury, NC
- Overton Elementary School, Salisbury, NC
- Knox Middle School, Salisbury, NC
- Southwest Elementary School, Clemmons, NC
- West Forsyth High School, Clemmons, NC

**Farewell Announcement**

State Superintendent Atkinson announced that Dr. Angela Quick has been named the Vice President of the New Schools Project and will be leaving the Department. She applauded Dr. Quick for her extraordinary service and leadership, and stated that Dr. Quick has been an asset to the Board's work and implementing that work in the Department of Public Instruction. She has much respect from her colleagues within the Department and throughout the state.

On behalf of the Board, Chairman Cobey presented an SBE mug to Dr. Quick as a small symbol of the Board's gratitude for her work and leadership. The presentation was photographed. Board member Tate stated that the Board might consider further honoring Dr. Quick by closing this meeting out and dedicating it in her honor. There were no objections.

**CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

Chairman Cobey commended the facilitators who led the Planning and Work Session this week for the Board, Mr. Brad Hall (National Association of State Boards of Education) and Ms. Lillian Altman (UNC School of Government). Chairman Cobey stated that it has been a long-standing tradition to hold such sessions twice annually. These Planning and Work Sessions help the Board reset itself to ensure that the Board sustains its focus on the right things and the important things. He thanked Mr. Hall and Ms. Altman for their work, and explained that next steps include gathering feedback from the Board's advisors and external partners.

Chairman Cobey thanked Dr. Richard Thompson (Interim Executive Director, North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching [NCCAT]) and staff members for hosting the State Board of Education at the NCCAT Cullowhee campus. Since the Board's arrival, NCCAT staff members have ensured that the Board's needs have been met, according to Chairman Cobey.

Chairman Cobey recapped the Board's work for the day, and then reminded Board members to hold March 31-April 3 for the next Planning and Work Session.

In closing comments, Chairman Cobey thanked Assistant Executive Director Betsy West and Executive Director Martez Hill for their coordination of this Planning and Work Session.

**OLD BUSINESS**

No old business was brought before the Board.

**NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was brought before the Board.

**CLOSED SESSION**

Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to convene in closed session reminding the public that after closed session the Board will take no action other than adjourning the open session officially.

*Upon motion made by Mr. A.L. Collins, and seconded by State Treasurer Janet Cowell, the Board voted unanimously to convene in closed session to consult with its attorneys on attorney-client privileged matters; and to consider the handling of the following cases: Cameron Creek Charter v. North Carolina State Board of Education; and Hope County v. North Carolina State Board of Education.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

Following adjournment of the Closed Session, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn from Open Session.

*Indicating no other business, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn. Upon motion by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, and seconded by Ms. Marcella Savage, Board members voted unanimously to adjourn the October 3, 2013, meeting of the State Board of Education in honor of Dr. Angela Quick.*