

**Minutes of the
North Carolina State Board of Education
Winston-Salem State University
The McNeil Ballroom ▪ Anderson Center
Winston-Salem, NC
October 1, 2015**

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
Janet Cowell, State Treasurer (via conf. call)	Rebecca Taylor
Greg Alcorn	Patricia Willoughby
Eric C. Davis	
Kevin Howell	

Also present were:

June St. Clair Atkinson, State Superintendent	Steve Lassiter, Principal of the Year Advisor
Evelyn Bulluck, Local Board Member Advisor	James E. Ford, Teacher of the Year Advisor
Rodney Shotwell, Superintendent Advisor	Keana Triplett, Teacher of the Year Advisor

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION

State Board of Education Chairman William Cobey called the Thursday session of the October 2015 State Board of Education meeting to order and declared the Board in official session.

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.

Chairman Cobey explained that the Board was having a one-day meeting this month on the campus of Winston-Salem State University. He explained further that the Board arrived in Winston-Salem on Tuesday as a part of its Planning and Work Session, noting that for the past couple of years, the board has held these Planning and Work Sessions in cities and towns across the state and have held their actual Board meetings on the campuses of the public universities. Chairman Cobey explained that the public schools and the State Board of Education have a number of connections, two of which are that we work to prepare students for

postsecondary education, and the universities we visit work to prepare the teachers for our schools and our students.

Chairman Cobey announced that today's meeting marks only the second time the Board has met on the campus of a historically black college or university. He expressed appreciation to Chancellor Elwood Robinson, noting that his staff has worked tirelessly to meet the Board's needs.

After explaining that this meeting is a one-day meeting and will incorporate the Board's committee discussions as part of the official business to approve needed actions, Chairman Cobey noted that the meeting was being audio-streamed and that the agenda and all materials are posted online and accessible through the State Board's website. Chairman Cobey welcomed visitors, online listeners, and Twitter followers.

The Chairman also explained that, as the Board moves around the state for its semi-annual meetings, there is always a Board member host who resides in the region. For this meeting, Vice Chairman A.L. "Buddy" Collins is the Piedmont Triad region's host. Mr. Collins is a lifelong resident of Forsyth County and former member of the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School Board.

Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman A.L. Collins was recognized to lead the Board with the Pledge of Allegiance.

➤ Welcoming Remarks:

- ❖ **Mr. David R. Plyer (Chairman, Forsyth County Board of Commissioners)**
- ❖ **Dr. Elwood L. Robinson (Chancellor, Winston-Salem State University)**
- ❖ **Dr. Denise Pearson (Senior Associate Dean of the College and Professor of Education)**

Chairman Cobey recognized Mr. David Plyer, Chairman of the Forsyth County Board of Commissioners, for the official welcome to Winston-Salem and Forsyth County.

Mr. Plyer welcomed and thanked the State Board of Education for holding its meeting in Winston-Salem at Winston-Salem State University (WSSU). He prefaced his remarks by explaining that most of his career was spent in radio and television. He shared a story about how the auditorium at WSSU collapsed in a storm approximately 20 years ago, and that eventually a brand new auditorium was built. Mr. Plyer explained that following the dedication, he made the following announcement: "The dedication of the new Kenneth R. Williams auditorium was held today. . . ." Shortly after Dr. Williams called him from his office to confirm that he was not dead yet. Mr. Plyer stated that he learned a lesson that day about announcing things. Mr. Plyer encouraged Board members to take the opportunity while in Winston-Salem to visit the School of Design, the Innovation Quarter, and the Reynolds Building, which is being made into a mini-hotel, expected to open within five months. He suggested the hotel as a future meeting place for the State Board in downtown Winston-Salem.

Mr. Plyer pointed out that the Winston-Salem Board is comprised of two former teachers and a former school superintendent. He also noted that his two daughters are teaching in Winston-Salem as virtual

school teachers. Mr. Plyer ended his comments by extending a warm welcome from all of the Winston-Salem Commissioners and elected officials from Forsyth County.

Following Mr. Plyer's comments, Chairman Cobey recognized Dr. Elwood Robinson, Chancellor of WSSU and host for this State Board of Education meeting for his welcoming remarks.

Dr. Robinson provided a historical perspective of WSSU established in 1892 for the express purpose of educating recently freed slaves. The College then, and the University now, was founded upon providing education to those who had historically been denied, but it has always been responding to the challenges of higher education for over 100 years. He spoke briefly about Chancellor Kenneth R. Williams, noting that during his inaugural remarks, Dr. Williams said that Winston-Salem's teachers college at the time would respond to the needs of higher education of this state. Dr. Robinson stated that WSSU has been so much a part of the history of educating individuals and continues in that tradition as we embark on a new strategic initiative to talk about how we want to prepare students for the 21st century, and so much of that will be related to what we do in our education programs. WSSU is an institution built on social justice, and the underpinnings of operations will be about equity. He challenged the State Board to look at its policies and procedures while asking themselves the question, is this equitable? He elaborated briefly about how WSSU strives to live up to the key hallmark of service and social justice, noting that they are aware of the challenges. Dr. Robinson noted that in 2015 there is still a huge disparity between the haves and the have nots. The difficulty in educating students is helping them to rise above and out of poverty, noting that Dr. Pearson would share briefly about the work WSSU is doing in the community. Dr. Robinson explained that in 2015, a new chancellor will be installed at WSSU, and part of that history is tied into having the State Board of Education here to do the work of educating our students. He added that as one thinks about the history of education in North Carolina, it has been nothing short of amazing and has been driven primarily by the higher education system; but the feeder is the students who graduate from that system that came out of the work that the State Board of Education oversees – it is so noble and so important, according to Dr. Robinson. In closing comments, Dr. Robinson asked Board members to take the opportunity to tour the campus, look at the facilities and get a glimpse of WSSU's students.

Following Dr. Robinson's remarks, and on behalf of the State Board, Chairman Cobey presented Dr. Robinson with a crystal apple as a token of appreciation from the State Board of Education. The presentation was photographed.

Next, Chairman Cobey recognized Dr. Denise Pearson, Associate Dean of the College and Professor of Education for her comments.

Dr. Pearson prefaced her comments by sharing that WSSU is the first postsecondary institution in North Carolina to confer elementary education degrees, noting a long history of commitment to educator preparation in the state. More than a century later, the university remains steadfast in its commitment to preparing exceptional educators who understand the importance of social justice education and the importance of going beyond equality, and what it means to be equitable in their approach to education. Dr. Pearson described the curriculum, which is currently being renewed with an increased focus on an urban education as well as rural education. WSSU offers Bachelor's degrees in elementary education, birth through kindergarten education, and teaching under which other concentrations fall. She also

noted an initial licensure program at the graduate level. According to Dr. Pearson, despite the challenges that are facing the education profession, the university is committed to the work so that kids can expect that the teacher standing in front of them is well prepared. Dr. Pearson noted that WSSU is privileged to have the State Board of Education as partners and is open to suggestions on how to strengthen the profession. In addition, Dr. Pearson elaborated on some of the community partnerships that WSSU is involved in, highlighting Dr. Kimberly Pemberton's (Assistant Professor) initiative where she takes her students into the Cleveland Avenue area every semester, into the community/housing complex, to provide an after-school program for children so they do not hang out in the streets. Her students practice what she has taught them about building literacy with their students in the community. WSSU is looking to scale that initiative up. In closing remarks, Dr. Pearson thanked the State Board for their leadership and for coming to WSSU for their semi-annual meeting.

Chairman Cobey noted for the audience that the three Teacher Education programs here – Winston-Salem State University, Wake Forest University, and Salem College – have sent both faculty and students to be a part of the Board's work this week. They have observed with the Board at schools and listened to panel discussions and State Board discussions. Chairman Cobey expressed appreciation for the work they do every day to keep the teacher pipeline flowing. He invited Dr. Denise Pearson of WSSU, Dr. Adam Friedman of Wake Forest University, and Dr. Sheryl Long of Salem College to come forward to receive a token of appreciation for their participation with the Board this week and for the work they do in teacher education and preparation. The presentation was photographed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

As the first order of business, Chairman Cobey drew attention to the full meeting agenda, which is available on eBoard. He noted that the materials have been posted on eBoard. The Chairman asked if there were any other changes to the agenda that Board members wished to request. Dr. Olivia Oxendine requested consent from the Board to remove TCP 4 from the agenda, explaining that the item pertains to the Educator Preparation Report Card. She explained that DPI staff informed her that there is additional time to collect data before the report is due. Hearing no objections, Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve the State Board of Education meeting agenda for October 1, 2015, as amended.

Discussion/Comments:

- There was no further discussion.

<i>Upon motion made by <u>Mr. Kevin Howell</u>, and seconded by <u>Mr. Greg Alcorn</u>, the Board voted unanimously to approve the State Board of Education meeting agenda for October 1, 2015, as amended.</i>

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the September 2-3, 2015, State Board of Education meeting.

Discussion/Comments:

- There was no discussion.

Ms. Patricia Willoughby made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 2-3, 2015, State Board meeting. Seconded by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes as presented.

Special Recognition

- **Guilford County Schools – 2015 North Carolina Schools of Character Award**
 - ❖ **Brooks Global Studies Elementary School (Ms. Ashton Clemmons, Principal)**
 - ❖ **James Y. Joyner Elementary School (Ms. Denise Ebbs, Principal)**
 - ❖ **The Early/Middle College at Bennett (Dr. Esther Coble, Principal)**
- **Guilford County Schools – 2015 National Schools of Character Award**
 - **The Early/Middle College at Bennett (Dr. Esther Coble, Principal)**

Chairman Cobey recognized State Superintendent June Atkinson for this special presentation.

Dr. Atkinson stated that building character in our students is an important aspect of public education. She explained that Ms. Fay Gore is the staff member at the Department of Public Instruction who helps coordinate this initiative at the state level. She introduced Ms. Gore to recognize the award-winning schools.

Ms. Gore explained that three schools are recognized today for demonstrating excellence in character education as measured by Character.org's 11 principles of effective character education. She spoke briefly about the application process, noting that for those schools that score a minimum of 3.3 points on the rubric are named State Schools of Character or Districts of Character and are submitted for national recognition. She stated that 15 schools applied from North Carolina this past year. Of the 15, three schools earned the distinction of State Schools of Character and one earned the distinction of National School of Character.

Ms. Gore stated that Guilford County Schools continues to show its commitment to the quality of character development with the addition of the three schools receiving this honor this year. She noted that, for the third straight year, Guilford County is the only LEA in North Carolina that received either a state or national award. Ms. Gore recognized the following Guilford County Schools and their representatives:

- ❖ Brooks Global Elementary School as a 2015 State School of Character – represented by Mrs. Ashton Clemmons (principal) and Ms. Lubchenko (AG teacher).
- ❖ James Y Joyner Elementary School as a 2015 State School of Character – Represented by: Ms. Denise Ebbs (Principal) and Ms. Cath Old and Ms. Mary Harris (Co-facilitators of Joyner's Character Education Committee)
- ❖ The Middle College at Bennett as the 2015 State School of Character and the 2015 National School of Character – Represented by Dr. Esther Coble (Principal), Mrs. Teresa Higgins (Curriculum Facilitator), Mrs. Lois Baldwin (Social Worker) and Mrs. Danielle Crosby (Social Studies teacher).

Central Office staff present includes:

- Mrs. Gwen Willis (Chief Officer of Student Services)
- Mrs. Charlos Banks (Executive Director of Student Services and Character Development)
- Ms. Yvonne Eason (Coordinator for Character Development and Service-Learning)

The representatives were invited forward to join State Superintendent Atkinson and Chairman Cobey to receive a framed certificate and the school's "School of Character" banner. The presentation was photographed.

SBE ISSUES SESSION

➤ **Board Member Strategic Planning Discussion**

- ❖ **Mr. Martez Hill (Executive Director, SBE Office) and Dr. Lou Fabrizio (Director, Data, Research and Federal Policy)**

Chairman Cobey recognized Mr. Martez Hill (Executive Director, SBE Office) and Dr. Lou Fabrizio (Director, Data, Research and Federal Policy) to lead the Board in the Strategic Planning discussion.

Mr. Hill prefaced this discussion by reminding Board members that, at the spring Planning Session, Chairman Cobey asked each committee chair to review the Board's Strategic Plan's objectives and measures and to make any recommended changes during the fall Planning Session. Mr. Hill reported that he and Dr. Fabrizio met with each committee chair along with DPI staff in a series of robust discussions about the objectives and measures. He recognized Dr. Fabrizio to present the updates and recommended changes that align with existing policies and plans and/or new laws. He also reminded the Board of the Office of State Budget and Management's (OSBM) directive to use SMART Goals that are measurable.

Dr. Fabrizio directed Board members to the hard copies of the materials for discussion, which were located at their places, noting that the documents are posted on eBoard under the 9/30/15 Strategic Planning Session. In addition, he noted that the Strategic Plan will be displayed through PowerPoint during this meeting.

Dr. Fabrizio reiterated that these recommended changes reflect many hours of conversations and debates. The updates are underlined and in red in the online version, according to Dr. Fabrizio. He presented a comprehensive review of all of the recommended changes in the document, soliciting Board member feedback during the presentation. Additional comments and observations were provided by Board members

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

- *Measure 1.2.3 – Percentage of Advanced Placement (AP) exams taken on which students score 3 or above.*

Under this measure, Dr. Fabrizio explained that the way the measure was originally written, it talks about the percentage of AP exams taken on which students scores 3 or above. He explained that many colleges or universities will accept or grant college credit, but it is not a guarantee that a student will receive college credit even if they get a five – it is dependent upon the college. He explained that by looking at this measure,

specifically at the percentage of exams taken, what we were missing was how we have had significant increases in the number of exams taken and the number of students who took at least one AP exam. He pointed out that the “note” provides more contextual information that shows we are reaching a lot more students taking AP courses and exams. He explained that when more and more students take the AP exam, the scores tend to drop. Therefore, the percentage we have been reporting is dropping, but we are excited that more students are taking the AP courses and exams. The research is clear that students who take those courses, even if they do not take the exam, tend to do better and stay longer in college, according to Dr. Fabrizio. Therefore, related to the outgoing years, rather than continuing to claim that we are going to expect more students to score 3 and above, we want to be more realistic and will continue to report the increase in the numbers of students who are taking the AP courses and taking the AP exams.

Chairman Cobey asked why we don’t use numbers rather than percentages. Dr. Olivia Oxendine asked if it would make sense to add an additional measure to track the increase in the number of students taking AP courses and exams. Dr. Fabrizio noted the suggestions. Mr. Hill interjected that one of the directives from OSBM is to have five goals and five objectives (three measures per objective). He added that, at the same time, the Department can track and monitor additional information that is not necessarily a part of the Strategic Plan. Dr. Fabrizio explained that, creatively, we could add some a’s and b’s to the measures – Ex. Measure 1.2.3. (a). A brief conversation occurred about the trend in the number of students who are passing the exams with a 3 or better. Ms. Sneha Shah-Coltrane explained that, in November, a report to the General Assembly will be presented to the State Board with further information regarding the Department’s efforts with the AP and IB (International Baccalaureate) exams. Board member Wayne McDevitt drew attention to the goal for ACT for 2015-16, which is identical to the results of 2014-15, asking if there is a reason we are not aspiring to a higher number. Dr. Fabrizio explained that with the ACT it is difficult to move that needle and rather than having to adjust the number annually, we want to see the upward trajectory and adjust accordingly. He explained further that there is always a danger in having progress and assuming that it will always continue; therefore, based on staff comments, we want to be conservative with some of the outgoing years. Mr. Hill added that, based on comments from the Board, he and Dr. Fabrizio will meet with staff to decide whether these are achievable or aspirational, and bring the document back in November for the Board’s consideration.

- *Objective 1.4 – Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in postsecondary education.*
 - ❖ *Measure 1.4.1. – Percentage of graduates needing remediation in the University of North Carolina (UNC) System in their freshman year following graduation from high school (i.e. – taking remedial coursework).*

Chairman Coby stated that this seems noteworthy because it is a huge savings of time and money. He asked staff to comment on this dramatic change toward improvement. State Superintendent Atkinson explained that there are several major reasons in the reduction: (1) The State Board of Education raised its graduation requirements, (2) The focus on students being career- and college-ready gives students a reason for staying in school, (3) High school teachers who recognize what is necessary to be successful at the next level, and (4) The standards of the SBE are aligned with the standards required to be successful in the freshman year either at the community college or university system. That alignment is important in assuring that students have those necessary behaviors, knowledge, and skills for higher education. In addition, Dr. Atkinson spoke briefly about the GEAR UP initiative as an important factor. Board member Olivia Oxendine spoke from a higher education perspective, noting that they are doing things at the freshman and sophomore level such as installing tools that will alert professors when a student is falling below a particular standard, which has been a tremendous help. Chairman Cobey stated that this reduction in remedial coursework is something that needs to be acknowledged publicly, directing Ms. Vanessa Jeter to promote this good news information. A brief clarifying discussion occurred about interventions in lieu of remediation.

❖ *Measure 1.4.2 – Percentage of graduates meeting the new remediation-free standards in the NC Community College System in their freshman year following graduation from high school and graduates not meeting the remediation-free standards but passing the placement exam(s).*

State Superintendent Atkinson reported that when she and Chairman Cobey attended the Education Cabinet meeting, the Community College interim president said that he had looked at the data for remediation, indicating (although not official) that there was a drop in the numbers. Superintendent Advisor Rodney Shotwell also spoke briefly about the entrance/placement exams, noting that there are many students who haven't failed the whole thing, only sections, but are still pushed to go into a full remediation program for the semester, noting that failing only a portion cannot necessarily be measured. The example Dr. Shotwell provided was that if a student fails one section and another student fails four sections, they are both claimed as being in remediation classes. He explained that this is frustrating because if you have a student that is going into a program that only starts in the fall, they will have to wait an entire year before they can get back into the program, the unintended consequence is that we are discouraging them. If students have to wait a year, they will get a job and make financial obligations that will make college more difficult even at the community college level, according to Dr. Shotwell. He noted that having the GPA standard will help. He also stated further that he would be curious to see the data disaggregated to see how many sections that students are actually failing in the placement exam that forces them into remediation. Board member Wayne McDevitt suggested that, at some point, he would like the Board to have some agreement with the community college system about the established remediation number. Dr. Atkinson stated that unfortunately bad news sticks, and that's what many people remember. She explained that the Department will have to work collaboratively with the Community College System to determine a way to have an official presentation to publicize the correct number for the media. In follow-up, Board member Patricia Willoughby agreed that we need to address this issue because like an urban myth, we have had a hard time shaking off this inaccurate number and it needs to be clarified. In addition, Ms. Willoughby noted that a lot of students go straight from high school to the Community College, but there are a lot of students returning after a break, she wanted clarification that those students are not a part of this data point. Dr. Fabrizio clarified that the only students this is measuring are the students who graduate in the spring and enroll in community college in the fall. Ms. Willoughby suggested that this be noted with an asterisk to help clarify the urban myth.

Superintendent Advisor Shotwell noted that remediation classes at the community college system are a \$93 million year revenue for students 18-99 years old. Dr. Atkinson shared that the General Assembly passed legislation where we would do a plan with the community college to address the need for remediation in mathematics. At the request of Dr. Atkinson, Dr. Rebecca Garland added that, in collaboration with the community college, the Department is required to come up with a plan for high school seniors who are not college ready to come up with appropriate coursework that both the high schools and community colleges can agree with to address the remediation issue further. She explained that the remediation-free policy that the community colleges have adopted would mean that students within their first three years of graduating from high school could meet the remediation-free policy as outlined in the community college. Outside of three years, the high schools are no longer held to that percentage of remediation after a student leaves. According to Dr. Garland, all of the community colleges have not yet implemented the remediation-free policy; they are required to come on board next fall. After elaborating briefly on the issue, Dr. Garland suggested that Dr. Lisa Chapman could provide the Board with an update about the work being done in partnership with them related to remediation. Vice Chairman A.L. Collins agreed that we need additional conversation about this issue because he is uncertain that this number is easily transferrable. He also suggested that the Board consider capturing the number of students who are receiving dual enrollment credit, because these students are more likely to attend school and be ready for postsecondary education. Dr. Fabrizio explained that this measure is captured later in the document.

- *Objective 1.5.1 – Increase student performance on the state’s End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).*
 - ❖ *Measures 1.5.1a – Percentage of students’ test scores at or above the proficient level on the EOG and EOC assessments (Students scoring Levels 4 & above: College- and Career-Ready (CCR) standard) The following note was deleted and separated into a new measure 1.5.1b below: (Note: Results for students scoring Levels 3 & above, Grade-Level Proficiency (GLP); also are reported.)*
 - ❖ *Measures 1.5.1b - Percentage of students’ test scores at or above the proficient level on the EOG and EOC assessments (Students scoring Levels 3 & above: College- and Career-Ready (CCR) standard), Grade-Level Proficiency (GLP).*

Dr. Fabrizio highlighted Measures 1.5.1a and 1.5.1b, stating that, based on earlier conversations with the Board, he separated the measures for college and career ready (1.5.1a) and grade-level proficiency 1.5.1b. He asked for the Board’s input on keeping the aggressive targets on college and career ready, specifically do we increase the standards for grade level proficiency because the grade level proficiency 3, 4, and 5 is surpassing what was originally established for the college and career ready benchmark. Dr. Fabrizio suggested that staff have additional conversation and bring recommendations to the Board with higher targets.

- *Objective 1.5.2 – Percentage of schools meeting or exceeding annual academic growth*

As it relates to this objective, Mr. McDevitt noted that the actual results have been entered for the 2014-15 school year, noting that the 2015-16 target has been left the same, he asked if that was realistic. A brief discussion was held about the decision to automatically increase the targets when the Strategic Plan was first established. Dr. Fabrizio stated that we are at the point where we need to look at past data to ensure that we are coming up with obtainable targets. He suggested that staff will vet this issue further as well.

Goal 2 – Every student has a personalized education.

- ❖ *Measure 2.2.2 –Percentage of LEAs/Charters using a Learning Management System (LMS) for student instruction.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this is one of the measures, originally written as follows: (*Percentage of schools using online modules (need to define) as an instructional strategy.*), that every time we came to the Board staff would have to say we need to develop some type of a survey and we were unsure of how it would work. Therefore, in collaboration with the Committee Chairs, staff decided that a much better measure would be the percentage of LEAs and charters using an LMS for student instruction, which would be easier to collect and provide valuable information.

- ❖ *Measure 2.3.2 –Number of teachers earning badges or microcredentials.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that staff also felt that this measure, originally written as follows: (*Percentage of high schools offering flexible student schedules (late afternoon or evening courses as examples)*), would not provide meaningful information. Since the Board has spent a great deal of time as it relates to global education and badging, staff believe this new measure will provide more meaningful data.

- ❖ *Measure 2.3.3 – Percentage of middle and high schools offering instruction at the pace appropriate for the needs of students using strategies such as credit recovery, credit by demonstrated mastery, and compacted curriculum.*

Dr. Fabrizio pointed out that this item is difficult to measure and would require a survey to collect the data and feel confident in the results; therefore, staff propose deleting this measure.

- *Objective 2.4.1a - Percentage of charter schools at or above 60% on EOG and EOC assessments (Students scoring Levels 4 & above: College-and-career-ready (CCR) standard) and 2.4.1b Percentage of charter schools at or above 60% on EOG and EOC assessments (Students scoring Levels 4 & above: Grade-level Proficiency (GLP)).*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this separates the college-and-career-ready standards from the grade-level proficiency standards. Dr. Rebecca Garland asked Dr. Fabrizio to address how this will work when we are switching how we look at this data. Dr. Fabrizio shared that the data reported in 2012-13 was still based on college-and-career-ready standards when it was levels 3 and above since we did not have grade-level proficiency then. He suggested that he can note that in the document.

- ❖ *Measure 2.4.3 – Percentage of charter schools meeting or exceeding all financial and operational goals as measured by the Office of Charter School’s performance framework.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this change was based on conversations with LFI Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor and staff. He explained that the word “academic” was removed from the measure, which formerly read “exceeding academic, financial, and operational goals” because the academic information about charter schools is already there in other measures. He asked that the word “all” be added (underscored above). In addition, Mr. Levinson called attention to the note: The data we are reporting 32.1% for 2014-15 excludes items that we anticipate removing or revising in 2015-16; with those items included, the 2014-15 total is 26%.

Mr. Levinson explained that he did not have the specific items with him, but there were a number of items where there were questions about what was considered the appropriate standard given that it was not required by statute or policy, but instead had been based on what was considered best practice. Therefore, for this baseline, staff felt it was appropriate to note that those standards could be revised or removed. Mr. Hill indicated that Mr. Levinson could bring those items to the Board in November.

- *Objective 2.5 –Decrease the percentage of Low-Performing Schools and Low Performing School Districts in the state.*

Dr. Fabrizio referred Board members to the one-page document where there is a strike through for the old objective 2.5 (*Increase the percentage of schools with a performance composite at or above 60% and meeting or exceeding growth.*) and the new language (underscored above). He reminded Board members that the General Assembly changed those definitions

- ❖ *Measure 2.5.1 – Percentage of Low-Performing Schools using the new definition from the General Assembly (September 2015): Schools that receive a school performance grade of D or F and a school growth score of “met expected growth” or “not met expected growth. (Baseline is the 2014-15 school year.)*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that the original Measure 2.5.1 – (*Percentage of schools with a performance composite at or above 60% and meeting or exceeding growth (Students scoring Levels 4 & above: College-and career-ready (CCR) standard: Note: Results for students scoring Levels 3 & above, Grade-Level Proficiency (GL) also are reported.*), was replaced with a new measure 2.5.1 (underscored above), using the new definition of low-performing schools from the General Assembly. He explained further that the data indicate that currently 24.6% of schools are designated as low-performing.

- ❖ *Measure 2.5.2 – Percentage of Low-Performing School Districts using the new definition from the General Assembly (September 2015): School Districts in which the majority of the schools in that district has been identified as Low-Performing Schools. (Baseline is the 2014-15 school year.)*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this is a new measure, which reflects that 13.0% of the school districts in the state are designated as low performing.

- ❖ *Measure 2.5.3 – Percentage of third grade students scoring proficient or higher (Levels 3 & above) on the reading beginning of grade, end of grade, portfolio, or alternative assessment.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this is the Read to Achieve number. He pointed out that the data for 2013-14 is also in red and underlined because an omission of some data was detected, which needed to be included. He explained that this is another place where the state is ahead of the target for 2014-15 and should be ahead for 2015-16. He asked the Board’s pleasure about making adjustments for those targets. Board member Rebecca Taylor requested that staff make some adjustments.

Vice Chairman A.L. Collins raised the issue of personalized education, noting that the General Assembly recently eliminated personalized education plans. He explained that we need to be certain as to what term is used and what a personalized education means, i.e. a common definition; he asked staff to address this issue in the near future. In response, Dr. Atkinson shared that there are some guiding principles of what would be considered a personalized education, and staff will bring those principles to the Board for consideration versus one size fits all. A brief discussion ensued.

Goal 3 – Every student every day has excellent educators

- *Objective 3.3 – Increase the number of teachers graduating from quality traditional and alternative educator preparation programs.*

- ❖ *Measure 3.3.1 – Percentage of teachers passing required licensure exams.*

Under this measure, Dr. Fabrizio explained that the old note has been stricken, which talked about significant changes in the licensure exam requirements that went into effect in 2014-15, making it unreliable to use historical data. Instead, in the space where it used to have the 2013-14 information based on one specific licensure exam, data are now presented from three different licensure exams: Foundations of Reading, Gen. Curriculum Multi-Subjects, and Gen. Curriculum Math. Dr. Fabrizio explained that actual results for the 2014-15 are presented and targets established for the following three years.

- ❖ *Measure 3.3.3 –Percentage of first, second, and third year teachers for whom ratings on Standards 3 and 4 are associated with higher levels of yearly student growth outcomes.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that staff suggested changing what we originally had been using as the measure (*Percentage of first, second, and third-year teachers rated proficient or higher standards on 3, 4, & 6 on the NC educator evaluation system*) to the revised measure (underscored above) in order to get at the heart of the effectiveness data. That data should be available to share by December 2015.

- ❖ *Measure 3.4.2 –Percentage of first and second year school administrators for whom higher ratings on Standards 2, 4, and 5 are associated with higher levels of school-level student growth.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this new measure (underscored above) is complementary to Measure 3.3.3, noting that this will be part of the big collection of data, analyzed in October-November and shared with the Board in December 2015. The new measure replaces the old measure (*Percentage of and second year school administrators rated proficient or higher standards on 2, 4, 5, & 8 on the executive evaluation system.*). In response to Board member Olivia Oxendine’s question, Dr. Fabrizio explained that this measure collects school administrators’ ratings on those standards through TrueNorthLogic software. Dr. Olivia Oxendine noted that Standard 8 has been removed from the original wording. She asked if the intent is to show a correlation between Standards 2, 4, 5 and 8 with student growth. Dr. Fabrizio concurred that is the rationale.

- Objective 3.5 –Decrease the disparity in the access to effective and highly-effective teachers for students in low-achieving and high-poverty schools relative to their higher-achieving and lower-poverty peers.

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this new objective (underscored above), replaces the old objective (Increase the percentage of effective or highly effective teachers in schools with a performance composite below 60% and not meeting or exceeding academic growth.) . He reminded Board members that several months ago he presented information about the educator effectiveness profiles developed by the U.S. Department of Education (USED), using data from North Carolina. Every state in the country was asked to develop and update their educator equity plan. Dr. Fabrizio reported that we submitted our plan on June 1. In September, the Department received a letter from USED detailing some components of the plan that they wanted revised. The revision was submitted on Wednesday, September 30, and Dr. Fabrizio shared that he received an email requesting a conference call with USED officials to discuss their thoughts on our revised plan. Dr. Fabrizio reminded Board members that the original plan mentioned the Department coming to the Board and asking the Board’s consideration of including something in the Strategic Plan specifically related to educator equity, which is Objective 3.5. Vice Chairman Collins pointed out that neither House nor Senate bill of the reauthorization of ESEA being considered has this as a part of it, explaining that USED is requesting information based on the current law. He added that the Board needs to recognize that we want to add this information to the plan, not because USED might mandate it.

Board member Eric Davis suggested modifying the first words to “Increase the access” unless “decreasing the disparity is a requirement of USED. Dr. Fabrizio explained that, currently, the analyses (required by USED) requires states to do this in rank order based on percent poverty and percent minority, and then compare data on certain statistics for the lowest quartile of the schools compared with the highest quartile of schools. In line with Mr. Davis’s comments, Dr. Atkinson suggested revising the measure to make it a more positive approach.

Vice Chairman Collins also suggested that community colleges must have strategic plans and that there must be some overlap that we might have to increase the pipeline of teachers; he suggested adopting a common goal. Board member McDevitt elaborated about elevating to a 20k foot view that the assumption is that if we reach these goals and these numbers, that our vision is being achieved. He suggested a conversation on the controllable variables versus the uncontrollable variables and what we are doing to mitigate those uncontrollable variables, noting that part of that is what the IHE’s are doing, but there are others as well. He elaborated briefly on an earlier conversation during the planning session about the importance of ensuring that students are not several years behind before they have interventions. Pre-K should be a part of this conversation as well. In response, Dr. Fabrizio shared that the community college system, in collaboration with Commerce, the University System, and DPI, has an initiative called Align4NCWorks. He explained that Dr. Atkinson asked him to be a part of this group to talk about each entity’s Strategic Plans. Dr. Atkinson suggested that it may be helpful for the State Board to have a presentation from the University System about their Strategic Plan. Chairman Cobey suggested that the time is right for this type of presentation.

In response to Mr. Collins’s concern about the pipeline, Dr. Rebecca Garland explained that there is a significant portion of the Budget Bill provisions that directs the State Board of Education as the lead working with the Community College System and UNC-General Administration to revise teacher education programs. She suggested that as part of that process, the group could look at the pipeline and how we attract individuals to the program, and over the next two years, the Board will receive status updates about the work, which is to be implemented in 2017. Mr. McDevitt reiterated that the Board is saying “Every student, every day has excellent educators.” He elaborated on the many factors beyond control in having an excellent educator in front of students every day, and questioned whether we would have reached that goal, even if

we've completed all of the objectives. He suggested the importance of articulating the objectives, and working with teachers to ensure they know that we are aware of the issues. In response to Board member Patricia Willoughby's suggestion about a meeting of the joint boards to talk about solving some of these issues, Chairman Cobey announced that the Governor has called a joint meeting on October 28 at the Koury Convention Center in Greensboro. Board members should receive a letter of invitation shortly. A brief discussion ensued.

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

Dr. Fabrizio explained that a few targets have been added and revised under Goal 4, based on data.

- ❖ *Measure 4.1.2 – Percentage of schools implementing 1:1 or Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) programs for students.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that the original measure was “*Percentage of middle schools . . .*”, and now we are looking at all schools implementing at 1:1 or BYOD programs for students. Targets have been established as well as results reported.

- ❖ *Measure 4.1.3 – Percentage of teachers reporting sufficient access to instructional technology.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that the original measure read “*Percentage of high schools implementing 1:1 programs for students.*”, which has been changed to teachers reporting sufficient access. Targets have been established as well as results reported.

- ❖ *Measure 4.2.2 – Percentage of schools using the Power School parent portal to allow parents to access information online regarding their children.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that this measure clarifies that we are looking at the percentage of schools using the Power School portal because the state is investing to provide access; therefore, we want to report the data. A brief discussion ensued about the need for this measure once 100% of the schools are using the parent portal and consideration of modifying the measure related to the effectiveness of the tool. Chairman Cobey directed staff to vet this measure further. Discussion also occurred regarding current funding, and the fact that once LEAs have to pay for the portal, the percentage may not be 100%.

Goal 5 – Every student is healthy, safe, and responsible.

- ❖ *Measure 5.1.2 – Percentage of high school students who agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers really care about them and give them a lot of encouragement as measured by the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) administered in the spring of odd number years.*

Dr. Fabrizio explained that, in talking with the Chair of the HRS Committee, it was discovered that the columns in earlier versions of this measure were inaccurate since the YRBS is administered every other year; therefore, the added language (underscored above) clarifies this measure. In response to Board member Kevin Howell's suggestion for further vetting on this measure, Dr. Fabrizio clarified that this is what students are saying about their teachers in the YRBS survey. A brief discussion ensued. Dr. Atkinson suggested that the student survey we are piloting may be an option for the future.

- ❖ *Measure 5.2.1 – Percentage of local school districts reporting implementation of each component of the Healthy Active Children Policy (local school health advisory council, physical education, recess/physical activity, and coordinated school health program).*

Dr. Fabrizio pointed out that the revisions in this measure are to provide clarification as to exactly what is happening.

- ❖ *Measure 5.2.2 – Percentage of high school students who are overweight or obese as reported on the YRBS administered in the spring of odd number years.*

Again, Dr. Fabrizio pointed out that clarification was provided related to YRBS administration.

- ❖ *Measure 5.2.3 – Number of schools participating in the innovative school breakfast program.*

Dr. Fabrizio noted a great leap that occurred in the number of schools (338) participating in the innovative school breakfast program in the 2013-14 school year, with an increase to 641 schools participating in 2014-15. He reported that Dr. Lynn Harvey (Director, Child Nutrition Programs) provided estimates for future years, noting that the recent big increase is not what they anticipate for future years; therefore, she was conservative in the estimates.

- ❖ *Measure 5.3.3 – Number (percentage) of K-12 students suspended out of school short-term (10 days or less).*

Dr. Fabrizio noted that this measure was modified to add the word “percentage” and to collect the actual percentage results. He spoke briefly about collecting short-term suspensions versus long-term suspensions.

Vice Chairman Collins spoke briefly about the importance of ensuring that LEA strategic plans align to this plan. In addition, he requested that the Board be provided a copy of the Community College System’s report on remediation. Dr. Atkinson explained that the Department will be able to get that report for the Board because the Community College System is required by state law to provide that information to each LEA superintendent each year.

Based on a discussion that occurred on Wednesday related to certain parts of DPI’s work being dependent on what other entities do, Dr. Atkinson asked for clarification, noting that she got the impression that the Board is interested in the Department bringing forth barriers for which there must be a collective push to get certain things done to reach these goals and objectives. In response, Chairman Cobey announced that he asked the LFI and GCS Committee chairs to collaborate with staff to develop a vision for this work prior to the spring Planning and Work Session.

A brief discussion ensued about partnering with every school in the state. In closing comments, Chairman Cobey stated that he is encouraged that the Strategic Plan is a living document, which can be refined as needed.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

Chairman Cobey noted a total of 10 items for consideration on the consent agenda. He asked if any Board members wanted to remove any item from the Consent Agenda. Hearing no requests, Chairman Cobey asked for a motion to approve TCS 1, TCS 2, TCP 1, TCP 2, HRS 1, HRS 2, GCS 1, GCS 2, GCS 3, and GCS 4.

<p><i>Upon motion by <u>Mr. Greg Alcorn</u> and seconded by <u>Ms. Patricia Willoughby</u>, the Board voted unanimously to approve the slate of Consent Agenda items as presented. (See Attachments TCS 1, TCS 2, TCP 1, TCP 2, HRS 1, HRS 2, GCS 1, GCS 2, GCS 3, and GCS 4</i></p>
--

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

CONSENT

TCS 1 – JLEOC Report: Public School Procurement of Information Technology

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

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 4.2: Use Home Base as an essential resource for instructional delivery and communications with parents and students.

Presenter(s): Mr. Philip W. Price (Chief Financial Officer, Financial and Business Services), Ms. Sarah Harris (Director, Financial Services Division), and Ms. Joni Robbins, (Section Chief, Purchasing and Contracts Section)

Description:

This report is being 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.

CONSENT

TCS 2 – Local Education Agency Race to the Top Expenditures: Final Analysis of Expenditure Patterns and Related Outcomes

Policy Implications: N/A

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

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

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

Description:

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

In 2010, North Carolina was awarded \$399,465,769.00 from the federal Race to the Top (RttT) competition to fund state and local education reform. States receiving RttT funds were required to allocate half of the funds to participating local school districts and eligible charter schools, which we collectively refer to as local education agencies (LEAs). North Carolina pooled \$34,639,376.00 in locally-allocated funds to provide a computing infrastructure, the North Carolina Education Cloud (NCEdCloud), to serve local needs statewide. LEAs were required to contribute funds from their local allocations on a prorated basis to this project, after which the amount allocated directly to LEAs was \$165,360,624.00.

The purpose of the direct allocation of funds to LEAs was to provide them with resources to support statewide RttT initiatives locally and to allow LEAs flexibility in crafting their own plans to achieve RttT objectives. LEAs pursued multiple strategies for spending their RttT funds. In 2010-11, LEA RttT expenditures totaled \$13,008,043.00, or approximately \$8.96 per pupil. In 2011-12, LEA RttT expenditures totaled \$51,462,447.00, or approximately \$35.19 per pupil.

- 1: In 2012-13, LEA RttT expenditures totaled \$50,804,698.00, or approximately \$34.41 per pupil. In 2013-14, LEA RttT expenditures totaled \$38,325,516.00, or approximately \$25.69 per pupil.

The first LEA RttT expenditures report provided information on the amount of RttT funds allocated to LEAs, as well as a historical analysis of the equitable distribution of funds across schools and LEAs.

- 2: The second report updated those findings with an additional year of data and more sophisticated coding and expenditure-tracking techniques, investigated patterns of local RttT fund expenditures across time and by purpose, and reported on progress on establishment of the NCEdCloud.
- 3: This final report has three purposes: 1) To describe LEA RttT fund expenditure, 2) To determine whether local-level RttT expenditures are associated with outcome measures, and 3) To describe the progress and cost-savings associated with the NCEdCloud.

Key Findings

1. By the end of the 2013-14 school year, 94.1% of the allocated LEA RttT funds had been spent, leaving 5.9% of LEA RttT allocations outstanding. According to updated LEA Detailed Scopes of Work (DSWs), 5.7% of funds were designated for spending during the 2014-15 school year, accounting for nearly all remaining LEA RttT funds.
2. Once planned 2014-15 allocations are taken into account, RttT-related spending for most traditional districts (96.5%) and participating charter schools (63.0%) was between 95% and 105% of planned spending levels, according to updated DSWs. (Note: No LEA was allowed to spend more than its allotted federal funds; the state initially covered LEA-level spending that exceeded RttT allocations and then collected reimbursements for that coverage from the over-charging LEAs.)
3. From 2010-11 to 2013-14, 97.3% of total traditional district RttT expenditures fell into five key categories: Classroom Instruction (55.1%), Support for Instruction (26.4%), Professional Development (9.2%), LEA Administration (5.0%), and School Leadership (1.6%).

4. From 2010-11 to 2013-14, 97.6% of total charter school RttT expenditures fell into five key categories: Classroom Instruction (69.6%), Professional Development (16.6%), Support for Students (5.2%), School Leadership (4.2%), and Special Instruction (2.1%).
5. 82.0% of traditional district RttT expenditures fell into four key goods and services subcategories: Technology (42.1%), Instructional Personnel (15.4%), Bonus/Supplement/ Extra Duty Pay (12.7%), and Contracted Services (12.3%). The two largest expenditure categories for charter schools were Instructional Personnel and Contracted Services, which each accounted for 31.4% of spending.
6. Three RttT objectives accounted for roughly 83% of LEAs' total RttT expenditures during this time: Data Systems to Support Infrastructure (47.5%), Great Teachers and Leaders (22.5%), and Standards and Assessment (13.0%).
7. Controlling for school demographics and prior school-level performance, RttT spending at the LEA level seems to have a limited relationship with student outcomes. The relationships should be interpreted with caution, however, because the analyses used for this report cannot definitively isolate the causal effects of the patterns of local expenditures from the effects of several other changes in the educational system during the time of the RttT grant. The analyses of student outcomes through 2014 suggest that increased per-pupil spending of RttT funds on Data Systems to Support Infrastructure may be associated with small decreases in End-of-Course (EOC) performance composite, while increased per-pupil expenditures on Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools is associated with small increases in the EOC performance composite.
8. An analysis of student outcomes suggests that LEAs that spent more of the RttT funding earlier and LEAs that focused on a smaller number of sub-objectives saw greater increases in their high school graduation rates, compared to LEAs that spent more of their funding later in the grant and spread funding across more objectives. The graduation rate also appeared to increase more in LEAs where more funding was spent on activities related to the State Success Factors and the Great Teachers and Leaders objective.
9. Based on the experiences of four sample LEAs, all services of the NCEdCloud have not yet been implemented across all LEAs. While some LEAs report having experienced cost savings already, others do not yet report experiencing any cost savings. The varied experience appears to have been driven by how technologically advanced each LEA was prior to the commencement of the NCEdCloud initiative.
10. Cost savings related to the NCEdCloud cannot be confirmed using current expenditure data. In order to facilitate future evaluation, the state should direct LEAs to improve their application of existing Chart of Accounts' codes to provide a more detailed and consistent accounting of technology spending.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the SBE accept this report.

21ST CENTURY PROFESSIONALS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Chair; Mr. Eric C. Davis, Vice Chair)

CONSENT

TCP 1 – Policy Revisions: TCP-H-001 – Global Educator Digital Badge Criteria

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #TCP-H-001

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education plan.

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

Presenter(s): Dr. Lynne Johnson (Director, Educator Effectiveness), Dr. Tiffany Perkins, Director, K-12 Curriculum & Instruction), Ms. Helga Fasciano (Special Assistant for Global Education)

Description:

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

Educator categories included in this policy amendment are: Teacher, Teacher Leadership Specialist, Library Media Coordinator, Instructional Technology Facilitator, School Counselor, Career Development Coordinator, School Social Worker, School psychologist, Speech Language Pathologist, Instructional Central Office Staff, Principal/Assistant Principal, and Superintendent.

Guidance and technical assistance documents will provide information on LEA implementation.

Recommendation(s):

Recommend that the State Board of Education approve the policy revisions.

CONSENT

TCP 2 – Policy Revisions: TCP-A-005 – Credits Required for the Renewal of a Standard Professional 2 License

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

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 31: Develop and support highly effective teachers.

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

Description:

During its 2014 session, the General Assembly increased the number of renewal credits required for a teacher to renew a Standard Professional 2 license. The number of renewal credits was increased from 7.5 to 8.0, and specified that standards for continuing licensure shall include at least eight continuing

education credits with at least three credits required in a teacher's academic subject area. Standards for continuing licensure for elementary and middle school teachers shall include at least three continuing education credits related to literacy. These requirements apply to licensed educators with licenses expiring on or after June 30, 2016.

Recommendation(s):

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

HEALTHY, RESPONSIBLE STUDENTS
(Ms. Patricia Willoughby, Chair; Mr. Eric Davis, Vice Chair)

CONSENT

HRS 1 – Return-to-Learn After Concussion

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

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 5.2: Promote healthy and active lifestyles for students.

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

Description:

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

Recommendation(s):

State Board of Education members are requested to accept the proposed policy.

CONSENT

HRS 2 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly: Completion of CPR by Students Required

Policy Implications: House Bill 837, SBE Policy #GCS-U-000

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student is healthy, safe and responsible.

Objective 1.2: Promote healthy, active lifestyles for students.

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

Description:

In July 2012, HB 837 required the State Board of Education to work in cooperation with the American Heart Association, the American Red Cross, and other nationally recognized programs to develop a strategic plan to phase in successful completion of cardiopulmonary resuscitation instruction as a requirement for high school graduation by the 2014-15 school year. Attached is the report to be provided to the General Assembly regarding the status of the plan and its implementation.

Recommendation(s):

State Board of Education members are asked to accept the report for submission to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee.

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

CONSENT

GCS 1 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly: Improve K-3 Literacy Accountability Measures

Policy Implications: General Statute §115C-83.10

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education.

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

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

Description:

The North Carolina Read to Achieve law (S.L. 2012-142 Section 7A) states that “The State Board of Education shall establish a uniform format for local boards of education to report the required information listed in subsection (a) and (b) of this section and shall provide the format to local boards of education no later than 90 days prior to the annual due date. The State Board of Education shall compile annually this information and submit a state-level summary to the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee by October 15 of each year, beginning with the 2014-15 school year.”

Subsection (a) includes the state-wide numbers and percentages of students who demonstrate and do not demonstrate proficiency on the third-grade End-of-Grade (EOG) test for reading, students who take and pass an alternative assessment of reading comprehension, students who are retained for not demonstrating reading proficiency and students who are exempt from retention for a Good-Cause Exemption.

Subsection (b) includes a description of all reading interventions provided to students who have been retained.

The attached report includes statewide results.

Recommendation(s):

The State Board of Education is asked to accept and approve the report to the General Assembly Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on Improving K-3 Literacy: Accountability Measures.

CONSENT

GCS 2 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly: Founding Principles Act

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

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

Objective 1.5: Increase student performance on the state's End of Grade (EOG).

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

Objectives 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers.

Presenter(s): Dr. Tracy S. Weeks (Chief Academic and Digital Learning Officer, Academic and Digital Learning) and Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director, Division of K-12 Curriculum and Instruction)

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 (DPI) and local boards of education, as appropriate, are directed to provide "curriculum content" to support this semester course. Lastly, the Act directs the State Board of Education (SBE) 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 United States History I were aligned to reflect all of the content enumerated therein. Because the United States History I Essential Standards had 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 United States History I to demonstrate this alignment. This modification included changing the name of United States History I to American History I: The Founding Principles to reflect the course name identified in the act. The United States History II was changed to American History II for consistency.

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.

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.

Update since the 2013 report:

The Bill of Rights Institute (BORI) modules were completed and available for use by schools during the 2014-15 school year. The course content aligned to both the American History I: The Founding Principles course and the Civics and Economics course, consists of 10 instructional units that contain the following: pre-assessment; primary source analysis; written reflection; and document-based assessments. More specific details of the units are contained in Appendix E.

Upon further consideration, in January 2015, the SBE determined that the Civics and Economics course would serve as the course students would take to fulfill the requirements of The Founding Principles Act as it provides a more in-depth study of the content outlined in the act. Consequently, the name of the Civics and Economics course was changed to American History: The Founding Principles, Civics and Economics.

In addition to the Bill of Rights Institute modules (BORI), DPI is also in the process of developing additional support documents and professional development that will assist districts with more effectively implementing The Founding Principles Act. This resource will consist of additional curricular units of instruction for the American History: The Founding Principles, Civics and Economics course that focuses on appropriate pacing and alignment.

The DPI Division of Testing and Accountability has included assessment items on the North Carolina Final Exams for the American History: Founding Principles, Civics, and Economics course to support the legislation. The average percentage of items per test form represents approximately 54% of operational items and 54% of field-tested items.

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 3 – Report to the North Carolina General Assembly: Access to Increase Successful Career and Technical Education (CTE) Participation and Credentialing Report

Policy Implications: Session Law 2013-1, Section 360

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

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

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

Description:

This Credentialing Data report is also required pursuant to Session Law 2013-360. The 2014 budget allotted funds to enable secondary students to participate in credential exams and requires NCDPI to

report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the number of CTE students that (i) earn community college credit and (ii) related industry certifications and credentials.

Recommendation(s):

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

CONSENT

GCS 4 – Career and Technical Education Revisions to Essential Standards

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #GCS-F-005

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

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

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

Description:

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

Courses Being Added:

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

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

In Trade and Industrial Education: Advanced Manufacturing I and Advanced Manufacturing II:
Advanced Manufacturing I - This course is the first part of a two-part sequence on the basic functional knowledge and skills needed in the advanced manufacturing environment. This course covers introduction to manufacturing, safety, and quality and is based upon the Manufacturing Skills Standards Council's (MSSC) Certified Production Technicians certification (CPT). CPT is recognized by manufacturers in NC and the USA as a fundamental certification needed by advanced manufacturing production workers. Topics included in this course include 21st century skills, working in manufacturing, understanding customers' needs, communication strategies, how to develop and deliver training, manufacturing safety, personal protective equipment, fire and electrical safety, blueprint reading, basic measurements, precision tools, quality systems, corrective action process, and verification

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

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

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

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

Law and Justice II: This course emphasizes the structure of the American legal system while examining constitutional legal issues. Students will explore the difference between common and statutory law in the context of how legal precedent is established. The course will explore the rights of citizens guaranteed by the United States and North Carolina constitutions. Students will also evaluate the powers granted to the police and the restrictions placed upon them by the respective constitutions and their amendments. Specific topics of discussion will include search and seizure, arrests, interviews, interrogations, and confessions in the context of criminal prosecution. Major emphasis will be placed on the role and decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Students will utilize reading, writing, and critical thinking in the analysis of cases in a mock trial. In addition to legal issues, students will be

exposed to advanced law and justice skills. Activities include tactics, methods, and skills utilized in the law enforcement field. Students will attain skills for dealing with disasters and emergency situations.

The course culminates with students demonstrating their skills through participation in a simulated disaster scenario. The students are required to meet both national and intrastate professional guidelines as designated by applicable regulatory agencies such as Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and North Carolina Emergency Management. Upon completion of the course requirements and the final disaster simulation, students may be eligible to obtain certifications in American Heart Association's (AHA) Basic Life Support, and/or American Red Cross (ARC) First Aid and CPR. English language arts are reinforced. Work-based learning strategies appropriate for this course include job shadowing. Apprenticeship and cooperative education are possible for this course. SkillsUSA competitive events, community service, and leadership activities provide the opportunity to apply essential standards and workplace readiness skills through authentic experiences.

Courses being removed:

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

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

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the State Board accept the proposed changes to the Career and Technical Education Essential Standards.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION AGENDA

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

DISCUSSION

TCP 3 – JLEOC Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession

Policy Implications: General Statute §115C-12(22), 2014-15 Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 3: Every student, every day has excellent educator.

Objective 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers.

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

Description:

General Statute §115C-12(22) requires the State Board of Education to monitor and compile an annual report on the decisions of teachers who leave the teaching profession. LEAs are asked to complete an annual report on the reasons teachers leave their systems, submitting data to the Department of Public Instruction. The report for the 2014-15 school year is attached.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the Profession as required by General Statutes.

Discussion/Comments:

- TCP Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine recognized Dr. Yvette Stewart to present this item.
- Dr. Stewart briefly highlighted data from the Annual Report on Teachers Leaving the profession.
- In closing comments, Dr. Stewart pointed out that the State Board has approved a number of initiatives to help recruit and retain teachers, particularly in some of the top five turnover LEAs, such as the Regional Leadership Academy, Beginning Teacher Support Programs, Regional Licensing Centers, the National Board pay differential, and Future Teachers of America and Teacher Cadets. Dr. Stewart also noted that, with the change in legislation this year, they continue to work with Dr. Tom Tomberlin and LEAs to report teacher effectiveness data as well. The Department will still have a goal as we move toward the implementation/launch of the new Licensure system to gather more detailed information about our teachers to use for future analysis, according to Dr. Stewart. She added that the LEAs will have an opportunity to review this data and help clarify any discrepancies or outliers, and provide additional information as needed.
- Chairman Cobey noted that in Johnston County when teachers became teacher leaders they were considered as “leaving teaching.” He spoke briefly about hybrid models where teachers may teach and lead a team of teachers, and, in his opinion, they are still teachers. He asked that this be addressed in the future. In addition, Chairman Cobey referred to the number of teachers retiring with full benefits (1,755), noting that he doesn’t understand why the state incentivizes teachers retiring after 30 years when many are in their prime. He suggested discussing and developing a recommendation for the Legislature to look at incentivizing teachers to continue teaching. A brief discussion ensued about ways to incentivize veteran teachers. Chair Oxendine concurred that this issue deserves further discussion.
- Board member Greg Alcorn spoke briefly about voluntary and involuntary attrition, noting that of the 14%, one percent is involuntary (dismissal). In response to Mr. Alcorn’s request about other state comparisons, Dr. Stewart explained that the Department does not currently collect this data, but could do so in the future.
- Board member Eric Davis stated that this particular report directly ties to the Board’s conversation on Wednesday and this morning as it relates to a common set of goals that the state as a whole needs to work toward. He spoke briefly about the huge expense associated with excessive turnover in any business, athletic team, or entity.
- With regard to Table 2, which shows the highest and lowest counties, Chair Oxendine requested that in the future, staff disaggregate the percentage of teachers that retired, etc.
- There was no further discussion.

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

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

ACTION**GCS 5 – Guidelines for Academically or Intellectually Gifted (AIG) Programs****Policy Implications:** General Statute §115C-150.5-.8 (Article 9B), SBE Policy #GCS-U-000**SBE Strategic Plan:****Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.**Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.**Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.**Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state's End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).**Goal 2:** Every student has a personalized education.**Objective 2.1:** Increase the number of students who graduate from high school with post-secondary credit.**Presenter(s):** Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Sneha Shah-Coltrane (Director, Advanced Learning)**Description:**

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

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

Recommendation(s):

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

Discussion/Comments:

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis explained that the Guidelines for Academically or Intellectually Gifted Programs were discussed in September. He added that this item is part of our statutory requirements to

provide guidance to LEAs on how they construct and implement AIG Plans. Chair Davis noted that this particular revision does not include any changes to the content, but provides further clarity and support of LEAs continuing to improve this program.

- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis, and seconded by Mr. Kevin Howell, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the proposed changes to the North Carolina AIG Program Standards as the official guidelines for Local AIG Plans. (See Attachment GCS 5)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

GCS 6 – Read to Achieve Local Alternative Assessments

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #GCS-J-003

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 1.1: Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

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

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

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

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

Description:

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) was contacted by TE21 and informed that each year they develop new Case 21 assessments. As a result, a linking study must be completed annually for each assessment to determine the minimum third-grade end of the year proficiency scores for use under Read to Achieve, G.S. §115C-83.1C. The use of Case 21 as an alternative assessment for Read to Achieve is pending until successful completion of each linking study.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that Case 21 is pending approval until the successful completion of the linking study.

Discussion/Comments:

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Dr. Tammy Howard to present this item.
- Dr. Howard explained that this item is in reference to the Read to Achieve local alternative assessments, noting that the Board approved the slate of these local assessments for 2015-16 at its September meeting. Immediately following that meeting, Dr. Howard reported that the Department was contacted by one of the vendors that produces the Case 21 assessments who notified us that they actually rebuild new assessments

every academic year. She explained further that the vendor also has to redo their Lexile linking studies with MetaMetrics annually. Therefore, the number of items a student needs to score correctly to meet the Lexile levels will change yearly, according to Dr. Howard.

- The purpose of this item is to note that the Department is requesting to change the chart, approved in September, to indicate that CASE 21 is pending. As the Department receives the results from the linking studies this year, the chart will be updated. Dr. Howard also noted that a list of the schools that used this assessment in 2014-15 is included in the attachments (located on eBoard). Dr. Howard stated that the Department will notify those schools of this change.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis, and seconded by Ms. Patricia Willoughby, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve Case 21 upon successful completion of the linking study. (See Attachment GCS 5)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

GCS 7 – Changes to the 2014-15 Accountability Report

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

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 1.1: Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

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

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

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

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

Description:

Changes to the 2014-15 accountability data will be presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) for Action on First Reading at the October 2015 meeting.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the changes to the 2014-15 Accountability Data.

Discussion/Comments:

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Dr. Tammy Howard to present this item.

- Dr. Howard explained that the Board approved the 2014-15 Accountability Results during its September 2015 meeting, noting that there is a correction window for approximately 10 days following that meeting where LEAs and charter schools have the opportunity to provide any corrections they might have in their data. Dr. Howard referred Board members to the revised report (located on eBoard) for the Board's consideration, which shows the corrections by school and district. She noted that these corrections increased the state's graduation rate to 85.6% and the other changes are primarily in reference to performance in annual measurable objectives.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis, and seconded by Dr. Olivia Oxendine, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the changes to the 2014-15 Accountability Data, as presented (See Attachment GCS 7)

DISCUSSION

GCS 8 – Approval of Alternative Schools' Accountability Models

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #GCS-C-038

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

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

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

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

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

Description:

In December 2014, the State Board of Education approved SBE Policy #GCS-C-038, which gives alternative schools three options in lieu of reporting a School Performance Grade:

- (1) Alternative school returns student scores to the home school for inclusion in the home school's A-F school performance grade,
- (2) Alternative school reports data on student achievement and growth, and receives a status of progressing, maintaining, or declining, but does not receive an A-F school performance grade, and
- (3) Alternative schools may submit their own alternative accountability models to the State Board of Education for approval.

Alternative schools submitted documentation for the options that will be utilized for the 2015-16 school year in August. The Accountability Services staff have reviewed the requests and will present a summary of the options at the October meeting for discussion.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the alternative accountability options as presented.

Discussion/Comments:

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Dr. Tammy Howard to lead the discussion of this item.
- Dr. Howard explained that this item is in reference to alternative schools that have availed themselves of the policy that allows them to present their accountability model in lieu of reporting school performance grades. Dr. Howard directed Board members to the attached chart (Attachment 2) that lists the alternative schools and information around the different proposals. Dr. Howard reported that staff have reviewed the proposals and are confident that they are meeting the requirements for performance and growth measures. In addition, Dr. Howard noted that, at the request of the Committee Chair, included in the chart is an estimate of student enrollments in each of the alternative school programs, which will change yearly.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the October State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in November 2015. (See Attachment GCS 8)

DISCUSSION

GCS 9 – Technical Corrections to Course for Credit Policy

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #GCS-M-001

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

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

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

Presenter(s): Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services), and Mrs. Sneha Shah Coltrane (Director, Advanced Learning)

Description:

NCDPI is presenting to the State Board of Education two changes to clarify this policy and support student needs most effectively.

- (1) In August, this policy was updated to include technical changes incorporating new course names to reflect integrating Founding Principles with the Civics and Economics Course. The revised policy presented to the State Board of Education inadvertently included a change to the credit recovery section (6.1) that requires the administration of an end-of-course test at the conclusion of credit recovery. With credit recovery consisting of a subset of a course, not the entire content, whether to administer the end-of-course test has been a local option. This policy is presented to the State Board of Education in October with a change to the language that will allow local school districts the latitude to make the decision of whether to administer the end-of-course test at the conclusion of credit recovery.

(2) Beginning this year, freshman high school students (7.4) have their grade replaced when they choose to “repeat a course for credit” that they have failed previously. It is clear that this opportunity should be made available for all students who may fail a high school course and should not be limited only to the freshman class. The revised policy presented to the State Board of Education clarifies that all students who fail a high school course initially, starting in 2015-16, and choose to repeat a course for credit will have their previous grade replaced with their new course grade.

Recommendation(s):

The State Board of Education is asked to review and discuss the proposed amendments to this policy.

Discussion/Comments:

- GCS Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Ms. Sneha Shah-Coltrane to lead the discussion of this item.
- Ms. Shah-Coltrane explained that there are two items in this technical correction. The first is an error on the Department’s part where a word was left in the policy from a previous discussion around credit recovery. With the last adoption, LEAs quickly informed the Department of this shift from “shall” to “may” require the administration of an end-of-course test at the conclusion of credit recovery. This would give the discretion back to the LEA, according to Ms. Shah-Coltrane.
- The second technical correction will impact a greater number of students. Ms. Shah-Coltrane explained that last year the Board adopted a policy that permitted freshman students, beginning in this academic year, to repeat a course for credit that they failed previously, and replace the grade. The revised policy would make this opportunity available to all high school students to retake a course in its entirety for credit after failing it and have their previous grade replaced with their new course grade. Ms. Shah-Coltrane clarified that this policy would be effective this year with the Board’s approval, but would not be retroactive.
- There was no further discussion.

This item is presented for Discussion during the October State Board of Education meeting and will return for Action in November 2015. (See Attachment GCS 9)

NEW BUSINESS

- Proof of Concept Update
 - ❖ Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services)

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Howard provided an update on the Proof of Concept Study, noting that today was the first day that the window opened for the Interim Assessment. She reported that all materials necessary have been delivered to the LEAs, which include administration guides, and test forms for each grade level. Dr. Howard spoke briefly about the approval process for each of the test forms that go through approximately 25 approval levels prior to distribution. Dr. Howard also described the steps taken to ensure that everyone is prepared for the administration by providing a calendar of training events.

Dr. Howard elaborated briefly about the Interim Assessment 1 Reports. 1. The Class Roster is a classroom report for teachers that provide individual student responses, so the teacher may know if the student answered the item correctly: content standard, depth of knowledge, class/school percent correct, item type, and correct answer. Teachers have 30 days to review the test book to see how the student did on a particular item. Dr. Howard shared that it is critical to get feedback from the teachers to see if these items really measure what is being taught. In addition, Dr. Howard described the Individual Student Report that goes home to parents, which

shows the number of items a student answered correctly and the average number of items students in school answered correctly.

The third area of reporting will be comprised of state data, but will not provide district or school comparisons. Dr. Howard reported that schools have expressed, and the Department understands fully, that they would like to know how their school did in comparison to the entire state. Dr. Howard explained that this report will not be completed until everyone has completed testing in a cycle; the first testing window is open until October 31.

Dr. Howard also spoke about communication efforts, which include two scheduled webinars for teachers and principals to share information on the reports and to provide guidance on how to use the data to make instructional decisions. The Department has also developed a short parent survey (<http://tinyurl.com/p5n9dwu>) for feedback on the usefulness of the data on the student report. In addition, a teacher survey is being development by staff for feedback on the usefulness of the data on the class reports. Dr. Howard reported that the Department is also planning observations in some of the schools across the state, and will probably rely on regional accountability coordinators to work with DPI staff in this component, which will provide an opportunity for conversations with our practitioners.

In addition, Dr. Howard explained that her division is working with Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instruction) to develop a planning tool that will identify needs and capacity for possible state-wide implementation. The target for reporting on this is December, according to Dr. Howard.

Dr. Howard also reported that the Department's technical advisors (experts in accountability and testing) reviewed the design of the study at its two-day meeting last week. She shared that they noted the importance of the field test year in 2016-17. They recommended attending to well-defined purposes as well as caution when drawing conclusions based on performance of study students and non-study students, providing several suggestions on how to do that. The technical advisors also noted the low-stakes for students as a positive as well as the effort to gather feedback. Dr. Howard also spoke briefly about lessons learned from past projects such as the NC Final Exams that can be applied to this project.

Dr. Howard explained that the Local Benchmark Study is in addition to the Proof of Concept Study. She explained that the Local Benchmark Study is looking at LEAs that administer benchmarks locally, taking their data from those benchmarks from 2014-15 and comparing student performance on those benchmarks to the performance on the End-of-Grade assessment. Dr. Howard reported that seven districts and two charter schools have expressed interest in participating in the Local Benchmark Study. She explained that the Department is sending a survey to those LEAs and charter schools to determine the benchmark product, grade level(s), and content area(s). Next steps are to design the study and collect the data from the districts using an external researcher to do the analysis. Board member Olivia Oxendine thanked Dr. Howard for all of the hard work the Department has invested in this effort, noting that eight months ago she was skeptical of this approach. Dr. Oxendine stated that while she still has questions, she sees great benefits coming out of the information teachers will be able to glean from the study reports and apply to their pedagogy, and also noted that she is thrilled with the care the agency has given to developing this study. Dr. Oxendine asked if Dr. Howard sensed optimism from the technical advisors following last week's meeting. In response, Dr. Howard clarified that the role of the technical advisors is to come together to look at all of the components and provide any concerns they may have.

She noted that their concerns are not always things that operate well in the world of statewide testing programs. For example, they would take three years to roll this initiative out. Therefore, the Department takes their

information and feedback to do the best we can within the context we have, ensuring that the technical quality is sound. She elaborated briefly, sharing that she believes the technical advisors would caution to make sure we do it well and not try to do too much at one time. According to Dr. Howard, the technical advisors also cautioned using the terms formative and interim, and she spoke briefly about the rationale for this concern.

Board member Eric Davis asked about the Department's commitment to teachers on turnaround time when providing them with feedback. Dr. Howard described immediate scoring where a teacher can take the answer sheets to their central office and score them right away as their time permits. All reports are ready to be generated, according to Dr. Howard.

As it relates to the individual student report for parents, Mr. Davis suggested that it might be prudent to provide a statement that lets parents know that teachers are receiving feedback from the state to inform them about how to help their child. Dr. Howard shared that typically a statement about following up with the teacher for additional information is printed on reports to parents.

Mr. Davis commented on the Local Benchmark Study, noting that he was pleased that seven LEAs are participating, but wished there were more. He asked if there was anything that could be done to encourage greater participation. Dr. Howard explained that we actually need to get the survey results back on October 8 to see of those that volunteered, is there good representation of the different benchmarks. Then, perhaps we could solicit additional volunteers for the study based on local alternative benchmarks. Dr. Oxendine asked Dr. Howard to clarify the purpose of the Local Benchmark Study. Dr. Howard explained that the purpose is to find out if the local benchmarks provide the same information as we are gleaned from the End-of-Grade assessment, and whether it is possible that there is a local benchmark that could be administered that has already been developed that meet the requirements of our state and federal reporting on our end-of-grade assessments. Board member Willoughby asked Dr. Howard if the survey is also asking how long they have been administering these benchmarks. Dr. Howard did not think so, explaining that they were asking in context of the 2014-15 school year, but the question can be added if it pleases the Board. Mrs. Willoughby stated that the information would be helpful. Mr. Davis stated that he hopes this benchmark study will give us insight into what the LEAs are already using, effectiveness, and how we can tap in to what is already being done. A brief discussion ensued about participation in the webinars and communication efforts as it relates to buy in, transparency, gathering feedback, etc.

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

ACTION ON FIRST READING

TCS 3 – Request for Approval to Be Funded as Dropout Prevention and Recovery Program
Policy Implications: SBE Policy #TCS-M-003

SBE Strategic Plan:

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

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

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

Description:

The State Board of Education approved a policy that allows charter schools that are approved with a sole mission to provide a dropout prevention and recovery program to high school students in grades 9 through 12 to request to be funded on 5th month average daily membership. These schools have specialized programs to encourage students who have dropped out of school to re-enroll in school, and to provide an alternative for students who are at risk of dropping out of a traditional high school.

Two schools have provided a written request to be funded per this policy: Central Wake Charter High School and Stewart Creek High School. Both these schools have a charter with a mission to provide dropout preventions and recovery programs to high school students. Stewart Creek opened July 1, 2015, and Central Wake Charter High School is scheduled to open July 1, 2016.

Recommendation(s):

The Department of Public Instruction recommends that these two schools be approved for funding based on 5th month average daily membership.

Discussion/Comments:

- TCS Committee Chair Greg Alcorn reminded Board members that in September the Board approved a policy for funding high schools whose sole mission is to support dropout prevention and recovery programs. The purpose of this item is to bring forth two schools seeking approval of that process, which provides funding on the 5th month average daily membership. Stewart Creek opened on July 1, 2015, and Central Wake Charter is scheduled to open July 2016.
- There was no further discussion.

<i>Upon motion by <u>Mr. Greg Alcorn</u>, and seconded by <u>Ms. Patricia Willoughby</u> the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve Central Wake Charter High School and Stewart Creek High School to be funded based on the 5th month average daily membership as recommended. (See Attachment TCS 3)</i>
--

LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Chair; Mr. Wayne McDevitt, Vice Chair)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

LFI 1 – Amendment to Charter of Longleaf School of the Arts

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #TCS-U-014

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 2: Every Student has a personalized education.

Objective 2.4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals.

Presenter(s): Mr. Philip Price (Chief Financial Officer, Financial and Business Services), Mr. Adam Levinson (Interim Director, Office of Charter Schools) and Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith (Lead Consultant, Office of Charter Schools)

Description:

SBE Policy #TCS-U-014, Section 3 states that “Any proposed amendments not [explicitly mentioned in TCS-U-014] must be reviewed and approved by the State Board of Education.”

Longleaf School of the Arts (LSA) charter school requests approval to amend its charter to reflect modified position qualifications for its Head of School and Assistant Head of School. These qualifications are listed in the original State Board-approved application, as part of the school’s Business Plan; therefore, changes to these qualifications must be approved by the State Board per TCS-U-014.

The specific changes to the position qualifications include the following:

- (1) Former Requirement: LSA’s Head of School will possess a minimum of a Master’s Degree and have a minimum of three years’ experience in administration.

Amended Requirement: LSA’s Head of School will possess a minimum of an active teacher’s certificate and have a minimum of three years of experience.

- (2) Former Requirement: LSA’s Assistant Head of School will have completed a minimum of a Master’s Degree in an arts-related field and will have a minimum of two years’ experience overseeing curricular development, including overseeing employees.

Amended Requirement: LSA’s Assistant Head of School will possess a minimum of an active teacher’s certificate.

Recommendation(s):

The Office of Charter Schools recommends that the State Board of Education approve this action on first reading.

Discussion/Comments:

- LFI Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Mr. Adam Levinson to present this item.
- Mr. Levinson explained that this item is related to the Board’s policy regarding charter schools and amendments to their charters that are required to come before the Board.
- Mr. Levinson shared that this is a request from Longleaf School of the Arts to change the position qualifications for its Head of School and Assistant Head of School. He explained further that the reason the Board has to approve this modification is because it is in their original application, which is engrossed as part of the charter; therefore, this is an amendment to the charter.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, and seconded by Mr. Greg Alcorn the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the proposed charter amendments to the Longleaf School of the Arts (LSA) charter to reflect modified position qualifications for its Head of School and Assistant Head of School. (See Attachment LFI 1)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

LFI 2– 2014-15 Low-Performing Schools

Policy Implications: SBE Policy #TCS-U-014

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 2: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for postsecondary education.

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

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

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

Presenter(s): Dr. Rebecca Garland (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Dr. Nancy Barbour (Director, District and School Transformation)

Description:

The 2014–15 Low Performing Districts and School list will be presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) for Action on First Reading at the October 2015 meeting.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the 2014–15 Low-Performing Districts and Schools lists.

Discussion/Comments:

- LFI Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor explained that the purpose of this item is to present the 2014-15 Low-Performing Schools, and refers to the new laws that define how low-performing schools or districts are going to be recognized based on certain criteria. She recognized Dr. Nancy Barbour to present this item.
- Using a PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Barbour set the context for this presentation by providing the General Assembly’s definition of low-performing schools and districts, changes in the law, and what that means for LEAs and schools, and how District and School Transformation will support in those efforts.
 - 115C-105.37. Identification of low-performing schools.
 - ❖ Low-performing schools are those that receive a school performance grade of D or F and a school growth score of "met expected growth" or "not met expected growth"
 - ❖ Identified annually
 - 115C-105.39A. Identification of low-performing local school administrative units
 - ❖ A low-performing local school administrative unit is a unit in which the majority of the schools in that unit that received a school performance grade and school growth score have been identified as low-performing schools.
 - ❖ Identified annually
- Dr. Barbour clarified that any district that has more than 50 percent of its schools identified as low-performing is considered a low-performing district. In addition to the above two laws, there is a statement that says low-performing schools and districts will be identified annually, which is a change in the law.

- Dr. Barbour presented the number of low-performing schools and districts by the new State Board regions
- In addition, Dr. Barbour reviewed the specific guidelines set forth in the law for LEAs and schools to follow once identified as low performing, which includes written notification to the parents and guardians of all students attending any school or district within 30 days of the identification of low-performing status. Dr. Barbour noted that, according to General Statutes, upon receipt of the LEA's plan for improvement, the State Board will expeditiously provide feedback to each of the plans so the LEA can consider the feedback, choose to use it or not, adopt the plan as is or with modifications, and resubmit the plan to the State Board, and make available to the public. In addition, the 15 low-performing districts must submit a plan and specifically address how the district is going to support those low-performing schools in their district.
- Dr. Barbour announced that support for low-performing schools and districts will begin with District and School Transformation Services hosting four webinars, beginning October 2 inviting LEAs and charter schools to help them understand the law, requirements, etc. Dr. Barbour explained that the reason the webinar is occurring so quickly is because after the Board's approval of the list today, the first 30-day timeline starts for both schools and districts. She provided the schedule of webinars for the Board's information.
- Dr. Barbour explained that, related to the requirement for providing feedback, staff members are currently developing rubrics using SMART Goals to provide feedback to 409 schools and 15 school districts in a five-day turnaround. She elaborated briefly on this issue.
- In closing comments, Dr. Barbour shared that the Department is requesting approval of the low-performing list.
- In response to Board member Patricia Willoughby's question about additional money in the budget to support these efforts, Dr. Barbour confirmed that there were no additional funds. Mrs. Willoughby shared that the State Board spent Wednesday in the Winston-Salem/Forsyth school district looking at the significant progress made in these schools following receipt of a \$19 million grant over three-four years, specifically noting the upward trajectory.
- Board member Olivia Oxendine became emotional when noting that this report is very troubling. Superintendent Advisor Rodney Shotwell interjected stating that "Not one person who passed that law has ever stepped foot more than a day in any one of these schools. Yesterday, I visited a fabulous school in Winston-Salem, having no idea about the letter grade until I got finished. When I finished seeing all those teachers work as hard as they are doing, seeing all of the work and the plans they had in place, there is no way in the world I would ever give that school the grade that it was assigned – ever! When I think of failing, I think of something that is absolutely broken and not working and I haven't seen that yet. I had a school that went from an "F" to a "D" and it was a great relief because nobody wants to be labeled that. But they're working their hind ends off every day to do this. I can't imagine there are teachers out there who intentionally just don't want to do the work. They are all working very hard. And, I'm going to tell you it takes a special teacher to work in schools in that situation. It is easy to teach kids that come to you reading and well prepared for school with high expectations from their parents. But when you're working in a school like I did at Lexington Senior High School and you are dealing with almost 80% poverty, it takes a lot of compassion and work from a staff, and that is something that no test and no accountability model is ever going to measure in a teacher or an administrator that works in those schools – ever! You can't measure that, because if you did, they would be "A" schools. At least a huge "A" for effort. As a superintendent, I appreciate the help that DPI is going to give us, but giving me a notice that I've got either a meeting tomorrow or Monday is kind of short notice. But we're going to make it work. It would be nice if they were going to make these regulations, that there would be some money for us to help some of these schools even, it is just for professional development. The last time I checked, we have not

seen any of that money. If it wasn't for Race to the Top, it would be seven years without staff development money unless I'm doing it locally. I'm sorry, I'll get off my soapbox, and I'm going to stop talking, but I'm really put off by this because I know some of these schools that are on this list, and I would send my children there and not hesitate to do that. Both in districts that I used to work in and surrounding county districts, there are a lot of good people working there. There is one in particular on the list, the kids are getting it and working as hard as they can, but you know what they need? They need 20-30 more days of school for those kids to be at grade level by the end of that school year. Who is going to start stepping up and taking away our money, and give it back to us to do things for the kids that deserve it the most. We are robbing our children in poverty in this state and we need to do something about that now." Chair Becky Taylor stated that this is exactly what she wanted to say and believed that everyone around the table would say the same, but coming from Dr. Shotwell, it's more meaningful.

- Dr. Oxendine apologized for getting emotional earlier, sharing that she knows of a time when the Sandhills Region and other regions across the state that are impacted by poverty were far poorer 50 years ago than they are today. She stated that she knows a kind of poverty that would shock most people. Students during that era did not do all that badly academically. She said so while she gets poverty, she does not settle for poverty as the reason for this kind of outcome – it is about a principal, strong teachers, a superintendent, and local board of education that must come together to overcome poverty and do their best for these kids. She concluded her comments by stating that the State Board is going to have to do something drastic in spite of poverty.
- Speaking from six years of experience in a high-poverty environment, Teacher of the Year Advisor James Ford shared that one thing he finds problematic about the conversation both locally and nationally is that, however well intentioned, we often make the mistake of using outliers for exceptions to the rule to disprove the trend. He explained that there is a preponderance of data that shows the interactions between students attending high-poverty schools and their academic outcomes. Mr. Ford stated that he is concerned that we are not adequately responding to that problem – the notion that we can teach through poverty is absolutely false. From an educator's standpoint, Mr. Ford stated that the resources are needed to try to mitigate some of those issues. Mr. Ford also elaborated on Secretary Duncan's speech on Wednesday when he talked about the savings we would receive as a nation if we invested more in our schools – approximately \$15 billion – why not invest that money in the high-poverty schools.
- Chairman Cobey stated that it is clear that the State Board of Education needs to work with the General Assembly going forward. While they ask for a lot of information, the State Board was really not a part of the development of the performance grades. He reminded Board members that, as seen with Read to Achieve, we were able to get modifications to the law. In addition, Chairman Cobey stated that he hopes the law gives the LEAs the latitude to use electronic notification for the parents instead of spending funds on envelopes and postage; he suggested that staff be proactive and notify LEAs that they can send an email to parents to save money and be more efficient. State Superintendent Atkinson noted that most LEAs can probably use the Parent Portal for the notification.
- Vice Chairman Collins commented on this kind of conversation that bad legislation creates, noting that he doesn't believe that the goal is any different than the State Board of Education's goal that children in our charge deserve more than they are getting. While we can be critical of the inaccurate measures of the schools, the schools we visited yesterday have a tremendous challenge in overcoming the obstacles the children have. He cautioned the State Board not to lose sight of the fact that even those schools that are doing well, still have children that need to be educated. It is the State Board's job to communicate the real story – it takes four to six years of intensive remediation to get some of the children at the same starting line where we assume the rest of the children start. Mr. Collins stated that he is sorry schools are labeled as failing when some of these schools are very good, but it does not erase the fact that some of the

children need things differently than others. In his opinion, it is the State Board's job to lead the way in explaining the real story and offering solutions to the issues.

- Local Board Member Advisor Evelyn Bulluck agreed that the schools and districts will be stronger because of this mandate, but it is so unfortunate that we have labeled some good schools as failing. She elaborated about labeling the whole when the whole is not really broken rather than zeroing in on those students who have not reached their full potential.
- Chair Taylor reminded State Board members that the motion is dealing with identifying a list of schools and districts based on a definition provided in the law with certain criteria.
- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, and seconded by Mr. Greg Alcorn the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the 2014-15 Low-Performing Districts and Schools list as presented. (See Attachment LFI 2)

STATE SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Guilford Says Yes - Scholarship Program Opens Doors for Guilford Public School Students

Beginning with the class of 2016, all qualifying Guilford County Public Schools high school graduates will be eligible for scholarships under the Say Yes to Education program.

- Local officials raised more than \$32 million in private contributions toward a \$70 million endowment to pay for the scholarship program.
- Nine private colleges and universities and all North Carolina public two-year and four-year colleges and universities pledged to participate.
- Philanthropist George Weiss announced the program during a pep-rally style event at Ragsdale High School in Jamestown, NC
- A local scholarship board will be formed to iron out the details of the financial awards, but it was announced that students from families earning less than \$75,000 would be able to attend private colleges, tuition free.
- The so-called last-dollar scholarships will fill the gap between tuition costs and other scholarships and grants students may receive.

Expansion of the program to Guilford brings the number of eligible students nationally to about 140,000.

Innovation in Buncombe

Buncombe County Students Discover STEM at New Academy

Participants in the CTE Fall Conference toured the Nesbitt Discovery Academy as the highlight of a three-day workshop. Now in its second full year of operation, Nesbitt Discover Academy allows students to prepare potential STEM careers in a retrofitted former manufacturing facility that features contemporary architecture, open spaces, walls of glass and high-tech classrooms.

- The school is supported by local business, industry, post-secondary, and community partners, as well as the North Carolina New Schools Project.
- 100 students are selected by lottery to attend each year.
- 50 percent of students at the school are first generation college students
- The school operates as a Cooperative Innovative High School in a partnership with AB Tech Community College.
- Students may begin taking college classes as freshmen.

Touring CTE directors from across North Carolina were wowed by a broad range of cutting-edge learning tools, including a Geodesic Dome on loan from NOAA that allowed a real-time look into the universe. They left armed with ideas for innovation and hands-on learning to carry back to their own communities.

Special Recognitions and Awards

Luncheon to Celebrate NC's Highest Graduation Rate Ever

Principals and superintendents representing 59 high schools and 41 school districts across North Carolina will be invited to a special recognition ceremony honoring their leadership in helping North Carolina public schools reach an all-time high graduation rate of 85.6 percent in 2014-15.

- Schools will be recognized for achieving a 100 percent or the highest graduation rate in their cohort size.
- Small, medium and large districts will be recognized for achieving the highest graduation rate among school districts falling in similar size categories.
- The 10 local school districts with the highest graduation rates also will be recognized.

The previously announced rate of 85.4 percent increased to 85.6 percent after a data correction window that allowed NC DPI to correct mistakes following review by local school districts. The rate has increased from 69.5 percent in 2007.

The event will be held October 6 at the Sheraton Imperial, Research Triangle Park.

Parent Advisory Council Meets

The Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council met September 16 in Raleigh. Agenda topics included

- A-F Reporting
- Home Base Parent Portal Demonstration
- How the Multi-Tiered System of Support Can Help Students Succeed

New Additions Join DPI Team

- Lori Bartram (School Educator II, Office of Early Learning, Governor Morehead Pre-school)
- Lori Blaney (School Educator II, Office of Early Learning, Governor Morehead Pre-school)
- Angela LeMay (Education Consultant II, Career and Technical Training)

Recent Activities of the State Superintendent

☐ Attended and/or delivered remarks/keynote address at

- Council of State, Raleigh, NC
- Duplin County Schools' Convocation, Kenansville, NC
- "In Praise of Public Schools" event, Raleigh, NC
- Central Carolina Regional Education Service Alliance meeting, Raleigh, NC
- New Superintendent Orientation, Research Triangle Park, NC
- "Guilford Says Yes!" event, Jamestown, NC
- *Triad Today* taping, Winston-Salem, NC
- Focusing on STEM Education and Workforce Readiness panel, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC
- CTE Fall Conference, Asheville, NC
- Town Hall Meeting, Morrisville, NC

- Governor's Education Cabinet, Cary, NC
- North Carolina Rural Assembly, Cary, NC

Visited

- Martin Nesbitt STEM Discovery Academy, Asheville, NC

Legislative Update

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

Ms. Beaulieu drew attention to the one-page summary posted on eBoard that provides the 2015 relevant bills listing. She elaborated briefly on several of the bills listed below.

- A. 2015 Appropriations Act – Ch. SL 2015-241
- B. Education-Related Bills (with action since September meeting)
1. HB 44 – Local Government Regulatory Reform 2015, Ch. SL 2015-246
 2. HB3 112 Stanly Co Bd of Ed Election Method, Ch. SL 2015-242
 3. HB 259 General Government Technical Corrections, Pres. To Gov. 10/1/2015
 4. HB 272 Appointments Bill 2015, Pres. To Gov. 9/30/2015
 5. HB 334 Charter School & Other Education Laws Changes, Ch. SL 2015-248
 6. HB 503 Moore Co Comm and Bd of Ed Changes Ch. SL 2015-244
 7. HBH 527 Omnibus Local Act, Ch. SL 2015-253
 8. HB 792 Privacy/Protection From Revenge Postings, Ch. SL 2015-250
 9. HB 943 Connect NC Bond Act of 2015, Pres. To Gov. 10/1/2015
 10. SB 97 State Advisory Council on Indian Education, Pres. To Gov. 9/24/2015
 11. SB 119 GSC Technical Corrections 2015, Ratified
 12. SB 279 Amend Qualifications/Practice of Counseling, Ratified
 13. SB 400 School Access for Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, Ch. SL 2015-249
 14. SB 524 Graduation Requirements/Sports Pilot (*formerly: Founding Principles/Graduation Requirement*), Ratified
 15. SB 721 Adjournment Resolution (return April 25, 2016), Ch. Res 2015-14
- C. Other Relevant Bills With Action This Week That Did Not Pass This Season
1. HB 539 Charter School Funding
 2. SB 95 Achievement School District (Performance-Based RIF/School Policy)
 3. HB 15 Education Software/SWD Tuition

Philip Price spoke briefly about the budget bill, highlighting items such as the \$750.00 bonus for all state employees, textbooks and digital resources, \$2 million for connectivity, reading camps for grades 1 through 3, teacher assistant funding, and the \$2.5 million decrease to the Department of Public Instruction. In addition, Mr. Price spoke about flexibility related to the Excellent Education Act in response to Chairman Cobey's query.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Chairman Cobey thanked Board members, advisors, and staff for their participation and work to prepare both for the Planning and Work Session and Board meeting. He expressed appreciation to the Board's hosts: Dr. Eric Tomlinson (President of Innovation Quarter), Dr. Gary Green (President, Forsyth Technical Community College), Dr. Lorraine Sterritt (President, Salem College), Dr. Beverly Emory (Superintendent, Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools), Dr. Elwood Robinson (Chancellor, Winston-Salem State University), and to all of the staff assigned from these institutions who have provided for all of the Board's needs.

Chairman Cobey reminded Board members that the Strategic Plan discussion will continue over the next several months, noting that this approach will allow the Board to process its conversations from month-to-month as it works to ensure that the right measures and that the right things are being measured.

Chairman Cobey announced that Vice Chairman A. L. Collins, Mr. Martez Hill, Mr. Kevin Howell, and the legal team will be attending the Annual conference of the National Association of State Boards of Education later this month, and will share their experience with the Board in November.

Referencing an earlier conversation about the joint meeting of Boards, Board member Wayne McDevitt shared that he received a letter of invitation from the Governor to attend the Education and Workforce Leadership Summit on October 28 at the Koury Convention Center in Greensboro. This summit is being held prior to the start of the annual NCWorks Partnership Conference in Greensboro that is attended by workforce and education professionals across the state. Participation in the Summit, beginning at 11:00 -12:30 and lunch ending at 1:30, is by invitation only. Members are also invited to attend the Opening Session of the conference from 1:30 – 3:00.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Cobey explained that over the past few months, Board members have held conversations related to the names of its committees so that stakeholders and the general public have a better understanding of the types of items that would fall under each category.

Chairman Cobey directed Board members to State Board Policy #TCS-C-006 (located on eBoard), which is proposed for amendment to reflect the new committee names that the Board will begin using in November:

- Business Operations (formerly TCS);
 - Education Innovation and Charter Schools (formerly LFI);
 - Educator Standards and Practices (formerly TCP); and
 - Student Learning and Achievement (formerly GCS).
- HRS will remain Healthy Responsible Students.

Chairman Cobey called for a motion to approve the proposed amendments to SBE Policy #TCS-C-006.

Upon motion by Mr. Greg Alcorn, and seconded by Mr. Eric Davis the State Board of Education voted unanimously to approve the proposed amendments to SBE Policy #TCS-C-006 as presented.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business was brought before the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business in Open Session, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to convene in Closed Session. He noted for the audience that immediately following adjournment of the Board's Closed Session; the Board will adjourn its Open Session.

Upon motion made by Mr. A.L. Collins and seconded by Mrs. Patricia Willoughby, 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:

- (1) Next Generation Academy v. NCSBE,*
- (2) TPS Publishing v. NCSBE, and*
- (3) Kerrigan v. NCDPI.*

Following adjournment of the Closed Session, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn the October 1, 2015, State Board of Education meeting.

Upon motion made by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, and seconded by Ms. Patricia Willoughby, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the October 1, 2015, State Board of Education meeting.