

## Standards and Assessment Committee Minutes

May 12, 2016

Members Present: Laura Belnap, Dixie Allen, Dave Crandall, Brittney Cummins

Members Excused: Spencer Stokes

Committee Staff: Rich Nye, Cheri Rieben

Others Present: Tim Tingey, Von Hortin, Vonda Parriott, Randy Raphael, Ryan West, Morgan Jacobsen, Emilie Wheeler, Barbie Faust, Sara Jones, Summer Anderson, Nancy Tingey, John Dougell, Lisa Olsen, Allison Nicholson, Tina Smith, Wendi Morton, Laura deShazo, Thalea Longhurst, Rich Young, Brian Ipson, Jo Ellen Shaeffer, Bruce Northcott, Richard West, Kathleen Riebe, Chase Clyde, Rabecca Cisneros, Skip Francone, Ryan Marchant, Susan Soleil, Steven Winitzky, Sheryl Garner, Nicole Call, Lillian Tsosie-Jensen, Diana Suddreth, Ann White, Travis Cook, Natalie Grange, Tami Pyfer, Ricky Scott, Robert Austin, Diana Suddreth, Jennifer Throndsen, Dom Blanc, Garrett Rose, Jen Jacobson, Holly Hoyt, Kelly Cole, Nicole Reitz-Larsen, Helen Woo

Start Time: 5:45 p.m.

### Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee reviewed and accepted the minutes of April 14, 2016.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Cummins that the committee approve the minutes of April 14, 2016 as written. Motion passes unanimously.

## Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Instruction Providers

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Lillian Tsosie-Jensen regarding the list of potential providers for child sexual abuse prevention instructional materials.

In June 2015, the USBE approved the guidelines for instructional materials for child sexual abuse prevention. The instructional material review committee heard presentations from eight potential providers of instructional materials in September 2015. The rankings from this review were all above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile mark which is higher than before. In spring 2016, the review committee reconvened for an evaluation of instructional materials from providers not seen prior and/or providers with updates to their programs. Based on these reviews, providers were chosen and presented to the committee for approval.

The recommended providers include:

- **Youth:**
  - \* Family Place
  - \* Child Lures
  - \* Utah Valley Family Support Center
  
- **Youth Serving Adults:**
  - \* Younique Foundation
  - \* Child Lures
  - \* Utah Valley Family Support Center
  
- **Parents & Guardians:**
  - \* Younique Foundation
  - \* Child Lures
  - \* Utah Valley Family Support Center

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by Board Chair Crandall that the Board consider approving the list of potential providers presented for child sexual abuse prevention instructional materials. Motion passed unanimously.

## East Hollywood High School Request for an Alternative High School Designation

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from several representatives of East Hollywood High. East Hollywood High has been in business for 12 years. They have had approximately 1,000 graduates.

The school principal reported that nearly all of their students have been considered at risk for failing to complete high school. Approximately 60% of their students also come from circumstances of poverty. They are a Title I school.

Two parents, who are also East Hollywood High Board members, presented information regarding their own children and the success they had by attending East Hollywood High.

There was much discussion regarding accountability. Because of the current accountability system, schools like East Hollywood High are working hard, having successes but still given a failing grade. This designation would help resolve that problem. The committee felt that the designation was not the way to fix that problem, instead it was amending the school accountability process.

The committee stressed the importance of needing to amend the school accountability process in order to be able to accurately and appropriately give schools an alternative school designation.

The committee invited the administration of East Hollywood High to help in the restructuring of the accountability process.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Allen to approve the alternative school designation for East Hollywood High for one year while staff continued work on designation guidelines. Members Belnap, Crandall, and Cummins opposed. Member Allen approved. The motion failed.

## Murray RDA Modification Proposals – Smelter Site and Central Business District

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Von Hortin and Tim Tingey in regards to the proposed changes to the Murray RDA budget of the smelter site.

The proposed modifications of the budget do not change the base taxable value of this area, does not change the project area, nor does it extend the time frame of the URA.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Allen to recommend that the Board consider having their TEC representative vote to approve the amendment to the Murray RDA. Motion passed unanimously.

### R277-419-2 Pupil Accounting (Amendment)

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Rich Nye regarding R277-419-2. The amendment for this rule is minor in nature and made at the request of the Standards and Assessment committee.

The requested change is to updated the definition of “qualifying school age” from “no more than 17 years old on or before September 1” to “no more than 18 years old”.

There was one clarification regarding the youth in custody students that the committee noted should be made:

- 1) On line 115 change 18 back to 21.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Allen to recommend that the Board consider approving R277-419-2, with the additional minor amendment on second reading. Motion passed unanimously.

### R277-403 Student Reading Proficiency and Notice to Parents (Amendment)

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** No information on was heard on this item. The item was tabled.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** No motion was made on this item. It was tabled to until the June 2016 meeting.

### R277-404 Requirements for Assessment of Student Achievement (Amendment)

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Allison Nicholson regarding R277-404. Allison clarified that all assessment directors will be notified of this rule and of the September date requiring LEAs that have an alternative schedule to submit their annual testing plan to the Superintendent.

After much discussion, the committee suggested several additional changes to clean up and clarify the rule including:

- 1) Remove lines 31-33.
- 2) On line 110 add “end of year” after the.
- 3) Change line 115 to say U-Pass;
- 4) Remove lines 116-121.
- 5) On line 122, change (c) to (6).
- 6) On line 124, change (d) to (c), change one to the and remove everything after the word assessment.
- 7) Remove lines 127-128.

- 8) Changes lines 129-131 to (d), (e), and (f) instead of (f), (g), and (h).
- 9) Remove lines 132-133.
- 10) On line 136 change (j) to (g).
- 11) On line 137, change (j) to (g).

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Cummings that the Board consider approving R277-404, with the additional new amendments on second reading. Motion passed unanimously.

### High School Sage Testing

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Rich Nye regarding high school Sage testing. There are several things to consider. The two main purposes of assessment are: 1) To drive instruction and 2) For accountability purposes.

The biggest concern from committee members was the lack of definition of the purpose of Sage testing at a state level. The purposes of assessment work at the LEA level is clear, but the purpose of it at the state level is not clear and until that is clear, the committee is unable to give a voice to whether SAGE should be continued in grades 9-12.

HB200 gives the LEAs the option of having students take the SAGE or not. They can take the ACT in its place. Right now it is split about 50/50 in regards to who will still be giving SAGE. Parents also have the right to opt their student out of taking the SAGE. In 2015, approximately 3% of parents chose to opt their student out. This will affect accountability reports when you have LEAs that take it and some that do not. Despite having options to give SAGE or not give SAGE, there was discussion that giving a statewide exam does help ensure equity among students.

There have been several issues with students not taking SAGE seriously because it is not tied to student performance or grades. It is not used for teacher accountability either, so it comes back to the purpose of it. This shows more reason that the accountability system at USOE needs to be revised.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** No motion was made on this item. Information and discussion only.

## Social Studies Standards Release for 90-Day Review

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Robert Austin regarding the revised Social Studies standards and their release for a 90-day review period.

There are six courses in these standards. Robert stressed that these standards have been designed to reinforce the educational outcomes found in other disciplines.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion as made by member Allen that the Board consider approving the release of the revised Social Studies standards for a 90-day public review period. Motion passed unanimously.

## Rubric for Process of Designating an Alternative or Special Needs School

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Rich Nye regarding the information that was put together for the process of designating an alternative school. A rubric did not make sense once work on it began. Aaron Brough found it was better to put a bullet point list for charter schools as well as the definition of district alternative schools.

The concern is that the items listed that could/would designate a charter school an alternative school is typical for most charter schools. Charter schools are also not known for encouraging students to leave their school and go back to main stream schools. The other concern is that by law charter schools have to enroll via a lottery system. This does not leave room for holding spots specifically for those “troubled” or “at risk” students.

The conversation came back to the accountability system and the importance of it being in place before an alternative school designation is made. The committee felt that until the accountability standards and measures are reviewed and revised, a decision on the rubric/list for determining an alternative school could not be made.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Cummins that the Board consider having the accountability committee study and revise the standards and measures for alternative schools. Motion passed unanimously.

## Data (Address) Collection and Use

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Natalie Grange and Rich Nye regarding data (address) collection and use. This item was heard in the Finance Committee in April 2016.

At the instruction of the Finance Committee, members of the Board of Education staff came up with three different proposed courses of actions to obtain the needed information. The problem to resolve is that local replacement fund (LFR) calculations are being based upon inaccurately reported district of residences (DOR) uploaded from the LEAs.

The committee evaluated each of the three proposed courses of action. At first look, option #1 puts the responsibility on USBE. Option #2-#3 puts the responsibility on LEAs and Charter Schools.

There is concern that Charter Schools are not or will not provide information to the LEA's voluntarily. So asking them to work together to validate might prove to be difficult. There was also discussion about fining or penalizing a charter school for providing inaccurate information. Would that be appropriate or even feasible?

Nicole Call provided legal input regarding following FERPA.

This data is vital to ensure that correct LFA calculations and tax rates are submitted each year. There is also a quick turnaround time from when the data comes in to when Natalie has to run her reports. That is also something to be considered when looking at the three course of action options.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Allen to approve option #1 for a year and readdress the process next year to see if any changes need to be made. Members Belnap and Crandall opposed. Members Allen and Cummins approved. The motion failed.

## School Turnaround Plans

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Sheryl Garner regarding the 26 turnaround plans that were submitted. A committee put together by Rich Nye reviewed the plans. Only two plans were approved as is. Several of the plans only needed minor revisions but there were a few that needed major revisions.

Each turnaround school that needed plan revisions was given a letter that clearly outlined the revisions that were needed. These plans are due no later than June 20, 2016. Once these plans are received, they will be reviewed and the results of this review will be brought back to this committee in August, 2016.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Allen that the Board consider approving the two plans that did not need revisions as well as the revision plans for the other 24 plans. Motion passed unanimously.

## STEM School Designations 2016

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Ricky Scott and Tami Pyfer regarding the STEM school designations for 2016. This was a long process for these schools and their applications really showed why they should receive these designations.

In October 2015, 42 schools completed the pre-application for STEM school designation. However, there were only 24 schools that actually completed the application process. There were three different review periods where these applications were reviewed. A total of 19 schools received the STEM school designation.

This was the pilot year and staff has taken feedback from all these schools regarding how to improve the rubric and application process that will be taken into consideration during the next year.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by Board Chair Crandall that the Board consider approving the STEM school designation for the 19 schools that were submitted. Motion passed unanimously.



## SAGE Item Development Plan

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Jo Ellen Shaeffer regarding the SAGE item development plan. This item came to the committee in April, 2016 and Jo Ellen was asked to come back with a detailed plan including costs, for the next 18 months.

This plan is broken down into two areas. The first one is for science in grades 6-8. This will include 200 items for each grade in 6-8. Currently there only about 45 items for each grade that will be able to be used with the new science standards. The total cost for this is estimated to be \$1,736,153.

The second plan is for math and ELA in grades 3-11. This includes 488 math items (mostly for secondary math that will coincide with the revised secondary mathematic standards) and 262 ELA questions. The total cost for this would be \$1,783,680.

The question was brought up about what portion of these costs belong to grades 9-11. There is concern that if SAGE is discontinued or students are not assessed in the high school grades, it would be a waste of money to increase the test items for those grades. Jo Ellen indicated that it is not broken down that way currently.

The costs for this would be paid using the following funds: \$1.6 million out of state funds, \$1 million in G5 federal monies, and \$832,000 from the FY14 federal carryover.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** A motion was made by member Cummins that the Board approve the SAGE item development plan and move forward with new item development for grades 3-8 only. Motion passed unanimously.

## Kindergarten Data Points

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Jennifer Throndsen regarding kindergarten date points and statewide kindergarten assessment.

Jennifer provided information regarding R277-489 Early Intervention Program. This verifies that USOE is currently already required to do a pre/post assessment for kindergarteners. LEAs are also required to report that data, but to date that has proved to be problematic. Jennifer is working on ways to improving the reporting methods.

Tami Pyfer went to the district superintendent's meeting to get their feedback and/or support for a statewide kindergarten readiness assessment. A total of 25 superintendents responded. Out of that 25, a total of 23 were in support and 2 were not. Jo Ellen Shaeffer provided information she received from the assessment director's meeting. Several of the assessment directors were not in favor of a statewide assessment, they would prefer to continue using the assessments they are currently using.

Some of the district concerns include the speed that the data would be returned to the school, if the assessment is developmentally appropriate, will it be used for teacher or school accountability and of course teacher buy-in.

The staff found several data points for identifying students who are demonstrating risk factors for future scholastic achievement. These include literacy and numeracy issues. Currently DIBELS (both literacy and math) aligns with these data points. In 2015-16 approximately 33,825 kindergarten students are being assessed with the DIBELS Literacy. DIBELS math is a fairly new program still.

There are several reasons to gather this data on both a local and a state level. Including providing early intervention for students' sooner in the school year, OEK access, as well as having the data to show the effectiveness on OEK programs and pre-school programs. This data can be used to help support additional funds from the legislature.

Jennifer also provided a few suggestions on how to move forward from here. The committee will let her know if they want her to come back at a future meeting.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** No motion was taken on this item. Information and discussion only.

### Digital Studies

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** The committee heard information from Thalea Longhurst, Laura deShazo, Nicole Reitz-Larsen, and Helen Woo on the high school digital studies requirement as well as the intent of the Digital Literacy Task Force from 2012.

The purpose of this credit is to give students a "creator" course. There are currently several courses that meet this criterion. This credit would allow students to be creators with and of technology. This could be something simple or more advanced.

There was concern from the committee about the need for this requirement as well as if the requirement is kept, how is equal access given to all students even in small LEAs. There is also concern about students that might not want to go further with technology but would rather go forward in another field (i.e. art, music, etc). Both Laura and Thalea assured the committee that students can take different types of technology classes in most if not all subjects. An example would be using technology to compose a song/musical piece.

The task force originally put it in place to help kids become college and career ready. The intent of the task force was to put classes in place over the course of a student's education that would allow them to first learn, then master, and finally create. Technology will be used in almost anything a student will do in the workforce. The high school credit is to help them be ready for this. The CTE team expressed concern that if the credit is removed and a student does not take any time of technology class beyond the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, they will be so far behind when they enter college or the workforce, that they will have difficulty being successful. There is a test out option, but the cost will need to be paid for by the student.

**COMMITTEE MOTION:** No motion was taken on this item. Information and discussion only.

End Time: 10:32 PM