

# **Standards of Learning Innovation Committee**

## Meeting Minutes

### Secondary Subcommittee Meeting

Jefferson Conference Room, Monroe Building

October 16, 2014 1:00-4:00pm

## **Attendees**

---

### **Present Committee Members:**

Alan Seibert, Grace Chung Becker, Karen Cross, Veronica Donahue, Meg Gruber, Sarah Gross, Brian Matney, Jeion Ward, Renee Zando

Sanford Williams, William White, and Laurie McCollough were present via conference call.

### **Absent Committee Members:**

Kelly Booz, Terri Breeden, Susanna Burgos, Jeff Bourne, and Chriss Walther-Thomas,

## **Scribe**

---

Pat Novak/Eric Steigleder/Lisa Jackson

## **Agenda**

---

- Welcome
- Carnegie Alternatives and High School Innovations
- Part 1 – Virginia’s Assessment Innovators Presentation
- Discussion of Recommendations
- Next Steps/Schedule of Future Meetings
- Closing Comments

- Adjourn

## Call to Order

---

- **1:00pm** – Stewart Roberson (Chair of Committee) called meeting to order and presented opening remarks.
  - Committee members present via conference call were asked to introduce themselves.
  - Thanked the steering committee for their work and effort.
  - Discussed the order of the documents in the packets, and presented the new interim recommendation document.
  - Reminded committee to keep in mind the needs for November 6<sup>th</sup>.
    - Two activities that need to be accomplished for the day: learning more about various parts of the assessments, and understanding and discussing the new recommendation document

## Welcome

---

- Alan Seibert discussed the results of the previous full body meeting held on September 30, 2014.
  - Discussed the importance of flexibility and the emphasis on changing seat-time requirements

## Carnegie Alternatives and High School Innovations

---

- Steve Staples introduced Dr. Deborah Jonas.
- Deborah Jonas presented on alternatives to the Carnegie unit that have been used in other states. (See Dropbox)
  - Discussed the historical perspective and evolution of the Carnegie Unit, as well as other plans such as the Winnetka Bloom and Keler.
  - Presented models from Danville, KY; Pittsfield, NH; Elmbrook, WI, and the Ohio Credit Flex Option

- Emphasized the importance of competencies, demonstrated mastery, application of knowledge, and individual learning experiences.
- Present group with 3 handouts (See Dropbox)
- Present a short video about student-centered learning in New Hampshire.
- Senator Miller asked would the cost to change to these alternatives be more, less, or about the same amount?
- Deborah Jonas answered in Danville, the same budget is used. Schools apply for grants to support the work. The local budget was initially used which came from some monies from the Race to the Top budget.
- Steve Staples commented on his recent meeting with the Virginia Business Council.
  - Presented the question whether students should be considered the customers of education? And if not, who should?
- Alan Seibert presented via PowerPoint on the history of the SOLs.
  - Discussed the importance of knowing the difference between the SOLs and the assessments.
  - Emphasized the importance of measuring student achievement and progress.
  - Discussed that SOLs were meant to measure minimum competencies, but not to measure college and career readiness.

## **Virginia's Assessment Innovators**

---

- Presentation given by Dr. Don Robertson and committee member Brian Matney of the Virginia Beach City School System (See PowerPoint).
  - “CWRA” used for high school students
  - “IPT” for younger students
  - Assessment administered twice a year
- Senator Miller asked whether the CWRA+ would create too much stress to students.
- Don Robertson and Brian Matney answered no, but explained the risk of the Board taking the exam and tying into accreditation making it another high stakes test.

- Alan Seibert presented the idea of having an accreditation scale that would review typically high-performing schools on a 5-year cycle, middle-performing schools on a 3-year cycle, and low-performing schools on a 1-year cycle.
- **Alan Seibert called for a 10 minute break, asked Committee to review the summary of the teacher panel from the Elementary Subcommittee Meeting held on October 14, 2014.**

## Discussion of Recommendations

---

- Group 1/Principle 1: Veronica Donahue, Roxann Robinson, Grace Chung Becker
  - Asked that links or a glossary be provided for terms that appear on the document.
  - Believed there was redundancy in the working of recommendation 1 and recommendation 2.
  - Suggested that recommendation 3 should be under Principle 2 instead of Principle 1.
- Group 4/Principle 2: Sarah Gross, Renee Zando, Brian Matney
  - Edited the first statement of the principle, discussed the lack of autonomy that may be created from the current wording.
  - Changed wording of recommendation 5. Delete “pilot” and add “professional development and dissemination of pilots in order to use as alternative authentic assessments.”
  - Agreed that recommendation 6 was fine as is.
- Group 3/Principle 3: Karen Cross, Jeion Ward
  - Suggested adding to recommendation 7 “for any school that does not meet accreditation, they should be able to immediately submit data based on the demographics of their community, then that school be provided resources to address these issues”
  - Suggested that money from the eliminated SOLs should be redirected to wrap-around services for school divisions.
- Group 2/Principle 4: Meg Gruber, John Miller, Chris Braunlich
  - Group questioned why recommendation 10 and recommendation 11 were separate.

- Suggested that demonstrations of competency must be derived from authentic assessments
- Discussion of recommendation 12 involved questions:
  - Do we need verified credits in the first place?
  - And if so, how many and which ones?
  - And if so, how should we verify them?

## Next Steps/Schedule of Future Meetings

---

- Stewart Roberson reminded the committee to give hard copy comments or email other concerns in reference to the Principles discussion to Lisa Jackson.
- Reminded committee that next steps would be to focus on the accountability system.
- Reminded committee to be prepared to approve desired results on the teleconference on October 27<sup>th</sup>
- Karen Cross asked when will the details be sent out for the upcoming teleconference? And when would future meeting after November 6<sup>th</sup> be scheduled?
- Lisa Jackson answered that the details would be coming out later in the week via email.
- Jennie O'Holleran informed the committee that there would not be any more meetings for the calendar year.
- Stewart Roberson discussed that the next round of meetings will be discussed during the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting and that between then and the next full meeting, there will be smaller group/subcommittee meetings.
- Steve Staples discussed keeping in mind that the legislatures on the committee would be busy from January on, meetings would be planned accordingly.
- Stewart Roberson opened the floor up to committee members participated via conference call. No one participated.
- Next Meeting:
  - Subcommittee Meeting:
    - October 27, 2014 – teleconference Elementary Subcommittee, 10:00am

- October 27, 2014 – teleconference Secondary Subcommittee, 11:00am
- Full Committee Meeting
  - November 6, 2014 – time and location TBD

## **Closing Comments**

---

- Alan Seibert discussed the important of changing the system with a component approach, being able to change individual parts instead of having to change entire system.
- Emphasized the importance of remembering that school systems are not teaching percentages.
- Recommended a shift from “pass rates” to “individual achievements.”

## **Adjourn**

---

- **3:55pm** – Stewart Roberson adjourned meeting and provided closing comments.