



**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
TRUSTEES OF BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
TRUSTEES FOR THE IDAHO SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND**

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
July 29, 2011
Special Teleconference Meeting
Boise, ID**

A special teleconference meeting of the State Board of Education was held July 29, 2011. It originated from the Board office in Boise Idaho. Board President Richard Westerberg presided and called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Richard Westerberg, President
Don Soltman, Secretary
Rod Lewis

Ken Edmunds, Vice President
Bill Goesling
State Superintendent Tom Luna

Absent:

Emma Atchley and Milford Terrell

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Accountability Workbook - Amendment

State Supt Luna presented this item. He reminded the Board that he had brought this topic up at the June Board meeting. Mr. Luna noted that the request that is coming before the Board at this time follows up on what he discussed with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). He is asking the Board to approve a change to the Accountability Workbook annual measurable objectives (AMO's). The requested change is to leave the 2009-2010 AYP targets in place for 2010-2011 before resuming the incremental increases in targets each year. Mr. Luna explained that in the ongoing discussions he has had with USDE on this matter USDE has indicated verbally that they are in agreement with the rationale and the change.

Board members discussed the request, its timing, and the manner in which it came to the Board's attention. Board member Soltman asked how many additional schools would not make AYP if this request is not approved. Mr. Luna indicated that it would be about 150 schools. He pointed out that these would primarily be those high-scoring schools which have already attained an AYP rating of 85% - 87%, but do not meet the 90% or better rating.

Mr. Luna explained that when NCLB began, states laid out the AMO's that they planned to meet. Idaho set a trajectory that was a steady step towards the 2014 target, whereas many states set lower numbers. He noted that the change does not lower standards, but simply spaces out target increases more incrementally, as allowed by USDE.

Mr. Luna also indicated that when Idaho started this in 2002 there was an expectation that the law would be reauthorized in 2007, at which time Idaho could make corrections based on lessons learned. The reauthorization has not happened, so Idaho is left to work with an old, antiquated model. This change does not lower the standards, but simply spaces out the target increases. It will help sustain and continue the movement toward full proficiency for all Idaho students.

Board member Edmunds raised a question related to the rationalization that was used in the beginning. Mr. Luna explained that effort to come up with the original model and targets was transparent. He pointed out that Idaho is moving to a new accountability system that concentrates on student academic growth versus the proficiency focus of NCLB. He noted that his argument to move to a growth model is that it requires every student to show progress and continue to grow academically.

Mr. Edmunds asked for clarification related to the number of schools meeting AYP based on maintaining the prior year target. Mr. Luna suggested that if this request is not approved the number of schools not meeting AYP because of the 90% proficiency target will increase. As a result, significant funds and resources would be needed to address the deficiencies. During this time of great economic hardship, the financial burden to the schools would be very detrimental.

Mr. Edmunds asked if Idaho is reaching a permanent plateau in improvements. Mr. Luna explained that as Idaho gets closer to the 100% proficiency target, the more the focus of the effort is on students who have specific needs. He pointed out that the new system will make it possible to focus on all students; the goal is to see all students continue to grow.

Board member Soltman expressed concern that this item is coming to the Board at such a late date. He noted that schools have been working towards the current AYP targets and the timing for this seems wrong. Mr. Luna explained that this item came up in his presentation at the June Board meeting. The Board decided then to have a special Board meeting for this discussion; today happened to be the best time for everyone to meet.

Mr. Luna pointed out that the school districts are aware that Idaho is moving in this direction. He noted that during discussions with the schools, the feedback coming to him has been positive. He reiterated that the impact of not approving this request would mean that the schools would face additional funding hardships.

Board member Lewis commented and noted that he agreed with Mr. Soltman. He asked what happens when the growth model is put into place. Does every school start over? How do you implement a growth model in the AYP scheme? Mr. Luna explained that in the broad scheme, every student will still be tested with a statewide assessment based on the current standards. But, meeting AYP will be based on the minimum academic growth for the student in that school

year. He noted that the State Department of Education (SDE) will need to determine what those rates are. SDE will have the ability to see what growth has been and use that as a beginning level for setting AYP. This means students at both ends will need to demonstrate growth and schools will be held accountable for that.

Mr. Lewis asked what happens to the schools in terms of where they currently stand. Do they stay in their current status or do they all start at zero? Mr. Luna explained that they will stay where they are currently. Mr. Lewis expressed concern and suggested that it will be difficult to mesh the two measurements (AYP and growth). Mr. Luna noted that the growth model has been a goal for some time; it just wasn't possible before. He pointed out that there is no value in pushing the reset button. He explained that schools that haven't met AYP under the proficiency model will still have to work to move out of that.

Mr. Lewis asked if the schools know what the consequences will be of not meeting the growth targets. Mr. Luna said they do know the consequences. The targets are not set yet, but they will be.

Scott Grothe of the Board office commented. He indicated that when SDE determines the growth targets, they will still have to be approved by the feds. Mr. Luna indicated he has spoken with USDE and has been assured that will happen by December 31st for all states moving towards a growth model. He emphasized that it will not be a long or drawn-out process. He noted that the targets will have to also be approved by the Board. Mr. Luna reiterated the commitment the feds have made to him is that the whole process will be done for the states wanting to get this done by the end of the year.

Mr. Lewis asked why Idaho wouldn't want to have everything lined up before taking this step. Mr. Luna noted that if Idaho puts a plan together that doesn't get approved, Idaho will stay in the same place. Idaho is not moving away from the accountability that comes with NCLB; Idaho is changing the numbers so that it doesn't end up with a huge number of schools who currently meet AYP moving into not-meet AYP. He reiterated that Idaho is simply asking to freeze the AMO's for one year. Also, if for some reason the growth model isn't approved, Idaho will move to the 90% AMO level the following year.

Mr. Lewis and Mr. Soltman suggested that the growth model doesn't tie in with the action today of freezing the AMO's. Mr. Luna reiterated that the action today will freeze the AMO's so that the SDE doesn't find another 150 schools are not meeting AYP.

Mr. Lewis commented, related to Mr. Soltman's point that he also struggles with the timing and the approach SDE has followed. He pointed out that it would have been more appropriate for SDE to communicate to the SBOE about this issue some time ago, before taking it to USDE, and before making any public statements. He emphasized that there should have been dialogue with the Board beforehand. He explained that there is discomfort at the Board level with how SDE has gone about this. Board member Goesling stated that he appreciated Mr. Luna's leadership on this matter.

Mr. Luna apologized for not communicating with the Board before this went public. He asked the Board members to look at the request at this point, and not focus on the process he followed, or the communication issues. He noted that Board staff has recommended that we do this as well.

Mr. Westerberg indicated that he would vote yes because it does seem to be the right thing to do at this time.

M/S (Luna/Westerberg): To adopt the Idaho Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, as submitted. Roll call vote taken; motion passed 4-2 (Mr. Soltman and Mr. Edmunds voted nay).

There being no further business a motion to adjourn was entertained.

M/S (Lewis/Luna): To adjourn at 4:07 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.