

MINUTES

October 29, 2003

Minutes of the special meeting of the State Board of Education held October 29, 2003, at the Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah. Meeting commenced at 12:15 p.m Chairman Kim R. Burningham presided.

Members present were:

Chairman Kim R. Burningham
Vice Chairman, Janet A. Cannon
Member Dixie Lee Allen
Member R. Michael Anderson
Member Linnea S. Barney
Member Tim Beagley
Member Laurel Brown
Member Edward A. Dalton
Member Greg W. Haws
Member Denis R. Morrill
Member David L. Moss
Member John C. Pingree
Member Joyce W. Richards
Member Debra G. Roberts (participation via PolyCom)
Member Teresa L. Theurer

Members Jed Pitcher and Sara V. Sinclair were excused.

Also present were:

Executive Officer Steven O. Laing
Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington
Associate Superintendent Patrick Ogden
Associate Superintendent Raymond Timothy
Executive Director, USOR, Blaine Petersen
Public Affairs Director Mark Peterson
Board Secretary Twila B. Affleck

Also present were:

Members of the Press:

Jennifer Toomer-Cook, Deseret Morning News
Ronnie Lynn, Salt Lake Tribune
Amy K. Stewart, Standard Examiner
Linda Mariotti, Granite School District
Cheryl Phipps, Utah PTA
Forrest S. Cuch, Director of Indian Affairs
Martha Berglund, Citizen
Lil Ackley, Roy Jr. High PTSA
Charles Hausman, Salt Lake City School District
Chad Harris, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Pat Rusk, Utah Education Association
Martine Smith, Citizen
Maria Grant, Citizen
Doug Wright, San Juan School District

Utah State Office of Education Staff:
Carolee Gunn, Student Achievement and School Services
Nan Gray, Student Achievement and School Services
Vicky Dahn, Student Achievement and School Services

Board Member R. Michael Anderson lead the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Board Member Linnea S. Barney offered the Reverence.

Board Secretary Twila B. Affleck recorded the minutes.

Chairman Burningham excused Board Members Jed Pitcher and Sara Sinclair.

Review of Key Input Documents

Lynn V. Trenbeath reviewed the Executive Summary Recommendations emphasizing some key points from the Summits.

Superintendent Steven O. Laing reviewed the questions from the public hearings. Dr. Laing emphasized the question of using the CRTs in the assessment of competency.

Discussion ensued relative to the use of the CRTs and other assessments being used to determine competency; what brought the Board to the point of moving in this direction; and where and how UBSCT fits in.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington reviewed the Steering Committee feedback from the Summits and public hearings.

(For complete details, see General Exhibit No. 9172.)

Chairman Burningham distributed a copy of the Performance Plus document as revised from the meeting on October 14, 2003. (For complete details, see General Exhibit No. 9173.)

Future Direction

Board Leadership Resolution

Chairman Burningham presented a Resolution for Future Direction developed by the Board Leadership that:

- The move toward competency is right.
- The move is supported by politicians, citizens, educators, statewide.
- There is, however, considerable concern about the details: dropouts, CRTs, definition of competency.
- There is also a serious financial concern: \$203 million is not likely or even possible.
- Therefore, the Board of Education advocates amendment of Performance Plus to:
 - Follow a gradual (deliberate, thoughtful, and planned) phase-in, with a longer time line toward competency;
 - Start now with aspects upon which there is great comfort and which will help our children;
 - Provide more time to work out the details of full-blown competency within the next year;
 - Require financial support, but at increment levels as full-blown competency is developed.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton to adopt the resolution beginning with Therefore, the Board of Education advocates amendment of Performance Plus to: (1) Follow a gradual (deliberate, thoughtful, and planned) phase-in, with a longer time line toward competency; (2) Start now with aspects upon which there is a great comfort and which will help our children; (3) Provide more time to work out the details of full-blow competency within the next year; (4) Require financial support, but at increment levels as full-blown competency is developed.

Member Dave Moss spoke in favor of the motion indicating that he has always felt that the “train” was moving too fast. This will provide an opportunity for continued dialog from the public and a continuation of development.

Member John Pingree commented that there is no mention of increasing graduation requirements. He indicated that when the Board first started discussion on this it was included. He suggested that graduation requirements be included.

Member Teresa Theurer voiced concern as to how SB 154 fits into this new time line and our continuing this process.

Superintendent Laing responded that SB 154 has a three-year window for the Board to pursue some of this activity. It does say that we would implement some of this beginning with the year 2007. Dr. Laing indicated that the sponsor of the legislation recognizes that this date is an unrealistic element of the legislation.

Member Denis Morrill voiced concerned about momentum. He indicated that he is in favor of diagnostic assessments, intervention and professional development. However, he is concerned that unless we show some method of testing the widget as it comes out the end, we won't get the funding for the other things.

Member Laurel Brown voiced concern in terms of perceptions. She is very much in support of the intent of the motion, but hoped that we are not assuming that if we take this motion, we are saying that we will continue to work on Performance Plus a little at a time, therefore we are holding off on competency education. She indicated she would like to look at the details of what we have in terms of current status and what aspects of the high stakes and competency we need to have in place to help children at this point.

Member Greg Haws voiced concerned with the word “comfort” in Item B. He felt that it doesn't say what we have been trying to do for the last year. He felt that there are three points not covered: (1) our students not meeting desired standards currently; (2) we don't have resources to meet those desired standards; and (3) if we are given the requested resources we will be able to assure our students will be able to meet the standards.

Chairman Burningham explained that his use of the word “comfort” was not intended as Member Haws commented it was being use. He suggested rewording may be in order.

Superintendent Laing commented that when talk about implementing this over some time, phase or increment, the challenge will be to implement a piece that can stand alone whether or not there is ever another dollar put with it. You can't select certain districts or phases, pilots, or the like. If we do something like this, it needs to be a stand-alone program once it is done. He suggested starting in the elementary levels.

Member Joyce Richards commented that she agreed with Member Haws. If we wait and dilly dally, the longer we linger the more students we will lose and we can't do that. We have three years on SB 154 and suggested that there be a plan that indicates we can do this in three years provided we get the funding to do so. She felt the logical place to begin would be with elementary schools. However, she voiced concern with the middle-level students who will be moving into the high schools and be required to pass the test with a C grade or above.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Dixie L. Allen and seconded by Member Laurel Brown to change the resolution to read:

- a. Follow a deliberate, thoughtful and planned phase in with an appropriate time line toward competency.
- b. Start now with the aspects that are attainable, and which will help our children immediately.
- c. Provide the needed time to work out the details of specific competencies, rubrics, appropriate interventions, reliable assessment types, professional development and other details that need to be developed with continued stakeholder involvement and dialog
- d. Require financial support as rapidly as possible until we can implement the full proposal.

Member John Pingree questioned if in item b it is intended that we list in the next phase those areas we want to concentrate on. Chairman Burningham responded yes.

Amendment to the Motion carried unanimously.

Original Motion as amended carried unanimously.

Specific Recommendations from the Board

Chairman Burningham noted that during the Leadership meeting three proposed motions were prepared. He turned to the board for discussion relative to next steps.

Member Greg Haws commented that the question needs to be answered as to whether or not our students are currently meeting the desired standards and whether Associate Superintendent Harrington needed time to study it.

Superintendent Laing requested that a more correct statement would be that not enough of our students are meeting standards. We have students who are doing well enough throughout system that it is the envy of any place in the world, but there are not enough of them doing it.

Superintendent Harrington responded that there are a number of data that we have access to that will help us in this. We already know we need help in elementary, especially in grades one through three. Also, interventions are important and we need to take action now to help children succeed.

Member Denis Morrill commented that since we are limited in funds, we should concentrate to the extent needed on literacy in grades K-3.

Member John Pingree suggested that the graduation requirements be increased.

Member Ed Dalton commented that as he looks at the three documents presented at the beginning of the meeting there are some items on each one and those are the ones we should begin working with. He suggested that task forces, and study groups properly assigned could get to some of these issues. For example, need to identify the competencies, assessments and diploma alternatives. Identify and build relationships necessary with higher education, specific strategy that links us to stakeholder groups, particularly parental participation, interventions/remediation analysis and a financial time line, and electives. These are areas to clarify to move the program forward.

Member Laurel Brown commented that she agreed with the concept that we need to put our resources in the early grades, but we also need to recognize the current status we have for those that will be required to pass the Utah Basic Skills Competency Test (UBSCT) in order to obtain a basic high school diploma.

Motion was made by Member Laurel Brown and seconded by Member John C. Pingree that in lieu of our discussion today that we are going to go back and look at CRTs and other issues. We need to recognize at this point in our system we already have differentiated diplomas and up until this point in time our Performance Plus proposal we have not delineated that. She would like to have a proposal that says schools or school districts shall offer differentiated diplomas and completion certificates to secondary school students and adults. Member Brown presented a two-page proposal which included specifics to obtain a basic high school diploma of graduation, specifically items 1-10. (For complete details, see General Exhibit No. 9174.) She requested that as we are restructuring a new proposal we have these headings and concepts of differentiated diplomas built into the proposal.

Chairman Burningham clarified that these are specific changes to the Performance Plus document, not necessarily next steps.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon commented that she had an opportunity to meet with Doug Reeves and discussed the idea of competency measured graduation. One of our ideas has been using the CRTs as a make or break test for students to graduate. She suggested that we take a portfolio approach which would be a broad definition with several different lines of evidence that students could perform to demonstrate they were competent. She suggested ten lines of evidence and require students to meet seven of the ten to receive a diploma. Some of the lines might be attendance, and students attend school 80-85 percent of the time; require they have a C- or better in English and math classes used for graduation; accumulation of a specific number of credits; students write a senior thesis instead of taking a test; submit three essays one of which would be nonfiction writing; citizenship component; service learning component; demonstration of exit competencies; successfully passing CRTs at a sufficient level in the courses that are used for graduation; successfully passing UBSCT. This would give students a menu of sorts to demonstrate they are

competent and deserve to graduate. We would build within the lines of evidence that would meet the students needs in a different way. This would remove our reliance upon one test or one line of evidence. With this format we could offer modifications that might meet the needs of special education students. Also, the possibility of offering a higher level of diploma for students who are accelerated. Vice Chairman Cannon suggested that a task force be appointed to look at the issue of defining competency and differentiated diplomas.

Member Theurer requested a point of clarification as to whether we are getting down to the details of our next steps or revisions of the Performance Plus proposal.

Member Laurel Brown clarified that we currently have two differentiated diplomas by statute and board rules. Her intent was to put the recommended headings into a broader framework to add structure to what we are working under.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington noted that a group of special educators and parents who have met for some time. Their language is included in the current proposal, noted in italics, because it is different from the last time the Board reviewed the document. It is not what Member Brown has indicated.

Member Brown clarified that her amendments were to the booklet and what was done by the Board at the last Board meeting.

Dr. Harrington explained the inclusions in the new document.

Chairman Burningham clarified that Member Brown has presented a concern for which a lot of work has gone into. There is also a task force established and these are issues related to the proper form the Performance Plus recommendation would take.

Member Dixie Allen suggested that an approach would be that the wording from Member Brown and the recommendations from Vice Chairman Cannon go to the existing task force and have it worked through and presented for Board consideration at our next meeting.

Member Laurel agreed with this approach as long as a Board Member sits on the task force.

Substitute Motion was made by Member Laurel Brown and seconded by Member John C. Pingree to instruct staff to make sure the special education task force involve a board member (Laurel Brown) and bring her recommendations together for a proposal the Board can examine at the December Board meeting. Substitute motion carried unanimously. It was clarified that the committee also needs to look at English Language Learners and 504 students.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon commented that the Board has some recommendations for kids coming up to graduate, and one of the key concerns is based around our definition of competency. She felt that the task force while dealing with differentiated diplomas, also needs to look at the issue of competency.

Member Teresa Theurer suggested that a separate task force be formed to look into different ways to

demonstrating competency.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington commented that there is an existing committee that has given some initial thought to competency. She suggested they be brought back together to develop the competency issue as identified by Vice Chairman Cannon.

Motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member Dixie Allen to use the group currently existing, including a Board Member, to work on the definition of competency and bring it back to the Board. Modifications should be made for special needs students as well as accelerated students. This would be brought back to the Board at an appropriate time in the near future. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Burningham presented a proposed motion prepared by the Executive Committee which would establish a competency program in the elementary level:

Since competency is much more than just the results on one test, and since it is most appropriate and fair to begin an emphasis on competency where it will most positively affect the educational experiences and learning of students—the elementary level, and since our core curriculum contains statements of standards and objectives for student learning that can be the basis for a competency measured approach, we: (1) Concentrate on developing a competency measured system of education in the elementary grades K-6; (2) Use the core curriculum standards and objectives as the basis for describing competency; (3) have staff consult with local districts and report back to us on innovative ways to use diagnostic/formative assessments, identify and implement interventions, and report student competencies that could be generalized throughout the state; and (4) implement the above beginning in the 2004-5 school.

Vicky Dahn, Director of Curriculum shared what is being done on this in Box Elder District relative to elementary competency using No Child Left Behind (NCLB) funds.

Member Tim Beagley commented that he liked this approach because it comes from the bottom instead of the top. He suggested that the wording of #4 be changed to: “Obtain funding for and implement the above beginning in the 2004-5 school.”

Motion was made by Member Tim Beagley and seconded by Member Teresa Theurer to adopt the motion prepared above with the change suggested to #4.

Member Dixie Allen suggested that it also include dealing with remedial students in secondary schools.

Member Denis Morrill indicated that we know we are not going to be able to afford the whole program, and if we keep adding things, we will be right back to the whole program.

Superintendent Laing clarified that the area for fluctuation is in Item 3. We based the \$203 million calculation off an estimate for the whole state. However, if we identify interventions and innovations that are already being used in some districts, the figure could be less than that.

Discussion ensued relative to the need for interventions for secondary students.

Member Mike Anderson shared the success of the STARS Program in Alpine District and how it might be

used across the state.

Associate Superintendent Patrick Ogden questioned that due to the lateness in the budget process can we accomplish Item 3, as outlined in time to get it into the budget package for this year. Superintendent Laing responded that it indicates this could be generalized throughout the state and could be implemented in 2004-5. We could start with those that have something in place, and sure up the ability to extend it over the next year.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Dixie Allen and seconded by Member Tim Beagley to change the wording in #1 to read: "Concentrate on developing a competency measured system of education for the areas of literacy and mathematics for all students performing below the 8th grade level."

Member Denis Morrill spoke against the amendment because once again we are dividing up the funds and we don't have a lot of money and it looks like it will take a lot of money.

Member Allen noted that a lot of this is already done and the State Office is telling us that a lot of competency measures and testing in the elementary schools are already in line, what isn't done is in the middle level schools.

Superintendent Laing commented relative to the implications of what the amendment to the motion will do. He indicated that there are tremendous needs across the system, but we don't have a sufficient investment at the elementary level in the identification of competencies in a timely and immediate fashion, and the intervention immediately or even remediation. It compounds itself, so by the time they get to the middle level, students have greater deficiencies. Dr. Laing voiced concern that because the one piece might be around, the substance around consistent diagnostic informative assessments and interventions that have the support of research-based analysis to show that they are effective, he is not sure they are there, this is the heart of the issue.

Member Allen cautioned that we can't wait six years. We need to put the pressure on to the point that it happens. She felt that we need to put the goal in line until it gets done. If its right its right and we should do it now.

Member Morrill commented that the whole program is right. However, what we are trying to do now is backup a little and say if we can't implement all of it what are we going to do. He suggested that we start with smaller pieces and put them into effect when we have the funding. He suggested that we give the legislature examples of programs so they know how the funding will be used.

Member Anderson spoke in favor of the motion because it deals with literacy and mathematics. He felt we need to set the goal and get something started now.

Member Tim Beagley commented that he didn't think that by saying we will concentrate on certain level we are abandoning anyone. There are some tremendous programs out there working and we can seek additional funds for them.

Amendment to the motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon,

Dalton, Moss, Richards, and Theurer voting in favor; Members Haws, Morrill, Pingree and Roberts voting against; Chairman Burningham also noted his opposition.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Greg W. Haws to amend # 4 to split out the implementation dates for K-6 2004-2005, and 6-12, 2005-2006.

Superintendent Laing commented that the motion as it exists now is impossible to do. You may have students in the same school reading below grade 6 and some reading below grade 8. You have to provide the opportunity in all schools and differentiate based on how deficient the student is as opposed to what grade level they are in. The way the motion current stands is more appropriate.

Member Haws withdrew his motion.

Member Morrill commented that he will vote against the motion because it is too broad and not going to have the funds to accomplish it.

Member Theurer requested clarification of the wording of #4, to implement what?

Superintendent Laing indicated that the original motion had some things we could start doing. We could start reporting, gleaning the interventions being applied in districts around the state, some using No Child Left Behind money and try to perpetuate those depending on the amount of money we have. Possibly perpetuating them into school where No Child Left Behind money doesn't apply, for example.

Member Beagley modified his motion that #4 read: "Implement proven interventions as funding becomes available." Amendment was seconded by Member Teresa Theurer.

Amendment to the Amendment was made by Member John C. Pingree that #4 read: "Implement proven interventions in the 2004-5 school year if additional new funding becomes available." Amendment to the Amendment was seconded by Member Teresa Theurer.

Member Ed Dalton commented that there are some practices going on now that could be shared that do not require funding.

Superintendent Laing commented that it is not safe to assume they could be implemented without new funding.

Amendment to the Amendment carried unanimously.

Original motion as amended carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Haws, Moss, Pingree, Richards, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Member Morrill opposed.

Chairman Burningham presented an additional proposed motion:

While our primary focus on developing a competency measured system of education is appropriately targeted at the elementary level, and since graduation from high school remains the ultimate accountability at the end of the public school experience, the middle level years must be not neglected since they are critical to the preparation of students as they move from the nurturing environments of the elementary school toward the more self-directed and diverse experiences of the high school. We

must, therefore, begin now to add meaning and substance to the middle level education of students: (1) Charge an ad hoc committee of two to five board members and representatives of parents, middle level teachers and administrators, superintendents, and USOE staff to examine middle level education and make recommendations about how we can move this level of public education toward measuring student competency and increasing student accountability for mastery prior to entering high school; (2) direct that task force to consider the core curriculum standards and objectives as a basis for measuring and reporting competency while acknowledging society's entrenched reliance upon letter grades as students advance through high grades, and (3) ask the ad hoc committee to report back to the Board in its regularly scheduled meeting in April 2004 so that the Board can develop an implementation strategy for the 2004-2005 school year.

Motion was made by Member Joyce W. Richards and seconded by Member Dixie L. Allen to adopt the proposed amendment above.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Teresa L. Theurer and seconded by Member Tim Beagley to change #3 to read: "Ask the ad hoc committee to report back to the Board in its regularly scheduled meeting in April 2004 so that the Board can develop an implementation strategy." This would eliminate "for the 2004-2005 school year."

Member Dave Moss suggested that rather than eliminate the time line entirely to specify during the 2004-2005 school year. Members Theurer and Beagley accepted the change in their motion. Amendment to the motion carried unanimously.

Motion as amended carried unanimously.

Member Debra Roberts questioned if we needed a motion to change the basic units, specifically including financial literacy, in the graduation requirements for the graduating class of 2008.

Superintendent Laing noted that Member Pingree had previously suggested that we would accept the graduation requirements as specified in Performance Plus, which would include financial literacy.

Chairman Burningham presented the following proposed motion relative to high school:

Recognizing our work over the past year began as a focus on and a desire to increase graduation requirements, and acknowledging the tremendous amount of learning that has occurred and that rightfully results in the previous motions, but still wanting to begin affecting the rigor and quality of the high school experience, that we through the four members common to both the Utah State Board of Education and the Utah State Board of Regents, advocate for and develop the criteria for a high school diploma offered by the Utah State Board of Education and endorsed by the Utah State Board of Regents which recognizes: (1) student course taking above minimal high school graduation requirements, including passing CRTs where they exist; (2) student achievement as conveyed by traditional letter grades with no grade less than a C (2.0) and a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.6; and (c) student scores on traditional college entrance tests (ACT or SAT) at levels equaling or exceeding current admission requirements to Level One institutions of higher education in Utah, and, as a result, guarantees the student admission into a state institution of higher education of his or her choice.

Member John Pingree questioned if there was actually a vote on accepting the higher graduation requirements. It was noted that we had accepted the graduation requirements as a means of obtaining competency.

Superintendent Laing further explained the incentive aspects for high school students with a high school diploma that would guarantee the student admission into a state institution of higher education. He indicated that the higher education group will have to decide the implications.

Member Linnea Barney questioned if there was any idea on how many students this may affect. She did not want to overwhelm the higher education system. Superintendent Laing responded that based on some of the concern that was expressed around the existing levels of Performance Plus, if there was 70 percent that could not meet the consistent C level, obviously, it will not be overwhelming.

Member Tim Beagley voiced concern that he is uncomfortable voting on something that would affect higher education. He suggested we could be more general with a motion that suggests the State Board explore the possibility of communicating with the Board of Regents in such a way to establish a team of courses and assessments that might ultimately end up in a guaranteed admission.

Chairman Burningham clarified that the thought was that this is not in our power, but we may provide some impetus toward that thinking.

Member Teresa Theurer suggested that the Board discuss this at another time when the members of the Board of Regents are present.

Member Dixie Allen suggested prior to that the last word of first paragraph to insert the word may, “and endorsed by the Utah State Board of Regents which may recognize:

Superintendent Laing noted that if there is a diploma, this would propose that the State Board would award the diploma or an attachment to the diploma of a seal or some other recognition, and the Board of Regents would recognize or endorse it. It would be a collaborative effort.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon commented that in the earlier discussion we passed a motion for a task force to look into the idea of differentiated diploma. Included in that was looking into something for higher end students. She anticipated this type of thing in that motion that was passed to work this through that task force.

Vice Chairman Cannon commented that she felt this would strengthen the senior year. Motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member R. Michael Anderson to adopt the motion suggested by Chairman Burningham with the addition of the word may in the last sentence prior to recognize.

Member Tim Beagley spoke against the motion that without the two members of the Board of Regents to represent themselves he was not comfortable. In addition, he felt this issue was more complex. He suggested that a better motion would be that we look at this issue in more detail at a later time in coordination with higher education.

Member Teresa Theurer spoke against the motion for the same reasons as Member Beagley.

Member Mike Anderson commented that he recognized what Members Beagley and Theurer were suggesting, but he felt we would be recommending as a Board that the four individuals suggested in the motion look at

and consider what can be done to implement this kind of program.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon and seconded by Member Linnea S. Barney proposed an amendment to her motion that on line 5 after the words Utah State Board of Regents, to eliminate the words advocate for and. The sentence would then read: the Utah State Board of Education and the Utah State Board of Regents develop the criteria for a high school diploma offered by the Utah State Board of Education and endorsed by the Utah State Board of Regents which may recognize:

Member Laurel Brown indicated that the concept was okay with her, but she did not feel comfortable moving ahead without the other parties, i.e. members of the Board of Regents. Member Dixie Allen proposed an amendment to eliminate through the four members common to both. It would then state that the Utah State Board of Education and the Utah State Board of Regents develop the criteria...” Vice Chairman Cannon and Member Anderson accepted this change as part of their amendment. The last sentence in the first paragraph would then read: I move that the Utah State board of Education and the Utah State Board of Regents develop the criteria for a high school diploma offered by the Utah State Board of Education and endorsed by the Utah State Board of Regents which may recognize:

Amendment to the motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Moss, Pingree, Richard, and Roberts voting in favor; Members Beagley, Brown, and Theurer voting against; Member Haws absent.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington requested clarification indicating that she is to convene two task forces, one to consider the special needs population and the other to revise competency along the kind of framework of the motion made by Vice Chairman Cannon, and a sub group of the competency group is the Board of Regents and Board of Education group, or are they separate and apart. Chairman Burningham clarified that the Board of Regents and Board of Education group are separate and apart.

Superintendent Laing indicated that the second motion relative to middle schools specified an ad hoc committee, including Board Members. We will need to determine what Board Members and others. From the discussion, there is an existing task force or advisory committee dealing with special education issues that we anticipated taking differentiated diplomas for that group, and Member Laurel Brown would join that group. It was further clarified that the original special populations group did not include expertise in English Language Learners nor 504, and these will be added to that group.

It was clarified that the Ad Hoc Committees and/or Task Force composition will be brought back to the Board at the November 14 meeting.

Chairman Burningham further clarified that the Performance Plus Ad Hoc Committee is disbanded and the task forces and other ad hoc committees established today will report to the Curriculum Committee, noting that the

majority of the ad hoc committee are members of the Curriculum Committee.

Member Teresa Theurer commented in regard to the graduation requirements and having those be as in the Performance Plus document, she is concerned with the paragraph on page 5 that deals with the way students may earn units. It is filled with the word “CRTs.” She indicated that there were others also concerned about this. She suggested that this be removed and replace it with something else. Superintendent Laing commented that his understanding of the earlier motion was to establish the fifteen requirements, with nothing about how the credit is earned. Also, the number of specified electives have been reduced based on the underlying statement of additional requirements and electives as prescribed by the local board of education.

Superintendent Laing further clarified that in the Performance Plus document, page 4, all of the section under the bolded High School Students Must Earn Required Units of General Education as one Measure of Ability and all of the information on page 5 under Districts and Charter Schools will maintain autonomy within the requirements.

Motion was made by Member Teresa L. Theurer and seconded by Member John C. Pingree that the two paragraphs at the bottom of page 4 of the Performance Plus document, then to the next bold and include the bolded section at the bottom of page 5, “Districts and Charter Schools Will Maintain Autonomy Within Requirements” be put into effect for the students graduating in the year 2008.

It was clarified that with this motion the Board would then need to change its rule on Graduation Requirements. Further that the rule modification come to the Curriculum Committee in December.

Superintendent Laing noted that this will mean that districts offering more than 24 units will have to look to see if they have enough requirements in the core areas. In some districts this will raise the electives issue.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Pingree, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Haws, Moss and Richards absent.

Motion was made by Member Edward A. Dalton and seconded by Member Teresa L. Theurer to remove all reference to the CRTs as measures of competency in the Performance Plus document.

Chairman Burningham commented that he did not know why there was such a worry about changing the Performance Plus draft, when we are not even recommending its implementation. The Board has said it is a draft and what the Board will do are the things that have been discussed today. He felt that over a period of time we will want to examine this very carefully. He also expressed concern about eliminating the CRTs entirely without careful thought.

Member John Pingree suggested that the CRTs not be eliminated because we don’t have anything better.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington suggested that the motion may want to be that the CRT is not the only or only one of two forms for determining competency.

Chairman Burningham agreed and indicated we would not be ready to work on it now because we have said we will work on other areas.

Motion was made by Member Edward A. Dalton that the Board continue to recognize Performance Plus as is presently written as a work in progress and that it continue to go through the committee approach until the language is perfected.

Superintendent Laing commented that each iteration of the document where that was a prominent concern that continues to describe proficiency as reliant and perhaps even determined by passage of the CRTs is going to continue to be a lightning rod.

Member Dalton commented that he did not want the public to think that the Board has abandoned Performance Plus. Further, he believed the references to CRTs should be deleted because that is not a measure of competency. It is one measure of several related to competency.

Associate Superintendent Patti Harrington suggested that the Board use Recommendation #4 from the Steering Committee to direct all committees to recognize competency is a complex skill set that is greater than the sum of its parts and therefore must be assessed over time utilizing multiple types of performance assessments. CRT's are appropriately used for board measurements (school, district, state) but do not represent individual competency.

Amendment to the motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon that in the Performance Plus document, page 5, in bold Students May Earn Units in Middle and High School in Different Way, to eliminate the language under that and replace it with the language identified by Dr. Harrington, Recommendation #4 from the Steering Committee.

Dr. Harrington indicated that she would not want see exact language in the changes to Performance Plus, but rather have the Board give guidance that relates to that principle. Then staff could come back with a recommended change.

Substitute Motion was made by Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and seconded by Member Laurel Brown that the State Board would like the Committees to work around the framework that competency is a complex set of skill set that is greater than the sum of its parts and therefore must be assessed over time utilizing multiple types of performance assessments. Motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Moss, Pingree, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Haws and Richards absent.

Motion was made by Member Teresa L. Theurer and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton that on page 5 of the Performance Plus document, under Students May Earn Units in Middle and High School in Different Ways: Students shall earn course units through one of the following: 1. Earning a course grade of C or better (reflective of the final ability of the student as determined by the teacher. Eliminate the remainder of the paragraph. 2. Providing evidence of preparation in the subject area from a menu of lines of evidence approved by the USBE. Eliminate the remainder of the paragraph. Delete #3, and retain the last two sentences.

Clarification was noted that we are only deleting in the Performance Plus document the consideration of

CRT as a determinant toward competency.

Member Laurel Brown questioned if the document that will go on the Board's web page be the one that includes the underlined and italicized wording as well.

Member Brown requested an addition to the motion to remove the underlined and italicized section on page three "Diagnostic and Formative Assessment Interventions. Further to eliminate the section on Accommodations and/or Modifications May be Made For Some Students on page 6. She clarified that it would not mean these concepts would not be put into the document, only that they have not been discussed or approved by the Board.

Members Theurer and Dalton accepted this as part of their motion.

Superintendent Laing clarified that we would remove that and just put in parenthesis "specifics have been assigned to a committee."

Discussion ensued relative to the appropriateness of making changes to the document at this time. The document currently on the Board's web page could indicate that it is a "working draft."

Member Laurel Brown clarified that in the interest of public communication the intent was to be sure that the public, as we go forward from this meeting, understands our intentions, i.e. to look closely at our usage of CRTs and we are not going to move forward with that. This motion addresses the issue.

Motion carried with Members Allen, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Moss, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Anderson, Barney, Pingree (Chairman Burningham also noting his opposition); Members Haws and Richards absent.

Motion was made by Member Edward A. Dalton and seconded by Member John C. Pingree to formulate a plan and send some type of response to the teams, districts and stakeholder groups to let them know how we have responded to their input.

Superintendent Laing indicated that Mark Peterson immediately following Board meeting sends out a summary of the actions taken by the Board. Today's will reflect the adjustments made. This summary goes to all the news media and a large number of others. He questioned what was intended by the motion.

Member Dalton responded that so many people that wondered "will they listen to us and how will we ever know?" We have listed and we have an opportunity to either go visit or send a letter or some simple message that is strong enough that they individually feel like we did listen.

Motion was withdraw with the understanding that the Communications Committee will look at this and see what might be appropriate.

Other Business

NASBE Committee Participation

Chairman Burningham encouraged Board Members to participate on NASBE Committees or Study Groups.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon noted that she has served on the Governmental Affairs Committee for the past six years. She encouraged Board Members to consider participating on that committee since she will be on the Board of Directors.

Legislative Inquiry Regarding Continuation of the Utah Basic Skills Competency Test (UBSCT)

Chairman Burningham reported that we have received an inquiry from the Legislature relative to the Board's position on the continuation of the Utah Basic Skills Competency Test (UBSCT).

Motion was made by Member John C. Pingree and seconded by Member Teresa L. Theurer to continue UBSCT at the present time.

Amendment to the motion was made by Member Laurel Brown and seconded by Member Dixie L. Allen that the Board agree to continue UBSCT with the stipulation of adequate funding for interventions.

Superintendent Laing questioned or else what? If there isn't any more funding the law requires us to administer the test every spring.

Member Denis Morrill commented that if the law is already there so why do we need to say we want it to continue or not.

Chairman Burningham clarified that the legislature wanted to know our opinion about whether or not it should be continued.

Member Morrill suggested that it would also be our opinion that we would like more money for interventions.

Amendment to the motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, Beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Moss, Pingree, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Haws and Richards absent.

Original motion to continue UBSCT with the message about more money for interventions. Motion carried with Members Allen, Anderson, Barney, beagley, Brown, Cannon, Dalton, Morrill, Moss, Pingree, Roberts and Theurer voting in favor; Members Haws and Richards absent.

Superintendent Laing questioned if the Board wanted their budget adjusted to reflect interventions as a priority? He indicated that the current priorities are growth, increment in the WPU and monies for the Performance Plus competency area. He indicated that we will need to go back and recalculate the budget based on some of the motions adopted by the Board.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.