

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
WILL ROGERS COLLEGE HIGH/JR HIGH SCHOOL
3909 EAST 5TH PLACE
TULSA, OKLAHOMA

April 26, 2012

The State Board of Education met in regular session at 9:45 p.m. on Thursday, April 26, 2012, in the Will Rogers College High/JR High School Auditorium at 3909 East 5th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma. The final agenda was posted at 9:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 25, 2012.

The following were present:

Ms. Connie Holland, Chief Executive Secretary
Ms. Terrie Cheadle, Administrative Assistant

Members of the State Board of Education present:

State Superintendent Janet Barresi, Chairperson of the Board
MG (R) Lee Baxter, Lawton
Ms. Amy Ford, Durant
Mr. Brian Hayden, Enid
Ms. Joy Hofmeister, Tulsa
Mr. William "Bill" Price, Oklahoma City
Mr. William "Bill" Shdeed, Oklahoma City

Others in attendance are shown as an attachment.

**CALL TO ORDER
AND
ROLL CALL**

Superintendent Barresi called the State Board of Education regular meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Holland called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, OKLAHOMA
FLAG SALUTE, AND MOMENT OF SILENCE**

The Will Rogers College High/JR High School ROTC Color Guard led Superintendent Barresi, Board members, and all present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag, a salute to the Oklahoma Flag, and a moment of silence. Students of Will Rogers led the singing of the National Anthem and provided entertainment.

**MARCH 29, 2012 REGULAR
BOARD MEETING MINUTES TABLED**

Superintendent Barresi tabled the minutes of the March 29, 2012, regular meeting until the May 24, 2012, Board meeting.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT

Welcome

Dr. Keith Ballard, Superintendent, Tulsa Public Schools, welcomed Superintendent Barresi, State Board of Education members and guests to a school that is emblematic of so many things going on today and greatness of the past. The school was built in 1936 and is a national historical registry location. Will Rogers School has produced many authors, musicians, and military leaders and continues to experience its greatness today. The school was a low performing school, became a part of the Project Schoolhouse initiative, and now has affiliation with college programs.

Dr. Ballard introduced Mr. Gary Percefull, President, Tulsa Public School Board of Education; Ms. Paula Wood, Tulsa Public Schools; and Mr. John Gaberino, Tulsa Metro Chamber.

Mr. Gaberino said on behalf of the Tulsa Metro Chamber and the entire business community, he welcomed Superintendent Barresi, Board members, and guests. Tulsa is proud of the public schools in Tulsa and proud the State Board is meeting in a very special place. Since 1996, Tulsa has invested over \$800 million in bond funds in Tulsa school buildings. Mr. Gaberino said he was at the meeting because the business community cares about what happens in public education. Approximately 1,600 members of the business community and partners in education are in different Tulsa school buildings throughout the area. The business community supports programs such as Oklahoma Scholars and the college access career readiness coaches program. Tulsa employers have also stepped up to financially support the Teach for America Program and the Tulsa Teacher and Leader Effectiveness initiative to ensure every child has a highly effective teacher every day. We are pleased about the support the Tulsa Teacher and

Leader Effectiveness evaluation framework has received from districts across the state. Mr. Gaberino said on the behalf of the Tulsa Metro Chamber and the 3,000 members we pledge to work with the State Department and Dr. Ballard, his administration, and the McLain educators and families to implement the C³ collaboration. Everyone wants to help make this partnership work to improve the education offered to Tulsa students. There is room for improvement, and the Chamber will work with the McLain partners in education to offer any assistance possible. We are selfish in this effort. We know we do it because it is the right thing to do, but also because we know that businesses cannot survive much less strive to succeed without an educated workforce. He thanked everyone for being at the meeting.

Dr. Ballard said we continue to be a part of eight schools in the Bill and Melinda Gates Teacher Effectiveness initiative. We were not winners of the big dollars, but we do receive substantial support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. A group of community supporters for Tulsa Public Schools banded together and pays all the salaries in the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness department and helps to bring various consultants to the district. Dr. Ballard introduced Ken Levit and Annie Van Hanken, from the George Kaiser Family Foundation.

Dr. Ballard introduced Ms. Stacy Vernon, Principal, Will Rogers College High/JR High School. Ms. Vernon began as a Spanish teacher in Tulsa Public Schools and rose through the ranks to head Edison High School. She certainly embraced the new evaluation system and tied professional development to that system. She did not hesitate to come to Will Rogers. Ms. Vernon has undertaken the challenge in an exemplary manner.

Ms. Vernon thanked the SBE for taking the opportunity to see school in action on a regular day. Board Members will be provided facility tours by students and were encouraged to ask questions about their school, academics, and future plans. We have students in Grades 6-10 this year. The middle school students have finished their state testing and are beginning to work on their year-end activities and their final exams. The high school students are in the middle of end-of-instruction testing. She encouraged Board members to talk to the students about what is happening at Will Rogers. The students know the importance of testing. All students have a seven-year plan regardless of which grade they are in so that they know where they are going and they know what they need to do to get there. Students play a big part in their academic experience and that is new for many of the students. The majority of the students came from two middle schools that were closed as part of Project Schoolhouse and consolidated at Will Rogers. Many students that have never thought about attending college or having any kind of education beyond high school are now considering that opportunity. The school is very proud of the fact that quite a few sophomores have been accepted into the tech programs for next year. When we talk about college and career ready, we are talking about the students getting that right now. We are very concerned about our students knowing what college is actually like. We have been fortunate this year to have some partners in the business community and have been able to take the entire sophomore class to visit three college campuses throughout the state.

Information from the State Superintendent

Superintendent Barresi thanked Dr. Ballard for hosting the State Board of Education meeting and Ms. Vernon and her staff for their hospitality at the beautiful historic location.

Superintendent Barresi reviewed Department activities that included: the SDE Digital Learning Summit; future remote SBE meetings at Howe Public Schools and two other school sites; Web-based Civics Education promoted by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor; Tulsa REAC³H network meetings; State Superintendent's Roundtable; 20-member Leadership Advisory

Council/Board; Classroom Teacher Advisory Board; the SDE budget request; C³ Schools meetings/MOUs rollout; REAC³H coaches; State Superintendent's listening tour/school site visits; and SDE rule approvals.

FIRST-YEAR SUPERINTENDENTS

First-year superintendent(s) attending the meeting were Ms. Lori Boehme, Superintendent, Caney Public Schools, and Mr. Scott Chenoweth, Superintendent, Perry Public Schools.

CONSENT DOCKET

Discussion and possible action on the following deregulation applications, statutory waivers, and exemptions for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years and other requests:

- (a) **Adjunct Teachers – 70 O. S. § 6-122.3**
Weatherford Public Schools, High School, Custer County
- (b) **Allow Two School Days in a 24-Hour Period – 70 O. S. § 1-111**
Calera Public Schools, Bryan County
- (c) **Cooperative Agreements for Alternative Education Programs – 70 O. S. § 1210.568**
Reydon Public Schools, High Schools, Roger Mills County
- (d) **Library Media Services – OAC 210:35-5-71 and 210:35-9-71**
Jones Public Schools, Jones Elementary School, Oklahoma County
Panola Public Schools, Latimer County
- (e) Request approval of recommendations from the Teacher Competency Review Panel for applicants to receive a license - 70 O. S. § 6-202

Board Member Baxter made a motion to approve the Consent Docket and Board Member Price seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Gen. Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Exceptions to Certain Alternative Certification Requirements for University of Tulsa Graduates Approved

Mr. Joel Robison, Chief of Staff, presented an exception request for alternative certification for June 2012 graduate students in math, science, English, history and foreign languages teacher education programs at the University of Tulsa (UT). The Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP) does not currently approve these teacher education programs.

Board Member Ford said once the certification is in place this brings those that have already graduated in. . . .

Dr. Diane Beals, Associate Professor, School of Urban Education-UT, said because of exigencies of both state certification and UT staffing issues, UT teacher education program graduates were allowed to apply for certification through the alternative placement program and be exempt from the work experience statutory requirement and Teacher Competency Review Panel (TCRP) by the previous SDE administration. The teacher education graduates must apply for alternative certification, complete a nationally approved full teacher education program, and pass required competency examinations. Future graduates will be approved by UT as staff increases.

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the exception request waiving the alternative certification requirement. Board Member Hayden seconded the motion.

Board Member Shdeed asked if this will continue or just graduates to date.

Superintendent Barresi said it is graduates to date. This is an exception and as Ms. Beals stated they are taking efforts to correct the issue.

Board Member Shdeed said that is what he understood but wanted to clarify.

The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; Gen. Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

Waiver of Degree Major Requirement for Alternative Certification Approved

Mr. Robison presented an exception request from Mr. David S. Milner to waive requirement for alternative certification. Mr. Milner's degree did not meet the alternative certification requirement. The TCRP determined that Mr. Milner would be a quality teacher and recommends certification to the SBE.

Board Member Hayden made a motion to approve the exception request and Board Member Ford seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following vote: Ms. Ford, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Gen. Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Professional Standard Production Report

There were no questions from the Board. This was a report only and no action was required.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Santa Fe South Middle School's Status As Not Being a C³ Partnership School Approved

Mr. Richard Caram, Director of C³ Schools, said the SBE requested Santa Fe South Middle School resubmit the district capacity determination document on which they met the required deadline. A panel of SDE staff reviewed/discussed the document, and the group came to a consensus on the ratings. After reviewing the documentation, Santa Fe moved from 10th to 52nd. Santa Fe submitted better information that was well organized. The Santa Fe document consisted of four notebooks, and the review process took six hours to complete.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

Board Member Baxter asked how much information was actually submitted in the short period of time.

Mr. Caram said compared to the first document submitted, the second document was contained in four notebooks. An enormous amount of work was done in a very short time.

Superintendent Barresi asked how long it took the team to evaluate the information.

Mr. Caram said approximately six hours.

Board Member Baxter said he appreciated everything that has been done. It must be quite a process to review 2,500 pages of capacity determinations on all these schools. We really have that sort of great analytical capability. It must be a very rigorous effort to evaluate all the information and get the number down to half a dozen schools let alone to try to run a school district and submit the information. As we go forward in the years ahead, can we find a more efficient, economical way for this process? He said he appreciated the fact the SDE looked at this issue again, and the results are great.

Board Member Ford commended SDE staff on this effort in a very short period of time.

Mr. Caram said it was an enormous effort.

Board Member Ford asked if the SDE anticipates having a more standardized approach to the information. Some schools provided little information, and some provided much more information.

Mr. Caram said this is a learning process. There will be many alterations and changes based on what has been done. We had a model from the United States Department of Education (USDE) and other states.

Board Member Ford said she would anticipate it would make the process not only less burdensome on the districts but also on staff.

Mr. Caram said that would be his goal.

Board Member Shdeed said that is exactly what this is – a learning process. We have gone through one round, and it will become much easier and efficient as time goes by. It certainly should. Maybe the fact that Santa Fe South chose not to help initially has taught us all something.

Mr. Caram agreed. We are here to learn at all levels.

Board Member Baxter asked how to proceed. Santa Fe is not currently on the list. We did not add them to the list last time.

Superintendent Barresi said correct.

Board Member Baxter asked if any action was actually required.

Superintendent Barresi said we are advising the Board that the internal recommendation by SDE staff is to move Santa Fe South Middle School to the Priority Level II status and continue to work with the district. It is the official recommendation that the State Board decline

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

the previous recommendation of moving Santa Fe South to the C³ list. At the April 9, 2012, Board meeting the recommendation was to add them to the C³ list, but the Board tabled that action.

Board Member Price made a motion to decline placing Santa Fe South Middle School on the C³ Partnership School list. Board Member Ford seconded the motion.

Board Member Hofmeister asked had Santa Fe Middle School been informed that they would move and have they had any opposed opinion of being in the Level II group. She said she had no information.

Mr. Chris Brewster, Superintendent, Santa Fe South Middle School, said what was the direct question.

Board Member Hofmeister asked if Mr. Brewster had a comment about that action.

Mr. Brewster said from the onset we have had a contention that we were not in the lowest performing five percent of middle and junior high schools in the state, as we understood the waiver to require for placement within any area on the priority schools list. We are appreciative of the SDE staff's work on the CDC evaluation and concur with the determination. They did an excellent job in a short period of time reviewing an enormous amount of information. Our original contention was that we disagreed with the placement within the list to begin with. Knowing the timeframe between now and August, where letter grades are going to be assigned to schools and that will now cause placement within the list. We do not wish to cause any great difficulties for the Board or the SDE as they work through this process. We will deal with it, as we need to. Our belief is Santa Fe is not in the lowest five percent of academic performance and if not, we would not be a priority school.

Board Member Hayden asked if Santa Fe South Middle School is not on the C³ list, does another school drop down into the list.

Mr. Caram said no.

Superintendent Barresi said at this time work will continue with the current six schools, looking into the spring test results, and a report will be made to the SBE in the future.

The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; Gen. Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

Superintendent Barresi said we would continue to work to improve this process going forward. It was based on other models, mostly from the federal government. Comments have been received from other superintendents who have submitted information that it was helpful to have an opportunity to step back and reflect with their staff, faculty and board and to look at the overall functioning of their district and they are taking specific actions to improve from there.

Board Member Ford asked if the Board would receive updates about the other partnership schools.

Mr. Caram said yes. He will meet with schools.

Superintendent Barresi said SDE staff has been visiting with community advisory boards, forming more community advisory boards, and working with superintendents. We are at various

stages with each of these schools and working very hard to get plans under way. We will continue to provide the Board updates.

Board Member Price said that maybe the best benefit is not that certain schools were rated, but the self-evaluation of schools caused their own improvement. He asked if that had been Mr. Caram's observation.

Mr. Caram said absolutely. He had conversations with seven superintendents that went through this process this week. One topic of conversation was what the schools have implemented and been working on and how can the SDE help.

Superintendent Barresi said now that the list is set we will move forward. The Board will see an intense involvement with the C³ schools and with the Level II schools. They will have a greater presence of the SDE and be in contact with the SDE and working with them in reviewing data, specific professional development for teachers and for their leadership. Most of the Level II schools have received a School Improvement Grant, and their work is ongoing as well.

Office of Educational Support

School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003 (g) Approved

Ms. Gina Scroggins, Director, School Turnaround, presented a request recommending School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003(g) to three schools. The *Elementary and Education Act* authorizes the school improvement grants. This grant provides additional funding and resources to turn around schools. To date, Oklahoma has been awarded three SIG grants from the USDE and subsequently is able to award sub-grants to districts and schools. Currently there are 11 SIG schools and approximately \$56,000,000 has been awarded. Some of the benefits of the grants include increased support to schools through the school support teams, improved teacher effectiveness, job embedded professional development, increased learning time is another component of the grant, and increased teacher collaboration time. To date the impact of SIG is that 7,000 students have been impacted by the SIG funds in both elementary and secondary education schools, including one alternative charter school. The local education agencies (LEAs) try to accurately place the teaching population with the student population as well as ensure there is a diverse and appropriate curriculum for the students. In addition these teachers are being trained and educated in job embedded professional development that addresses cultural differences, learning styles, and student engagement in order to meet the diverse needs of the students. The majority of students are economically disadvantaged and within that encompasses students that are English language learners (ELL) and also students on IEPs. The SIG grant has afforded supplemental teachers to help support these students, additional ELL assistance, and increased learning time. The purpose of the data is to identify and target the needs of these students. The third competition for the SIG has been completed. According to the USDE, Oklahoma is being noted as the first to apply for SIG funds using the new priority schools definition, and USDE is very excited Oklahoma is leading this effort. The total funding award for this cohort is just over \$5,300,000. This award is being made available through remaining SIG funds. This competition began four weeks ago. Sixty-six schools were eligible, and of the 66, six actually applied for the grant. Three of those schools are recommended for the grant.

Board Member Ford asked was the low number of applicants that were eligible because of the timeframe or the time of year.

Ms. Scroggins said she could only speculate as to why the number was low. Initially, there were 30 applicants that responded and sent in a letter of intent and attended multiple

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

videoconferences and webinars, but when the deadline came, there were six applicants. The reality is this grant is providing less funding than what this grant has provided in the past. The initial grant award was \$33,000,000, and this grant is \$5,000,000. From the beginning of this process, schools were aware the grant award would only be between one and three. The USDE recommended only one school be awarded. Generally, these schools receive \$6,000,000 over a three-year period, but we know there is a greater need in Oklahoma and are happy to be able to award three grants based on the funding amount provided to Oklahoma.

Board Member Baxter asked when was the SDE aware issuance of grants would be allowed.

Ms. Scroggins said a day or two within the first videoconference on March 21, 2012.

Board Member Baxter asked when were the applications due.

Ms. Scroggins said applications were due April 20, 2012, to the SDE.

Board Member Baxter asked what date the decision was made.

Ms. Scroggins said grant reviewers had three days to review.

Board Member Baxter asked what drove the date that the decision had to be made.

Ms. Scroggins said the USDE.

Board Member Baxter asked if the SDE could not have requested more time.

Ms. Scroggins said more time was requested. What is different about this competition from the previous competition is that there seems to be a sense of urgency for pre-implementation. If awarded today, the schools could begin to implement by the next Monday. The schools will receive their funding as soon as the draw down is received from the USDE, and they can begin securing external providers, securing personnel, and begin planning for their professional development this summer.

Board Member Baxter said his biggest concern is that we give the schools every minute of the time possible. Six out of 66 does not make any sense. This is free money.

Ms. Scroggins agreed. There is a lot of work involved in writing these grants. The grant readers were provided training on the requirements of the SIG grant. Grant readers were made up of SDE personnel, Title I committee practitioners, school support team leaders, and district personnel. The grants were read three times each. The applicants had to score a level three on a rubric that had a level of one to three. If all schools were determined eligible, then a second set of criteria had to be used. In addition, the LEAs must demonstrate the greatest need for funds and the strongest commitment to prioritize SIG in their school. The following LEAs have demonstrated they will use school improvement grant funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school identified in the LEAs application in order to implement fully and effectively the requirements of the SIG grant. State Board approval is requested to award the schools the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant: Shidler Elementary School and Roosevelt Middle School, Oklahoma City Public Schools, and Butner Elementary School, Butner Public Schools.

Board Member Hayden asked which three were not selected.

Ms. Scroggins said Grant, Marcus Garvey, and Clayton.

Board Member Baxter asked where is Butner located.

Ms. Scroggins said Butner is located in Seminole County.

Board Member Ford asked the size of Butner School District.

Superintendent Barresi said there are 226 students in the elementary school.

Board Member Price said he was curious about the criteria. How was this judged? Are the reforms more important than the amount of money? How successful have these grants been in turning around schools?

Ms. Scroggins said the first cohort is about to complete their second year of the grant. Most research states it takes more than the three years to see turnaround efforts. There has been tremendous improvement in the schools with external providers, with data, and the protective teacher collaboration time. Many changes are occurring. Two of today's nominees are current SIG awardees. The criteria for the rubric are very straightforward. It is specifically the requirements in the grant that had to be addressed. If the reviewers had questions about any of the information, they were asked to write comments and then follow up with the school districts for clarity.

Board Member Price said he presumes Shidler and Roosevelt had previous grants. Is that correct?

Ms. Scroggins said not those schools. The district has other schools with grants.

Board Member Ford made a motion to approve the request and Board Member Hofmeister seconded the motion. The motion carried with the following votes: Ms. Ford, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Gen. Baxter, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; and Mr. Price, yes.

Changes to Tulsa's Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Observation and Evaluation System Approved

Ms. Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent, Office of Educational Support, said in December 2011, the Board approved the processes for implementation of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) evaluation instrument. One of the components of the process was that any modification to the framework itself would be brought before the SBE and the likelihood the change would improve student achievement demonstrated.

In January, the SDE was approached by the developers of the Danielson framework with such a proposed change that was brought to the Board in February. It included a two-year refereed research study that was conducted on the new instrument with the changes made to determine whether it was likely to improve student achievement. The Board did approve that change in February.

In March the SDE was approached by the developers of the Tulsa framework with a change request, so we began collecting the data on what is the research base behind that decision and what led the developers to make that decision. The SBE has received information regarding the request from Tulsa Public Schools to make changes to the Tulsa TLE observation and evaluation system.

Ms. White said she wanted to draw the Board's attention to the implications of the modification to any framework. Particularly a few calls were received from districts after today's agenda was posted wanting to know what this meant for them because they just selected this model, and they asked what is the change. Those districts have been assured that the change that is being proposed is a change that would not drastically modify the overall model in such a way it might change a district's decision. However, we have also encouraged districts to understand that if they do change their decision on what model they want to use based on a modification, that would be possible, but we do not expect that to be likely.

Ms. White reviewed the proposed changes to the Tulsa rubric and an explanation of those change and the research brief provided by Tulsa Public Schools regarding the validation studies. When those two attachments were received at the SDE, there were questions about the two studies that were referenced since the studies themselves were not included in the packet. We requested those two studies. There was some confusion in the conversation, and Ms. White apologized for any misunderstanding she had regarding what the research base was. We believed that we were directed to the Gathering Feedback for Teaching Study, which was part of the Measure of Effective Teaching Study (METS). This particular study was not the research base behind the decision, but information was gleaned from the particular study that informed the general practices of fair assessment.

Board Member Ford asked if the Gathering Feedback for Teaching Study was used as an outline.

Ms. White said her understanding was that it was for general background information but was not the basis of this particular decision. We could not find the direct connection between this study and the proposed change, which is why additional information was requested in trying to determine the rationale or research base for this proposed change. Board members also had for review general background information, a horizontal bar chart comparing some indicators from the Tulsa framework with some overall value added research from the Tulsa model, and data charts. The information that is primarily data charts is not refereed research studies, or at least we have not seen that evidence.

Board Member Baxter said did it occur to anybody at any time to stop sending emails back and forth. This information was submitted on March 28, 2012. Why did we not sit down, have a discussion, and talk about this until everyone understood this the same way? Why are we sitting here in this awkward situation when this could have been resolved early in April? Why does the process work the way it does?

Ms. White said because of several factors. This was not a contentious conversation back and forth. We were asking for information. There were many phone conversations and emails in the process. We believed what we were asking for was understood and information was being collected. It has been an ongoing conversation.

Board Member Baxter asked what does the SDE need now to be happy?

Ms. White said she wanted to make it very clear that there is no judgment being made about the quality of the research or the conclusion of Tulsa Public Schools. The information, when Danielson brought their research forward, was a nationally recognized two-year refereed research study. We are not requesting that Tulsa do a two-year study. We just want to make certain the research base is a valid research study and because we have not seen a published study. Data charts are available, but there is no determination yet that the research methodology was a solid methodology.

Board Member Baxter said Tulsa is not able to explain that to the satisfaction of the SDE. Do you think they are making up the charts rather than based on research?

Ms. White said no, she is not a statistician nor a quantitative researcher. In looking at the information, there were connections that are probably good solid connections.

Board Member Baxter asked if this information went to an expert in the SDE that does that type of analysis. He asked Ms. White how she applied the judgments if she lacks the skill set that she believes is needed.

Ms. White said if we had a published report of the study that had been refereed, we could easily say a research committee said it was valid research. If we had the study, and it had not been refereed, it could be submitted to a university research committee to determine if it was a valid methodology for research. A quantitative researcher could determine if it was vetted and a quality research study.

Ms. White said for the Danielson framework the information was provided to the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (TLE) Commission first. The process that was approved does not require the TLE Commission to approve a modification but for the SBE to approve a modification. The TLE Commission did not make an action on Danielson's framework.

Board Member Ford asked where does the TLE Commission stand on this issue. She said she was frustrated because the SBE received information regarding this issue on a very short timeframe. She said she would like to see information that has gone through and been vetted by the TLE Commission and then submitted to the SBE.

Ms. White said for the Danielson framework the information was provided to the TLE Commission first. The process that was approved does not require the TLE Commission to approve a modification, but for the SBE to approve a modification. The TLE Commission did not make an action on Danielson's framework, but the information was provided to them. Because they did not take action and there were no comments received from TLE Commission members, the SDE brought that to the SBE with the assumption that was moving forward in a proper direction. Since the time of this request from Tulsa, there has not been a TLE Commission meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for May 3, 2012. Some documents have been provided to the TLE Commission. The most recent documents we have received were not forwarded to the TLE Commission, but those documents could be shared.

Board Member Ford asked what is the responsibility of the TLE Commission as it relates to the SBE.

Ms. White said their primary responsibility is to make recommendations to the SBE and to give oversight to the implementation process. There are several items outlined specifically in the law. Modifications to the framework is not listed in statute as a responsibility of the TLE Commission, and that is not a responsibility the TLE Commission indicated they wanted to keep when they made that recommendation. The recommendation from December was that it would go straight to the SBE and would not necessarily need to come back to the TLE Commission.

Board Member Ford said when they are silent, is the SBE to assume the TLE Commission approves.

Board Member Hayden said he understood it was up to the SBE.

Board Member Hofmeister asked information was submitted to whom.

Ms. White said all research universities in the state have internal review boards.

Board Member Shdeed said Tulsa wants to change their model. At the SBE meeting several months ago, the Board agreed to look at three models and give the process a year. Is that correct?

Ms. White said the SBE did approve all three models recommended by the TLE Commission.

Board Member Shdeed asked why Tulsa cannot make a tweak to their model. It is not a major change and does not affect the outcome.

Ms. White said she was not opposed to and had not made a judgment on the conclusions that Tulsa came to, but her role was to provide the SBE information regarding if the change was likely to improve student achievement. She said she did not feel she had enough information to make a recommendation to the SBE based on that factor.

Board Member Shdeed said it is still during the one-year test time and in fact Tulsa is responsible for their program that they present to the SBE.

Ms. White said the SBE is responsible for approving a modification.

Superintendent Barresi said the SBE should expect continuing requests for changes based on ongoing research for all three models. Danielson and Marzano have been established for so long they do not make many changes. Tulsa is in the second year for full implementation. She said she anticipates more of those requests in the future. That is not a judgment of good or bad. Staff was instructed to set up a process to review the requests for changes, review the research, evaluate the research, and independently validate the research if possible. We are fully aware that may not be the case for Tulsa. It is not a judgment statement. This is very high stakes. This has to do with employment and whether or not a teacher is hired, fired, promoted, or receives performance pay. She said we want to set the best standard going forward. We fully recognize this needed to be taken to the TLE Commission first. That was done with Danielson, and it was not an action item because they are not required to approve.

Board Member Baxter said the TLE Commission recommended to the SBE that the Tulsa model be adopted as the model for the state of Oklahoma. In the process, the SBE established going through the evaluation process for a year, and part of that SBE decision was that the Tulsa model is the presumptive model for Oklahoma. Unless something drastic happens, that will remain true. A large number of school districts have chosen the Tulsa model. This change is not a major change to the model. At the end of the year, we agreed we would look at all three models. The TLE has already made their recommendation, so it is up to this Board.

Board Member Ford said she agrees, but she has hesitation about approving a modification that has not been presented to the TLE Commission. The TLE Commission made a recommendation that the SBE agreed with. The information provided is a summary that we need additional data to support. Can that be done? Are we just looking at a timing issue?

Ms. White said when the SDE asked for the study, the summary of the study was submitted. She has not seen the methodology piece. Either the methodology can be submitted to

a researcher to determine if the methodology is appropriate with appropriate conclusions. If that has been done the information could be included the study itself.

Board Member Ford asked if the methodology been requested.

Ms. White said we thought we were having that conversation and communication, and as of yesterday the actual studies had not been received, just the summaries of studies.

Board Member Baxter asked Ms. White if she is not confident that Tulsa is accurately reflecting work that has been done

Superintendent Barresi said statute requires verified research based models and that means verifying the study not just a summary of the research. We are not trying to be difficult. We have simply set a standard for approval that in the future will be brought to us by all three models. We are trying to work with Tulsa so we can fulfill the requirements of the law and meet the standard.

Board Hofmeister said she would like to hear what those changes are.

Board Member Hayden said the amount of research and the supporting data should be based on the material being changed. If it is a minor tweak, it should not take much research. If it is a major change and overhaul to the program, then it should. We need to base our request on documentation and research to the level of the decision we are trying to make.

Ms. Jana Burke, Tulsa Public Schools, presented and reviewed the requested changes to the Tulsa evaluation model. Changes include removing Indicator 6 dealing with the physical environment of the classroom that has minimal correlation to student achievement. We are replacing this one indicator. There will still be 20 indicators. One factor that had been within another element of the evaluation rubric was not given the special attention it was due. Indicator 19 focused on three types of relationships: a teacher's relationship with students, a teacher's relationship with adults, and a teacher's relationship with parents. One element in Indicator 19 was removed and made a new indicator. There are several non-substantive changes similar to those made by Danielson. We did not change the substance; we simply made improvements. Ms. Burke said she does not think the changes require a refereed research study. We have external studies compared to some evaluation systems that do not that the TLE Commission approved. Those evaluation research studies were provided to the TLE Commission. The reason for this type of process is to strengthen measures. Danielson looked to research and input from the field when making changes. Tulsa does not think Danielson was put through the same amount of scrutiny as Tulsa, especially when the change to the Tulsa model has to do with whether or not you evaluate a teacher's physical environment. Several stakeholders were involved in the update. When the link between physical environment of a classroom and student achievement was measured there was a correlation of .03. That is compared to an overall average correlation in the district of .23. Indicator 19 evaluates teacher's interaction with students, colleagues, and families had a correlation of 1.7. None of the MET validation studies have been conducted by Tulsa Public Schools, which distinguishes Tulsa from one of the three models approved by the SBE. The University of Wisconsin gave Tulsa an extra opportunity to validate their protocol. The law does not require a validation study of any provider be authorized and to have an update made. The law requires a study be research based. Wisconsin looked at Tulsa's valuation data. One is being used for information purposes and one used for high stakes setting. The district also has value added modeling. The overall correlation was at .23, which is completely in line with national models. Some non-substantive changes were made to the model

to clarify and simplify indicators. The formatting was improved. All changes to the model have been presented to the SDE since March 28, 2012.

Board Member Baxter made a motion to approve the request and Board Member Hofmeister seconded the motion.

Board Member Ford asked if the motion was a full motion to approve the changes to the model.

Board Member Baxter said yes.

Board Member Price asked if there would be an objection to a provision that we would at least approve it today and have it presented to the TLE Commission, as it should be, and to provide any data that may be missing by the next meeting. That would be an amendment to approve it today but to have those two provisions. The TLE Commission is supposed to look at it at some stage. Mr. Price said he understood the need to approve today because the training needs to be done. We should at least try to follow the law in terms of presentation to the TLE Commission for their evaluation and thoughts.

Board Member Baxter said he did not have an objection, but as he understands, the Danielson change was presented to the TLE Commission; they did not respond, so the SBE assumed that everything was okay. He asked Mr. Price if that was what he was suggesting.

Board Member Price said he was suggesting that all of them should go back to the TLE Commission and at least have them review any changes in any of the programs.

Board Member Baxter asked Mr. Price if he thought having the TLE Commission look at all the models again would be useful now or toward the end of the one-year trial period.

Board Member Price said what is critical is by the end of the year. If they are meeting on May 3, 2012, the TLE Commission could do it then.

Board Member Ford said her fear is that if the SBE moves forward and then the Commission reviews, does not like the changes, and wants to make a change, that would put the SBE in the position of deciding whether to do that. There needs to be a protocol on how we handle these kinds of items. They should go to the TLE Commission before they come to the SBE because that is their task. No reflection on today or the Danielson model. We do need to set a protocol on going forward about how we are going to address these issues so the SBE is not caught with the TLE Commission coming behind us.

Board Member Baxter said he was under the impression that the TLE Commission declined to have that responsibility or role, and it was not required in law. He asked if that is what Ms. White said.

Ms. White said the recommendation the TLE Commission made was that all modifications would have to be approved by the SBE. That recommendation was silent on what role they would have in the process. The modification to the Danielson model was not presented as an action item to the TLE Commission because it did not require a recommendation. The TLE Commission did not meet after the SDE was contacted by Tulsa regarding this modification. The next Commission meeting is not until May 3, 2012, and we were trying to move the process through. The information was provided to the Commission on the Danielson

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

framework. Information was provided by email to the Commission regarding the Tulsa modification.

Board Member Baxter said so in fact this was never considered in any way by the Commission, the Danielson model. Is that correct? It was never considered or on the agenda as a matter of open meeting. It was not an action item. What was it and did the SBE vote on this? What happened?

Ms. White said it was on the agenda as a presentation. At that meeting there was not a quorum: therefore, there are no minutes of that meeting.

Board Member Baxter said therefore, there was no meeting. The TLE Commission is subject to the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act and never met to consider the Danielson update. Is that true?

Ms. White said that was correct.

Board Member Baxter said why all of a sudden do we want the Tulsa model to be done that way? If the information could be sent to the TLE Commission by email and then report that the Commission considered it and did not have any comment. That was not what happened. The TLE Commission is subject to the Open Meetings Act. They have rules, and they have an agenda. If they do not meet, Danielson cannot be given credit for having an approved update. That is just not true.

Ms. White said with all due respect it was not her recommendation that it go to the TLE Commission. One of the Board members made that recommendation.

Board Member Baxter said he was not asking how or whether it went. It was not considered, was it? The Commission never received a briefing other than by random email. Charlotte Danielson did not brief her update to the TLE Commission.

Ms. White said Charlotte Danielson did provide a presentation. Because there was not a quorum at that meeting, the recording of that meeting was made available to the Commission members who were unable to attend the meeting.

Board Member Baxter said the TLE Commission has never met in a session governed by the Open Meetings Act and considered a briefing by Danielson or had any discussion, or have they?

Ms. White said the distinction is by definition of Open Meetings Act. She deferred to Ms. Lisa Endres, General Counsel, regarding what can be said happened in that meeting where there was not a quorum.

Superintendent Barresi said there was a membership of people within the Commission. There simply were not enough members present to establish a quorum. The information was presented.

Ms. Endres said when a meeting is called and there is no quorum present, the members that are present can hear information. It would not be considered a formal meeting. It would not be recorded as a meeting. There would be no recorded minutes. The item was not an action item, which was the only reason it was allowed to be presented. Had it been an action item at the TLE Commission meeting, it would have been a violation of the Open Meetings Act to hear.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

It was not on the agenda as an action item. It was for information only. The Webinar was provided to the TLE Commission members.

Board Member Baxter said he had confidence in the TLE Commission, but we want to change the rules in the middle of the year.

Board Member Ford said she did not think the rules were changing. She said what if the TLE Commission does not like the changes that the SBE approved. Then the SBE is in direct odds with the Commission. She said she thinks the Commission has a history and been sitting long enough to understand the models.

Board Member Baxter said but at the same time, they have not opted to take this area of responsibility. Perhaps we should ask them if they want to.

Board Member Ford said they have not opted to approve the changes. The SBE approved the model. The Commission has tasked the SBE with approving the changes. She said she understood the Commission has not declined to review and offer suggestions or comments on these changes.

Board Member Baxter said but we do not know that because there has never been a meeting of the Commission where this . . . He asked if Ms. Ford would be comfortable suggesting the Commission look at all the models and changes the SBE has approved before the one year period is over and see if there are any questions.

Board Member Ford said she was not. It is difficult to approve something and then have somebody come behind that has a depth of knowledge to say that was a mistake. She said all she was asking is in the future the Commission review the changes. It is no reflection on the change that Tulsa has asked to make and no reflection on the Danielson model. She said she was trying to lay a process out so as we move forward through the years there is a clear understanding. That understanding would be that when something is sitting before the SBE for approval, that it has been vetted through a Commission that is statutorily in place for that depth of knowledge.

Board Member Baxter said that makes sense. He said you set the process then implement the process. You do not try to implement the process before it is established. He said the Danielson update took about 40 seconds, and he did not recall any talk about the TLE Commission having to bless all that. It is the responsibility of the SBE not the TLE Commission. If they want to advise that is good.

Board Member Ford said she wants a clear understanding going forward that when something is sitting in front of the SBE that is a request on the TLE because it is such an important aspect of the reforms that we have put in place, that it has gone through the TLE Commission.

Board Member Baxter said he was going with that. He said he is also mindful of the fact that the TLE Commission does not ever meet. The last two meetings have not taken place and so he does not want to be part of a cog that slows anybody's process. Tulsa is getting ready to train right now. He said he does not want to wait and see if the TLE Commission is going to meet or has a quorum.

Board Member Ford agreed.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

Board Member Price said that is the reason why as an amendment to General Baxter's motion let the SBE approve this today so the training can move forward, let us have a provision in which all plans need to be presented to the TLE Commission sometime before the end of the year and that any data that any of the plans need to provide to the SBE, need to be provided.

Board Member Baxter said then we are signing up for a solution that could be that there could never be enough data to justify a vote.

Board Member Price said we are voting today to approve. Mr. Price's question was will General Baxter approve the amendments which is that any data needs to be provided to the SBE, and the TLE Commission should review any changes before the end of the time period.

General Baxter said he does not understand all the numbers, and he does not know who is telling the truth and who is not. Does the law require a refereed study or not? This is intuitive. Tulsa wants to throw out the part about messy classrooms and place more emphasis on teacher/student relationships. What are we arguing about?

Superintendent Barresi said she could guarantee that even after the trial year, the SBE will continue to have requests to change the model on all three. A process was set up early on for approval of those, and the TLE Commission is an advisory commission to the SBE. We believe it is important in the vetting process for them to receive the information and to bring the information to the SBE for approval. No, we do not require refereed research studies. That is simply part of the industry standard. The fact that Danielson went through a two-year process, refereed and independently evaluated is great. It was very easy to move forward and bring before the SBE. It is in no way a comment on the quality of the research for the Tulsa changes. When the data and information was received from Tulsa, most of it was in narrative form. In an attempt to be as thorough as possible and follow a process, we simply asked for the research articles. Instead of waiting for a TLE Commission meeting, but in respect for Tulsa and their model, this was brought before this decision making body. She said she did not think one way or the other the training that is about to begin will be affected.

Board Member Baxter said they said it would and they are the ones who have to do the training.

Superintendent Barresi said well, there is a difference there. Nevertheless in respect to Tulsa and their model, we bypassed the TLE Commission and brought it before the decision making body. The process used for both models will continue to be pursued. It is very important. The changes are not a minor issue because it is the way the model will look forever. We need to be as careful as possible every single model is treated as equally as possible. We will continue to move along and set high standards for the models because they matter, because this is about effective teachers in classrooms and student achievement.

Board Member Price said it is a distinction without a difference. If we approve the model today and we are not affecting the teacher training, but simply putting out a general policy that the TLE Commission should before the end of the year review this because that is their job. Any data studies should be provided. We may have violated a policy in that we did not have the TLE Commission meet and have a quorum, but we do not want that to be the norm going forward.

Board Member Hayden said he appreciated Superintendent Barresi's comments on the process. There has to be some kind of a process, but consideration given to detail and research based on what was asked to be changed/modified. He said there does need to be a process, and it is high stakes. This SBE makes decisions every Board meeting on high stakes issues that will

affect education. Everything is high stakes, but we are appointed to make those kinds of decisions. It is fair for the SDE to request the information and give a presentation on what has been requested and what their opinion is on the materials provided, and for Tulsa to present on their model and we make a decision as a Board which is what we do regarding everything else. We may decide something presented does not have the research and as a Board, we may ask for more information and table a decision. He said he did not need the TLE Commission to make all those decisions because it is only a three-year body.

Board Member Baxter said he would accept an amendment that called for approval of the update and the review of all changes by the TLE Commission prior to the end of the one-year period prescribed by the Board for evaluation of the models. He said he would not accept an amendment that includes an undefined data call for research that is not required by the law.

Board Member Price made a motion to amend Board Member Baxter's motion to approve the modifications to the Tulsa model, and that this change and all future changes be presented to the TLE Commission for review prior to the end of the pilot year. Board Member Shdeed seconded the motion.

Board Member Hofmeister asked if it was an academic year. When does the year end? Is it the school year end or the end of . . .

Board Member Price said the end of the pilot year.

Superintendent Barresi asked if General Baxter would accept the amendment.

General Baxter accepted the amendment to the original motion.

The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Price, yes; Mr. Shdeed, yes; General Baxter, yes; Ms. Hofmeister, yes; Mr. Hayden, yes; and Ms. Ford, yes.

Update on the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System (TLE)

Ms. Alicia Currin-Moore, Executive Director, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, gave a brief update on the work of the TLE Commission and school districts across the state as data collection continues regarding the frameworks school districts have selected

April 16, 2012, was the deadline for districts to provide information to the SDE regarding their selection of the teacher framework and leader framework. As of April 20, 2012, 464 districts had responded to the survey and 66 non-responding districts. One district selected the Danielson model, 44 districts selected the Marzano model, and 419 districts have selected the Tulsa model. The total number of administrators that need training is 2,471.

Ms. Currin-Moore gave some background information on the leader frameworks selection. The statute provides for an exception. Superintendents of independent or elementary school districts, superintendents of area school districts who shall be evaluated by the school district board of education, will be evaluated by the board of education, and all others will use the administrator framework models. We interpreted that statute to mean the district can meet an exception therefore not needing to select a leader evaluation model. If a district has a superintendent who is also the principal of the school and there are no other leaders in the district, there is no need for that type of district to select a leader framework. Because of that, fewer districts provided information on leader models because some districts qualified for that

exception. The total of responding districts for the leader model was 419, and of that number 404 selected the McRel framework and 15 selected the Reeves framework. There are 1,026 administrators who need training, and 1,007 need the McRel training and 19 that will need the Reeves training.

Board Member Ford asked about the districts that did not respond.

Ms. Currin-Moore said she was making phone calls to those districts. Some districts have tabled these issues until their upcoming board meetings. Information was provided through a superintendent listserv, and some districts, because of personnel changes, were not on that list.

Board Member Price asked how districts plan to implement the models. The Gates study indicated more than one session needs to be reviewed, and videotaping was emphasized. He said he was convinced that regardless of how fine the model, without videotaping multiple sessions you cannot sustain doing coaching the teachers that need to be coached, disciplinary actions cannot be done and sustained, and outstanding teachers cannot be rewarded as effectively. He said he would encourage videotaping rather than an administrator just walking in and watching part of a classroom and then having their opinion challenged.

Ms. Currin-Moore said there is actually an RFP in the process of being distributed for training for the Marzano, Danielson, and Tulsa model, as well as the McRel and Reeves model. Part of the RFP requires a certain level of training hours and certification assessment. That certification assessment will have a written examination portion to provide a basic foundational understanding of the framework, and there will be a video portion the evaluators will score using the new rubric and match that against master evaluators. The combination of the two scores will create a certification. Their framework must certify an evaluator in Oklahoma.

This was a report only and no action was required.

Update on Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) Graduation Survey Results

Ms. Melissa White, Executive Director, Counseling/ACE, presented an update on the Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) graduation survey results. The results of the survey indicate 93.3 percent of seniors are on track to graduate.

Board Member Ford asked how many have not reported.

Ms. White said 121.

Board Member Hofmeister said that seems like a large number.

Board Member Hofmeister asked if that is the number of schools or districts.

Ms. White said districts.

Board Member Hofmeister said over 100 districts have not submitted information.

Ms. White said yes.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

Superintendent Barresi said the survey is voluntary. We are trying to keep track of where we sit as a state.

Board Member Hayden said we are still at 93 percent.

Ms. White said yes.

Board Member Hayden said it is amazing the number has not moved since last meeting.

Board Member Hofmeister asked why the number has not moved.

Ms. White said because the number of students added that are graduating seniors versus the number missing has stayed consistent. The average is still 93.3 percent.

Board Member Hofmeister asked how many students are not on track to graduate.

Ms. White said 2,040 students from the reporting districts are not on track to graduate.

Board Member Hofmeister said districts have reported 2,040 students, but we do not know about the remaining 100. The number could be larger.

Board Member Ford said the number could be any number. There are a number of districts at 100 percent.

Ms. White said in November the number was 6,000 without all districts reporting. Now the number is 4,000 less with not all districts reporting.

Board Member Ford asked if there was concern there might be reporting errors.

Ms. White said an email was sent to all superintendents of districts not reporting.

Board Member Ford asked if the districts provide information about the number of students that have looked to the alternative tests and projects.

Ms. White said the actual survey asked questions about missing EOIs. There were not specific questions about alternative tests.

Board Member Hofmeister asked when does the spring testing window close.

Ms. White said May 4, 2012.

Board Member Price said people tend to wait until the last minute. How much would this number decrease, and what feedback has been received indicating a student has tried everything and it did not work, or we have not tried different things? What is a typical response from the school districts that do not have 100 percent?

Ms. White said there was an open testing window in December. From November to now, it looks as though the number has dropped significantly with the open testing window. There is currently an open testing window.

Board Member Price asked if the number would go down half.

Ms. White said it is hard to know.

Board Member Price asked is the excuse that they have not tried the projects or the testing, or is the excuse that they have tried everything and it has failed?

Ms. White said both. Most of the time, when talking about options, there is typically an option someone has not considered, and when they do pursue an option, it is a success.

This was a report only and no action was required.

Update on Achieving Classroom Excellence (ACE) End-of-Course Projects

Ms. White gave an update on the ACE end-of-course projects survey that was due April 1, 2012. It has been reported that 251 students have attempted projects, and 63 of those have completed projects, 163 are still in progress, and 25 have quit the project or showed proficiency some other way. Some students attempted more than one project.

Board Member Ford asked for clarification of the incomplete and not started categories on the survey.

Ms. White said incomplete means that a project was opened and looked at and not started means it was not even opened. The vast majority of districts have not attempted projects.

This was a report only and no action was required.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Joel Robison, Chief of Staff, gave an overview of legislation including two bills that have been signed by the Governor. HJR 1125 was recently filed by Representative Shelton and is a disapproval Resolution regarding the A-F rules that will soon be reviewed by the Administrative Rules Committee. Mr. Robison reviewed other legislation dealing with the elimination of some reporting requirements, allowing school districts and other state agencies to not utilize the OSBI background check, the flexible benefit allowance, allowing school districts to maintain their current flexibility in spending, combining the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation and the Office of Accountability, changing how the SDE would address setting cut scores and performance standards, virtual schools, and National Board certified teacher stipend.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rob Miller, Principal, Jenks Middle School, provided comment regarding his concern of the implementation of the ACE graduation requirements for the class of 2012 and respectfully requested the Board grant a one-year waiver to all students who have not already met the ACE requirements.

Mr. Keiv Brummet, Clerk, Farris School Board, presented two Open Records requests. The reason for submitting the requests is trouble with T-3 lines, email, and the internet at Farris.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of
the State Board of Education
April 26, 2012

Ms. Janet Dunlop, Broken Arrow Public Schools, provided comment about concerns regarding the ACE legislation in place. Broken Arrow currently has almost 20 students who will not graduate.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. Board Member Ford made a motion to adjourn and Board Member Price seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The next regular meeting of the State Board of Education will be held on Thursday, May 24, 2012, at 9:30 a.m. The meeting will convene at the State Department of Education, 2500 North Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Janet Barresi, Chairperson of the Board

Connie Holland, Chief Executive Secretary