**Minutes of the Regular Meeting**

**of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education**

**Tuesday, November 29, 2016**

**8:35 a.m. – 1:45 p.m.**

**Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

**75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA**

**Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Present:**

**Paul Sagan**, Chair, Cambridge

**James Morton**, Vice-Chair, Boston

**Katherine Craven**, Brookline

**Ed Doherty**, Boston

**Roland Fryer**, Cambridge

**Margaret McKenna**, Boston

**Nathan Moore**, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Scituate

**Michael Moriarty**, Holyoke

**Penny Noyce**, Boston

**James Peyser,** Secretary of Education

**Mary Ann Stewart**, Lexington

**Mitchell D. Chester**, Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, Secretary to the Board

Chair Sagan called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Chair Sagan reported that the Board had a very positive retreat on November 15th including a discussion of goals and strategies. Board member Noyce, Chair of the Commissioner’s Performance Evaluation Committee, updated the Board on the committee’s work. She invited Board members to submit suggested revisions to the performance criteria and asked Commissioner Chester to send the committee an outline of his goals for the 2016-2017 year, to be incorporated into the performance review process.

Commissioner Chester welcomed Board members and concurred with Chair Sagan that the retreat was very productive; members discussed the Board’s mission/vision statement, responsibilities and authorities of the Board, and the Board’s role in securing a first-class education for all Massachusetts students, particularly for students who historically have been underserved. The Commissioner reported on recent ESE administrator appointments, including: Nina Marchese to lead the Office of Approved Special Education Schools; Keith Westrich as Associate Commissioner of College, Career, and Technical Education; and Robert Leshin to the position of Director of Food and Nutrition Programs. Commissioner Chester noted the dissemination fair that the Department sponsored recently and also updated the Board on New Heights Charter School. The Commissioner said the Department continues to seek input on possible changes to the Massachusetts accountability system and other aspects of education in light of the federal [Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)](http://www.mass.gov/ese/essa), and is holding five public forums to gather comments.

**Statements from the Public:**

1. Daniel Tillinghast addressed the Board regarding the establishment of an educator license for American Sign Language.
2. Aveann Bridgemohan addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
3. Elica Hector-Varrs addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
4. Jovan Lacet addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
5. Tito Jackson, Boston City Councilor, addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
6. Barbara Fields addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
7. Lisa Guisbond addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
8. Lincoln Larmond addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
9. Peggy Wiesenberg addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.
10. Robert Jenkins addressed the Board regarding the closing of the Mattahunt School in Boston.

Board member Fryer asked what the Board can do about the decision of the Boston School Committee to close the Mattahunt School. The Commissioner said the Mattahunt was identified as a Level 4 school in 2012, prompting the Boston Public Schools to establish a turnaround plan with input from a local stakeholder group. He said the school has received more than $2 million in funding over the last four years and student performance has remained flat or declined, which is alarming. Commissioner Chester said after a review of the school’s 2016 assessment results, he notified the superintendent that he was putting the school under review and directed the superintendent to develop an expeditious and effective action plan. He said Superintendent Chang decided to recommend that the Boston School Committee close the school and the School Committee voted to do so as of the end of this school year, giving students from the Mattahunt preference to enroll in higher-performing schools in the district and transforming the facility into an early learning center. Commissioner Chester said the Board does not have authority to close local schools, except that it may close charter schools for non-performance because the Board is the charter authorizer.

Board member McKenna commented that the Mattahunt School is under-chosen by families and therefore is an “excess school.” Member Fryer questioned the English language learner data provided to the Board, commenting that it did not align with the information shared by parents. The Commissioner responded that the ELL data in the documents were submitted to the Department by the Boston Public Schools. He noted that the Mattahunt is a topic on the agenda later in the meeting.

**Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education approve the minutes of the October 25, 2016 Special Meeting and October 26, 2016 Regular Meeting.**

The vote was unanimous.

**Proposed Revised English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks**

Commissioner Chester introduced Senior Associate Commissioner Heather Peske. Chair Sagan commented that the Board discussed the revised frameworks at length at the October 25, 2016 special meeting and the vote today is to send the proposed revised frameworks out for public comment. Member McKenna asked why technology was not included in the Mathematics Framework. Ms. Peske responded that technology is included in the Science Technology and Engineering Framework and the Computer Science Framework, both of which the Board approved last year.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with Chapter 69, Sections 1D and 1E of the Mass. General Laws, authorize the Commissioner to solicit public comment on the proposed revised *Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy* and *Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics.***

The vote was unanimous.

Member Noyce corrected her earlier statement and clarified that members should contact her regarding the Commissioner’s performance evaluation criteria at her state email account (pnoyce@doe.mass.edu) and not her personal email address.

**Educator Evaluation: Proposed Amendments to Regulations, 603 CMR 35.00, on Student Impact Rating**

Chair Sagan said the Board has discussed the educator evaluation system several times, and today’s vote will send the proposed amendments to the regulations out for public comment. The Commissioner said teaching and learning is the core work of our schools to prepare students for life after high school; consequently, we need to pay attention to student learning and build it into the feedback/rating/evaluation system.

The Commissioner summarized the Department’s work with the field to improve the evaluation framework. He said the revised architecture folds student learning into the overall rating rather than as a separate rating. The Commissioner said that the M.A. Association of School Superintendents, M.A. Elementary School Principals Association, and M.A. Secondary School Administrators Association support the proposed amendments, the Massachusetts Teachers Association and American Federation of Teachers-MA do not, and he is glad to continue the discussions.

Senior Associate Commissioner Peske presented the five priorities of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework. She reviewed the current framework design that includes two ratings and the proposed framework design that would include a single summative performance rating incorporating the impact on student learning. Ron Noble of the Department presented the five-step cycle that results in the summative performance rating. He said most districts use the model rubric and that unlike some other states, Massachusetts does not have a strict formula. Mr. Noble said with the Board’s vote, the Department will invite public comment through January 17, 2017, and the Commissioner expects to bring the regulations back to the Board in February.

Member Fryer commented that schools have tremendous influence on students, especially students in poverty. He said high value-add educators make a difference and smart policies that are designed to better manage schools also have long-term effects on students. Member Fryer said it is dangerous to believe the issue is all about poverty and parents rather than teachers. He said we need to hold schools and educators accountable.

Board member Moore asked if student impact has the same weight as other parts of the system. Ms. Peske responded that the Massachusetts evaluation system does not assign weights; it relies on professional judgment, which is a strength of our system.

Board member Stewart asked for data to support adding the indicator. She referenced a letter that the MTA and AFT-MA sent to Board members offering other proposals. The Commissioner noted that the union proposals did not include impact on student learning. He said in terms of evidence, there is a wide body of evidence that teachers have an impact on student learning. Member Stewart commented that implementation is a problem and student performance is tricky to add in a way that makes sense.

Member Fryer concurred that the details of implementation matter, and said there is evidence that these measures work. He cited a Gates Foundation study that found only two factors correlated with student learning: the previous year’s student gains and student feedback about the educator. He said his concern is that Massachusetts is not going far enough.

Board member Doherty said the Board cannot deny that poverty has an impact on student learning. He said the lowest test scores in the state are in our urban districts and Massachusetts has to invest more in our schools. He said he will vote to send the proposed regulations out for comment, but he is opposed to the proposal. Member Doherty said student tests are not designed to test the teachers and are not accurate or valid indicators of teaching; scores may vary each year even if teaching remains the same. He added that teachers are not opposed to testing, and low test scores should prompt the principal to examine teacher practice and see what needs to change. Member Doherty said adding student impact to standard 2 is significant because the educator must earn a proficient rating in standard 2 to get an overall proficient rating.

Member Fryer noted that student learning will be 1 of 17 factors in the evaluation framework. He agreed that students would benefit from more supports including after-school programs and breakfast in the classroom, and said they also need more effective teachers in classrooms.

Member McKenna said this process has been difficult and while she will vote to send out the proposed regulations for public comment, she hopes there will be more listening so we can reach a solution. She said educators need support and teacher turnover is a big problem.

Vice-Chair Morton said the quality of teachers is critically important to students’ success. He said he will be looking for a final proposal that includes student performance, because the evaluation system should reflect how students are doing and provide support to teachers accordingly. Vice-Chair Morton said he agrees with Dr. Fryer; a teacher saved his life.

Board member Moriarty said he would not support sending the proposal out for public comment because he believes this is being driven by opposition to using student impact information in the evaluation process. He said he has no tolerance for keeping ineffective teachers in place and he supports the current evaluation system. Member Noyce said schools need to be able to use objective measures of student learning, and including this as one out of 17 factors in evaluation seems an absolute minimum.

Secretary Peyser said he agrees with Dr. Fryer and the proposal is grounded in research that shows teachers matter, effective educators cause students to learn more, student learning can be measured, and teachers get better with feedback. He said student learning is at the center of what schools do and congratulated the commissioner for introducing greater flexibility and eliminating the separate rating, while retaining the essence.

Commissioner Chester said he appreciates the feedback from Board members. He said student impact is more than state test scores; it includes common assessments and portfolios, all of which are local. Chair Sagan thanked members for the thoughtful discussion.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with G.L. c. 69 § 1B and c. 71, § 38, authorize the Commissioner to proceed in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, G.L. c. 30A, § 3, to solicit public comment on the proposed amendments to the Regulations on Evaluation of Educators (603 CMR 35.00). The proposed amendments relate to the student impact rating, and also include technical changes, such as removing provisions describing timelines that have expired.**

The vote was 10-1. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition.

**Report on Two Level 4 Schools: Mattahunt School, Boston, and Commerce High School, Springfield**

The Commissioner said Mattahunt Elementary School in Boston (Mattahunt) and the High School of Commerce in Springfield (Commerce) have been designated Level 4 schools since 2012 and 2010, respectively, and despite the efforts that school and district officials have made to date, it is apparent from the 2016 accountability data that the conditions for successful school turnaround are not in place at either school. He said he directed each superintendent to present a plan that would rapidly and effectively move the schools out of underperforming status. He said Springfield has included Commerce in the Springfield Empowerment Zone Partnership (SEZP) and Boston has opted to turn the Mattahunt into an early childhood center and to give current Mattahunt students preference to enroll in high quality schools in the district.

Senior Associate Commissioner Russell Johnston outlined the next steps for Commerce, including developing a new turnaround plan and convening a local stakeholder group. Lydia Martinez, Springfield’s Assistant Superintendent, provided an update on the school. She said the district is pleased to have Commerce join the SEZP, which will provide the school with additional autonomy. She said the SEZP turnaround work is a true collaboration among the Springfield Public Schools, the Springfield Educators Association, the Department, and the Springfield Empowerment Zone. In response to Dr. Noyce’s question about school autonomy, Matt Matera of the Empowerment Zone said the schools in the SEZP can set policies including scheduling and altering the length of the school day.

The Commissioner acknowledged the work of Empower Schools, Matt Matera, Lydia Martinez, and the Springfield Public Schools for their willingness to adopt innovative approaches to improve opportunities for their students. He also acknowledged the organizations that have stepped up to help districts and the Department think about school turnaround. He thanked Vice-Chair Morton for serving on the SEZP board. Vice-Chair Morton said he is proud to serve on the SEZP board. He said the teachers association, elected officials, and community members have put aside differences to collaborate on this critical work with a common purpose.

Turning to Mattahunt, Commissioner Chester said when he places a school under review he considers the best path forward for students. He said one in five students at the Mattahunt cannot perform at grade level in English language arts and mathematics despite years of turnaround efforts and additional resources. He said the Boston Public Schools (BPS) proposal meets his criteria because it includes a commitment to give the students at the school first preference for a better school, and the district will provide counseling for families to make the decision.

Mary Driscoll, Instructional Superintendent for BPS, said the decision to close the school was not easy. She said the early grades show gains and the district plans to build on that with the early learning center. She said the enrollment process will begin in January, the school will close in June 2017, and families with students in these grades have the option to stay for K1, K2, and grade 1. Donna Muncey, BPS Deputy Superintendent of Strategy, responded to Member McKenna’s question and said that 300 students out of 600 are in the early grades. She said all students need to apply to go to the early learning center and current students entering those grades will be assured a seat.

Member Stewart asked about the timing of the outreach to the community. Ms. Driscoll responded that a meeting was held with families at the school in September to communicate the under-review status. She said the district went to the community with a plan on November 1st, notifications were sent home, and an automated phone call was also made to parents.

Member Doherty asked if the decision to close the school was based on the Commissioner’s letter. Ms. Muncey responded that the administration had discussed closing the school over the summer and decided to wait until test scores were received in September. She said the options presented by community members were discussed at the school committee meeting. Ms. Muncey added that despite all the additional resources, the school's performance was stagnant or declining, and BPS is committed to giving the students the opportunity to go to stronger educational environments.

Member Craven asked if funding was spent on ineffective resources and if community members were involved in the local stakeholder group. Ms. Muncey said the data and reports that the district received on the school as part of the Level 4 process were helpful in illustrating issues such as high teacher turnover and absenteeism. She said the decision to close the school gives the students the opportunity for a better education.

Member Fryer asked what the additional funding was used for. Ms. Driscoll responded that it was used for stipends for teachers for additional time and professional development through Teachers 21, a partnership with Lesley University, Teach Plus, ANet data coaching, guided reading, interim assessments, Blueprint math tutors, and acceleration academies. In response to his question regarding the assignment preference, Ms. Muncey said Mattahunt families will have one-on-one meetings, sibling preference at every school on their home-based preference list, and an opportunity to visit other schools. Member Fryer requested clarification of the ELL data.

Member Doherty asked if the superintendent would reverse his position if the school were to remain in Level 4. He said he would like to move from a test-and-punish system to a test-and-support mode.

Member McKenna said that in the four years Mattahunt was in Level 4, the district has had three superintendents and multiple school leaders. She requested further clarification on the school committee's decision and overall strategy on grade configurations. Ms. Muncey said the superintendent and administrators were concerned about the Mattahunt and discussed options before Commissioner’s letter was received. She acknowledged that there are 24 different grade configurations in BPS now, which the district is working to streamline.

Chair Sagan said the Commissioner's letter to the superintendent requested a plan, and the superintendent made his decision. Chair Sagan noted that the Springfield superintendent received a similar letter and made a different decision. He said he does not see any recourse to change the decision.

Member McKenna said the Boston School Committee was not irrational in its decision, noting the Commissioner had placed the Dever and Holland Schools in Level 5. Commissioner Chester commented that he placed another Level 4 Boston school, the Dearborn, under review and BPS took a different approach in that case. Member Doherty said he agrees with the parents’ suggestion to give the school another year.

In response to Member Noyce’s question, Ms. Driscoll said the school has a new principal this year from a Level 1 school who has selected a new administrative team, and there will be a five-week summer program for all Mattahunt students.

Member Moore said he would like to see the school stay open. Member Stewart noted the regulations give the Commissioner discretion in moving a school from Level 4. Member Moriarty questioned whether BPS has enough planning time to open an early learning center next fall. Chair Sagan said the Board does not have jurisdiction to change the Boston School Committee's decision, nor is he convinced that it should.

The Commissioner said he appreciates the passionate discussion. He said the school is among the lowest performing in the state and is falling further behind each year. He said the Dearborn School in Boston was in a similar situation and the current mayor and the school committee came up with a proposal other than closure or Level 5. Commissioner Chester said the Department has had many conversations with BPS and the district understands the options. He noted that BPS has many assets but great unevenness; the superintendent is trying to raise the quality of education for all students and he would not want to second guess the superintendent or school committee on this decision, which should result in a better educational setting for the students next year. Member Noyce recommended that the Department track the progress of the students going forward.

Member McKenna left at 12:30 p.m.

**Board of Elementary and Secondary Education FY2018 Budget Proposal and Report from the Board’s Budget Committee**

Member Craven, Chair of the Budget Committee, provided an update from the committee, which met on November 29 before the regular meeting. She said the state revenue picture is challenging. She distributed the committee’s revised budget memo and called attention to intergovernmental strategy, civics, and early literacy. Chair Sagan thanked the committee for their work and planning.

Secretary Peyser said he would abstain from the vote because by law the Board’s recommendation is transmitted to his office, which then informs his recommendations to the Governor.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with Mass. Gen. Laws chapter 69, § 1A, approve the budget priorities for the FY2018 education budget as recommended by the Board’s budget committee and the Commissioner, and direct the Commissioner to convey these recommendations and priorities to the Secretary of Education, the Governor, and the Legislature.**

The vote was 9-0-1. Secretary Peyser abstained.

**Recovery High Schools: Proposed Regulations, 603 CMR 54.00**

Commissioner Chester provided an overview of the Recovery High School program and the proposed regulations. He said the program is now codified in statute and the Department team has worked closely with stakeholders and the Department of Public Health.

Member Noyce commented that the materials were very informative. She noted that there are currently only a handful of Recovery High School programs in the Commonwealth. Member Moore asked if the programs exist within a school or are separate. Senior Associate Commissioner Cliff Chuang described the different models.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with G.L. c. 69, § 1B, and G.L. c. 71, § 91, authorize the Commissioner to proceed in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, G.L. c. 30A, § 3, to solicit public comment on the proposed Regulations on Recovery High Schools, 603 CMR 54.00.**

The vote was unanimous.

**Charter Schools: Amendments Requested by Foxboro Regional Charter School and Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School**

Commissioner Chester said he is recommending approval of the requested amendments. He said the Francis W. Parker request is a technical amendment to expand the region to include the town of West Boylston.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with General Laws chapter 71, section 89, and 603 CMR 1.00, hereby amends the charter granted to the following school, as presented by the Commissioner:**

**Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School (add West Boylston to charter region)**

**Location: Devens**

**Charter Region: Acton-Boxborough, Ashburnham-Westminster, Athol-Royalston, Ayer-Shirley, Bedford, Berlin-Boylston, Carlisle, Chelmsford, Clinton, Concord, Concord-Carlisle, Fitchburg, Gardner, Grafton, Groton-Dunstable, Harvard, Hudson, Leominster, Lincoln, Lincoln-Sudbury, Littleton, Lowell, Lunenburg, Marlborough, Maynard, Narragansett, Nashoba, Newton, Northborough - Southborough, North Middlesex, Orange, Oxford, Quabbin, Ralph C. Mahar, Shrewsbury, Sudbury, Tyngsborough, Wachusett, Wayland, Westborough, West Boylston, Westford, Weston, Winchendon, and Worcester**

**Maximum Enrollment: 400**

**Grades Served: 7-12**

**Effective year: FY2018**

**Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School shall be operated in accordance with the provisions of General Laws chapter 71, section 89, and 603 CMR 1.00 and all other applicable state and federal laws and regulations and such additional conditions as the Commissioner may from time to time establish, all of which shall be deemed conditions of the charter.**

The vote was 9-0-1. Mr. Doherty abstained.

The Commissioner provided an overview of the Foxborough Regional Charter School amendment request. He said the school has a strong academic program and has shown its commitment to serving a more diverse student body. He noted that some superintendents in the region are opposed to the expansion.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with General Laws chapter 71, section 89, and 603 CMR 1.00, hereby amends the charter granted to the following school, as presented by the Commissioner:**

**Foxborough Regional Charter School (enrollment increase from 1,300 to 1,700)**

**Location: Foxborough**

**Charter Region: Attleboro, Avon, Brockton, Canton, Easton, Foxborough, Mansfield, Medfield, Medway, Millis, Norfolk, North Attleboro, Norton, Norwood, Plainville, Sharon, Stoughton, Walpole, West Bridgewater, and Wrentham**

**Maximum Enrollment: 1,700**

**Grades Served: K-12**

**Effective year: FY2018**

**Foxborough Regional Charter School shall be operated in accordance with the provisions of General Laws chapter 71, section 89, and 603 CMR 1.00 and all other applicable state and federal laws and regulations and such additional conditions as the Commissioner may from time to time establish, all of which shall be deemed conditions of the charter.**

The vote was 8-2-0. Mr. Doherty and Ms. Stewart voted in opposition.

**Next-Generation MCAS: Update on Standard-Setting Policy Committee**

Commissioner Chester said as part of the transition to the Next-Generation MCAS tests, which will be given for the first time to students in grades 3-8 in English language arts and mathematics in spring 2017, the Department has been planning for how the results of those assessments will be reported. He said on the legacy MCAS tests, results are reported in four achievement level categories (Advanced, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Warning/Failing), with general policy-level descriptors associated with each of those categories. He thanked Member Noyce for serving on the Standard-Setting Committee.

Deputy Commissioner Jeff Wulfson gave an update on the development of the Next-Generation MCAS. He said the Department has published the test design and will be producing administrative guidance for district and school staff.

Associate Commissioner Michol Stapel said that to date, 96 percent of school districts have reported to the Department on their test mode selection for spring 2017: computer-based testing will be the mode for 90% in grades 4 and 8 and about 40% in other grades. She said the Department will publish the final list of mode choices on our website.

Member Stewart asked about priorities in test development. Deputy Commissioner Wulfson said the test is designed around the curriculum frameworks and the revised frameworks will be implemented over time. He said districts are transitioning to computer-based tests, and the Department will provide paper tests to districts that still need them. He said the Commissioner will discuss the high school testing program with the Board at the December meeting. Mr. Wulfson said the Department is awaiting further guidance from the U.S. Department of Education on use of alternative assessment for certain students with disabilities, as ESSA sets new limits on it. He added that currently the student’s IEP team makes the decision on use of an alternative assessment.

Member Fryer left at 1:05 p.m.

Chief Analyst Bob Lee provided an update on the Standard-Setting Policy Committee. He said there was consensus among the group in terms of the new levels and agreement that parents are the primary audience, so the descriptors and levels should be coherent across the grades and meaningful regarding students’ readiness for the next level. He said the group did not reach consensus on whether to have four or five levels.

Secretary Peyser asked if there was much discussion about the two lowest categories. Member Noyce confirmed there was a lot of discussion regarding the “not yet meeting” and “partially meeting” levels.

Member Doherty said he wanted to return to the Mattahunt discussion and asked if there is another option besides closing the school. Chair Sagan suggested that the Commissioner communicate with Superintendent Chang about what the Board heard and discussed today in relation to the district’s decision to close the school. The Commissioner agreed to do so. Member Craven asked for more information about stakeholder engagement in the school’s turnaround plan.

**Student Discipline: Data and State Initiatives**

Commissioner Chester said that this fall the Department published its annual report of student discipline data, as required by statute, based on data reported by school districts through the School Safety Discipline Report. He said there was a slight increase in the 2015-2016 incidents reported by Massachusetts schools compared to the 2014-2015 school year, although both the 2015-16 and 2014-15 years were consistent in that approximately 10,000 fewer students were suspended or expelled when compared to 2013-2014, the year before the new [state law](https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2012/Chapter222) and the Board's [regulations](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr53.html) took effect. The Commissioner said the Department is working with districts to consider creating meaningful sub-categories for reporting, to provide better information about why students are being suspended and what steps could be taken to address behavior issues more effectively.

Associate Commissioner Rob Curtin provided an overview of the state-level discipline data and noted that all of the data are available on the Department’s website. He said there was a slight uptick in numbers from 2015-2016 and a drop from 2014 through 2016. He also reviewed discipline by offenses and by grade and noted they are relatively unchanged or just slightly up. Associate Commissioner Rachelle Engler Bennett provided an overview of the Department’s initiatives to support districts, including the professional learning network. In response to questions, Ms. Engler Bennett said the professional learning network includes schools and districts with a high incidence of student exclusions, they are required to submit an action plan, and students’ chronic absence from school is a consideration as well.

Member Craven left at 1:25 p.m.

Secretary Peyser asked if the Department tracks data on services provided to students who are suspended. Mr. Curtin said the Department collects some information, but not details on the amount of time or frequency of services.

In response to questions about factors that might affect student misconduct and suspensions, Senior Associate Commissioner Chuang responded that the Recovery High Schools are intended to support students who are recovering from addiction and the Department works with other agencies to provide support to schools around substance abuse and comprehensive health education.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, in accordance with G.L. c. 69, § 1B, and G.L. c. 71, § 91, authorize the Commissioner to proceed in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, G.L. c. 30A, § 3, to solicit public comment on the proposed Regulations on Recovery High Schools, 603 CMR 54.00.**

The vote was unanimous.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adjourn the meeting at 1:45 p.m., subject to the call of the Chair.**

The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell D. Chester

Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

and Secretary to the Board

**Minutes of the Special Meeting-Planning Retreat**

**of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education**

**Tuesday, November 15, 2016**

**9:30 a.m. – 2:55 p.m.**

**Devens Common Center, 31 Andrews Parkway, Devens, MA 01434**

**Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Present:**

**Paul Sagan**, Chair, Cambridge

**James Morton**, Vice-Chair, Boston

**Ed Doherty**, Boston

**Roland Fryer**, Cambridge

**Nathan Moore**, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Scituate

**Michael Moriarty**, Holyoke

**Pendred Noyce**, Boston

**James Peyser,** Secretary of Education

**Mary Ann Stewart**, Lexington

**Mitchell D. Chester**, Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, Secretary to the Board

**Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Absent:**

**Katherine Craven**, Brookline

**Roland Fryer**, Cambridge

**Margaret McKenna**, Boston

Chair Sagan called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He welcomed members of the Board to the special meeting/FY17 planning retreat. The Board reviewed its mission statement:

*The mission of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education is to strengthen the Commonwealth's public education system so that every student is prepared to succeed in postsecondary education, compete in the global economy, and understand the rights and responsibilities of American citizens, and in so doing, to close all proficiency gaps.*

Board members discussed the mission statement, with consensus that the Board’s mission is to put this vision into action, working in partnership with others to achieve the stated goals. Concluding the discussion, Chair Sagan said the statement serves the intended purpose and there is no need to create a committee to revise it.

Chair Sagan said with the outcome of the ballot question on charter schools, the Board’s work remains focused on providing a high quality education for all the Commonwealth’s young people, particularly students who currently do not have strong educational options. Vice-Chair Morton expressed concern that the tenor of the national political campaign may be prompting increased harassment of certain students and groups. Commissioner Chester said the Department will work with the Attorney General’s Office and others to support schools in addressing these issues. Senior Associate Commissioner Russell Johnston said this is a leadership opportunity for superintendents, principals, and all educators, and the topic is on the agenda for the next meeting of the Urban Superintendents Network.

Commissioner Chester presented results from the VISTA survey on perceptions of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. He presented the Department’s *Strategic Plan Summary.* Secretary Peyser gave a presentation on *Education Reform in Massachusetts: From Good to Great*: key outcomes; getting conditions right; focusing, aligning, and integrating initiatives at each level; and what success looks like. Board members engaged in discussion on the presentations.

**Board Role and Responsibility**

General Counsel Rhoda Schneider presented a brief overview of the Board’s roles and responsibilities under state statutes and under the education clause of the Massachusetts Constitution, as set forth in the Supreme Judicial Court’s *McDuffy* and *Hancock* decisions. Commissioner Chester noted the recent decision of the Superior Court in *Doe v. Peyser*, the challenge to the charter school cap, in which the trial court stated that the Board’s five-level regulatory framework for identifying and assisting schools is one of the tools enabling the Commonwealth to meet its constitutional mandate. Members discussed various aspects of the Board’s roles and responsibilities.

**Board and Department Strategies for Promoting a First-Class Education for All – Particularly for Students Who Historically Have Been Underserved**

Commissioner Chester gave a presentation with data displays on changing demographics, variation in school effectiveness and teacher impact, achievement gaps, range of student achievement and growth across the economic spectrum of schools, progress in Lawrence, and achievement and student gains in relation to per pupil spending. Board members discussed practices associated with progress in Lawrence, including: leadership, collaboration, and teachers’ professional growth opportunities; intentional instructional practices, expanded time for teaching and learning, acceleration academies, and a richer curriculum; use of data to improve instruction; and improving school climate and culture.

Members discussed school spending and the recommendations of the Foundation Budget Review Commission in light of the data on the range of student outcomes at various levels of spending. Commissioner Chester noted Massachusetts has a high percentage of students in special education, prompting concern that some students may be misclassified due to instructional deficits or other factors rather than disability. Chair Sagan asked the commissioner to plan a future Monday evening special meeting of the Board to review in greater depth the data on student results in relation to school spending.

**Summary and Discussion of Next Steps**

Commissioner Chester pointed out other documents that Board members received, including *The Year Ahead (2016-2017).* He informed the Board about dates for release of student discipline data (Nov. 17), launch of the educator licensure public lookup tool (Nov. 21), release of 2015 PISA results (Dec. 6 or 7), and the next meeting of the Board’s budget committee (Nov. 29 at 7:30 a.m.).

Chair Sagan thanked Board members for their thoughtful participation.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED: that the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adjourn the meeting at 2:55 p.m., subject to the call of the chair.**

The vote was unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell D. Chester

Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

and Secretary to the Board