March 12, 2013
8:30 A.M. – 4:00 P.M.
School Administrators of Iowa, Clive

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Carver, Sandra Dop, Ron Fielder, Jason Glass, Jeff Herzberg, Liz Hollingworth, Pam Kirsch, Susan Lagos-Lavenz, Nancy Movall, Allan Nelson, Dana Schon, Jen Sigrist, Andrea Stewart, Matt Townsley, Bridgette Wagoner, Kari Webb

Non Members Present: Evan Abbey, Nancy Ankeny, Tascha Brown, Lacy Cherniss, Brenda Colby, Meredith Dohmen, Lisa Fry, Tim Johnson, Sarah Hale, Nancy McIntyre, Dan Peterson, Andy Wermes

AGENDA ITEM: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS 8:35

Expected Outcome: Open the meeting
Lead: Jeff Herzberg
Follow Up

Notes: Jeff Herzberg opened the meeting at 8:30 and had everyone briefly introduce themselves telling their interest in this work.

AGENDA ITEM: SETTING NORMS

Expected Outcome: Task Force Norms
Lead: Dana Schon
Follow Up

Notes: Dana Schon led a discussion to develop group norms.
1. We agreed to use Fist to Five for consensus: Display 0 to 5 fingers to show level of agreement or disagreement—fist being completely disagree to 5 being completely agree.
2. We generated a list of norms but there were so many that Dana will take them and compile the list for next time.

AGENDA ITEM: TIMELINE

Expected Outcome: Group will keep the timeline in mind during today’s meeting and make recommendations later in the day.
Lead: Sandra Dop
Follow Up
Notes: Sandra Dop handed out the current timeline from the Preliminary Report and asked that everyone take notes on it as we process other work today. She explained that if there were adjustments that needed to be made, we should make note of it. She also told the group to be thinking about who else should be invited into this work for specific tasks.

AGENDA ITEM: PERSONALIZED LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group understanding of a more accurate definition of competency-based and</td>
<td>Lisa Fry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalized learning, how they are different and how they are connected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Lisa Fry explained the learning taking place in the eCourse on personalized learning, which AEA 10 offered statewide. Several task force members are taking that course and were able to explain that we had been combining competency-based education with personalized learning. Competency-based education is working with competencies that students are aware of and working toward, but it does not have to be personalized. Personalized learning is giving students voice and choice in the learning pathways to the competencies. Personalized learning connects the learning to student interests and passions. We had been including that as part of competency-based education. With this understanding of the terms we now realize that our goal is really competency-based education in a personalized learning environment. She explained the differences among Individualized—find the individual’s gaps and help them fill in, Differentiated—adjust to meet the needs of groups of individuals, and Personalized—connect to the student’s needs and passion and give the student voice and choice in the learning pathway.

AGENDA ITEM: THE CCSSO INNOVATION LAB NETWORK AND CBE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The group will decide if the work of the Innovation Lab Network will be combined</td>
<td>Mary Delagardelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the Task Force work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Mary Delagardelle explained the work of the Innovation Lab Network and how it appears to be aligned to the work of the Task Force in that it has been decided that work will be on competency-based education and personalized learning. She asked the group if we would consider bringing these two work groups together. The consensus was that this will be a good partnership.

AGENDA ITEM: Technology Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update on the work of the AEAs to investigate technology and technology needs</td>
<td>Lisa Fry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: Our Preliminary Report included a recommendation that the state investigate what gaps exist between what districts need to create a 21st century learning environment and what they currently have or have access to. Lisa explained what the Media Service Directors are already doing to address that issue.

AGENDA ITEM: WORK GROUP REPORTS AND FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome:</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups report about work on February 14 and receive feedback.</td>
<td>Sandra Dop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Common Language and Guidelines—Sandra Dop
   Sandra reported on the definitions the group proposed. There was a lengthy discussion about the definition of competency statement and the work group decided to do more research.

2. Continuum Tool Kit—Andrea Stewart
   Andrea reported that the work group took the idea of a continuum and felt it was inadequate. They began work on a tool kit that holds competency-based, personalized learning as the center of the work and are developing components of that work as avenues in for districts. The tool kit will be digital and can be added to as we learn and develop more. The task force liked the switch from a single continuum to a tool kit that might include a continuum for specific work as appropriate. Jason Glass encouraged us to develop as much as possible by late summer so districts have something to work with next year.

3. Higher Education—Ron Fielder:
   Ron reported that the work group considered how higher education might support the work of districts in competency-based education, how they would facilitate smooth transitions to higher education and how they might prepare aspiring teachers and administrators. This work could include:
   - Research, benchmark outside of Iowa for research teams and partnerships. Identify colleges already doing this work
   - Contract with a university to do the evaluation
   - A group to investigate transitions and admissions as well as how to prepare teachers
   - Higher education host a strand for higher education in the IA ACSD conference this summer
   - Facilitate a conversation among higher education admissions
   - Emerging map of pilots, initiative locations, community, etc.
   - Current alternative pathways map
   - Ensure higher education faculty have pathways to competency-based work in their programs
Feedback: The group was asked if grant writing had been considered. They will add that to their conversation.

4. Chapter 12—Jeff Herzberg
   This group worked with consultants from the School Improvement Bureau at the DE to outline changes that need to be made in Chapter 12. These changes can be made without code changes by the legislature. Items that should be considered in Chapter 12 include:
   - time requirement – (200 minutes per week for 36 weeks and a specific area like PE still says 900 minutes)
   - offer and teach
   - multiple classes being offered in the same room at the same time
   - learning outside the classroom
   - schools not using CBE should continue to use the Carnegie units

**AGENDA ITEM:** REL MIDWEST SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Force understanding of the intended survey</td>
<td>Jill Walston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Jill Walston of REL Midwest explained the background of REL and how they are involved in educational research and listed the team.

She explained the evolution of the process and purpose of the survey. The survey will include all districts and will help identify the policies and practices currently being implemented across the state to gauge the degree of implementation and will help determine challenges districts face.

She explained the timeline of the survey, which will be web-based and administered in June 2013 with results by August 2013.

Next Steps: She asked us to report whatever changes we might want to make very soon as the timeline is tight.

**AGENDA ITEM:** WORK GROUP TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process timeline, work teams chart, ILN proposal, and next steps for work group</td>
<td>Sandra Dop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Participants self selected to the groups that reported this morning to process the items listed and propose next steps to the groups.
**AGENDA ITEM:** WORK GROUPS REPORT OUT AND NEXT STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome: Process timeline, work teams chart, and next steps for work group</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Dop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Groups processed into the Google Docs. No changes were recommended for the timeline; however, common language and the tool kit were noted as top priorities and suggestion for others to include were listed on the Google Docs for leadership. We held a brief discussion about next steps. Sandra asked everyone to go to the Work Days Google Docs and sign up for days they might be able to work on these tasks. She will send that to the group with the minutes.

The next full task force meeting is May 14, 2013 8:30 to 4:00 at School Administrators of Iowa in Clive

**AGENDA ITEM:** ADJOURN 3:45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome: Adjourn the meeting</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Dop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**