



Physical Education and Health Standards Review Team Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, Jan. 10, 2019

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 2:45 p.m.

Location: Prairie Meadows Plaza View Room, Grand View University, Student Center, 2811 E. 14th, Des Moines 50316

TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Barb Bakker, University of Northern Iowa
- Charity Campbell, Norwalk Community School District
- Kurt Denahy, Clinton High School
- Cindy Elsbernd, Iowa Kidstrong
- Stacy Frelund, American Heart Association
- Jan Grenko-Lehman, IAHPERd
- Jesse Howard, Middletown Army Reserve/Iowa National Guard
- Craig Johnston, Central Springs High School in Manly
- Jodi Larson, Ankeny Centennial High School
- Betsy Luck, Oskaloosa Middle School
- Brian Rhoads, West Des Moines Community School District, co-facilitator
- Pam Richards, Central College, co-facilitator
- Carlye Satterwhite, Des Moines Independent Community School District
- Sarah Taylor Watts, Iowa Department of Public Health.
- Shari Walling, Johnston Community School District

Team members who were absent: Erin Drinnin, United Way of Central Iowa; Neil Gray, Northeast Community School District; Donna Heying, Keystone Area Education Agency; and Jesse Nitchals, Estherville Lincoln Central High School.

Also in attendance were Rebecca Bates, a consultant with Midwest Comprehensive Center; Erika Cook, the Iowa Department of Education's bureau chief for standards and curriculum and co-facilitator; Tom Deeter, Iowa Department of Education; Kris Kilibarda, a department consultant with the bureau of leading, teaching and learning services; Rita Martens, Iowa Department of Education; Deb Schroeder, Iowa Department of Education; Lisa Stange, a department consultant with the bureau of career and technical education; Ellyn Ferriter, an intern with the Iowa Department of Public Health; and Melissa Walker, writer for the standards review team.

Agenda item: Welcome; review

Kris Kilibarda gave the team an overview of the process they have gone through to this point in the review of physical education and health standards. She introduced Ellyn Ferriter, an intern with the Iowa Department of Public Health who is a student at Des Moines University; and Jesse Howard, with the Iowa National Guard and a New London School Board Member, who is a member of the review team but hasn't been able to attend because of work commitments.

Kilibarda asked the team to discuss in table groups their work and share with the entire group:

- 1) They built a foundation for the need for PE and health standards and learned that Iowa is the last state in nation to have standards.
- 2) The team talked to professionals outside of Iowa about how to create standards. They talked to other states about their standards, and what worked and didn't work in the standards creation. They received other states' standards documents.
- 3) The team settled on a set of standards and decided to receive public feedback on them.
- 4) The team hosted nine public forums where members of the community shared their thoughts about the possibility of standards for the state. The team also sought public feedback through an online survey.

Agenda item: Review of Prior Final Reports to the State Board

Team co-facilitators Brian Rhoads and Pam Richards shared examples of previous standards' final reports that were submitted to the Iowa State Board of Education, so they team could see what other groups have done. They explained that the PE and health team's report would have similarities but also differences.

Richards and Rhoads explained the components the report would include: an introduction, an overview, a description of the process, details about the public feedback process, and the team's recommendations. They said the report will include their recommendations for standards and processes to operationalize the standards.

The individual table groups reviewed the other standards groups' report and then reported back to the entire team their thoughts about the reports and what they liked and wanted to do differently. The team wants their report to include information about the importance of the whole child and the intent behind the standards. They want a strong introduction that explains the importance for the standards in case members of the public don't read beyond the first few pages.

Agenda item: Process for Review of Public Feedback

Rebecca Bates, a consultant with Midwest Comprehensive Center, reviewed the data from the public survey with the team members. She explained how the data review process would go and reminded the team that just because a data point stands out or feels important to an individual team member, doesn't necessarily mean it's significant to the overall process.

Kilibarda also told team members that anytime someone from the public sent an email that information was put into a folder in the team's Google Drive for their review. The comments from the public forums also were typed up and are available for the team to review. The survey was open for three weeks, and there were about 1,200 individuals who reviewed the survey.

Bates led the team through assumptions and predictions of the survey data. Table groups worked together to list what they thought they would see in the data and to record their top three emergent themes within the standards survey.

Bates explained the group identified their predictions and assumptions because they will all have preconceived notions and feelings about the data, and they want to get those out so they can look directly at the data and what it says without trying to make the data fit their point of view.

Agenda item: Data Review

As the team began its review of the data, Bates said the team was to focus on the data, its trends and their findings. She asked the team to include trends about data points on sticky notes. She cautioned them against including data points that agreed with their assumptions if they were not a trend.

Deb Schroeder, with the Iowa Department of Education, organized all of the data from the survey into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets for the team to review. She gave the team a tutorial on how to review the information in the sheets and how to see which sections of standards received the most comments or edits.

Bates walked the team through how to write a finding. The team reviewed the introduction and discovered that less than 1 percent of survey respondents didn't think the standards were relevant. The finding would be that 99 percent of survey respondents find the anchor standards to be relevant. Team members were asked to write their findings on sticky notes and share which question from the survey it came from, so the original source could be located if needed.

Bates asked team members to record data points on colored sticky notes that were: significant, confirmed/contradicted predictions, or concerned them.

The team was asked to consider these questions as it considered inferences and implications of the data:

- 1) If the standard needs revision, what revisions or additions are necessary?

- 2) How does implementation of the standards by districts and teachers need to be supported?

The team also answered these questions as a group:

- 1) What did you learn, and how did your predictions compare with your actual data
 - a. about the written standards? Most were on board with them
 - b. about the professional learning to implement the standards? Time, money, resources and support from administrators, according to teacher respondents
- 2) Were there any surprises in the data related to the standards? If so, what surprised you? None.
- 3) Were there any findings that raised questions or were confusing? No.

Agenda item: Developing Recommendations

Bates explained to the team that every recommendation would be based upon data, but that not every data point would lead to a recommendation. Recommendations synthesize the data findings into statements that respond to the guiding questions.

As the team looked at the K-12 findings as a whole, they determined there could be a recommendation about time, money, etc. that would influence one of the guiding questions but might not result in a recommendation to change or revise a standard.

Each table reviewed the data and the feedback for specific anchor standards and a specific grade band. Here were their findings based on the survey data:

For the anchor and K-5 PE standards: Leave as is

For the anchor and 6-8 PE standards: Leave as is

For the anchor and 9-12 PE standards: Recommendation to leave the PE standards as written

All health: Based on the survey results, the committee recommends accepting the national health standards as is

K-12 findings: The majority of respondents supports the standards. In order to implement the standards as recommended, the amount of time students spend in physical education class needs to increase.

K-12 Professional Development: Time and resources should be provided to support standard implementation.

Agenda item: Group Consensus

Bates led the team through the consensus-building process. She went through all of the findings and the recommendations the team had written down.

Rita Martens asked the team for clarification regarding its recommendation that students receive more time in PE class. She wanted to know if this was for all students, a specific grade level, etc. Could more specific information be included to make the recommendation more meaningful? Bates said the recommendation was based upon the public feedback data, which said to increase the amount of time. There currently is no required amount of PE time. Kilibarda reminded the team that any final recommendation would need to be framed around a standard because that is the role of the review team.

Martens asked whether there were any comments in the data about students who request waivers to not take PE classes. There were no questions about waivers on the survey, and no information about them in the standards.

Kilibarda reminded the team that for this meeting they were to make recommendations based on the public feedback data. At the team's next meeting, they'll review their initial recommendations, as well as the recommendations the team developed based on public feedback, to develop their final recommendations. The team was brought together as an expert group, so their knowledge will be important in creating the final recommendations. The team was reminded of their original charge, which is to recommend a set of physical education and health standards.

Kilibarda also reminded the team that the physical education and health standards will be recommended standards not required standards and that the only entity that could make the PE and health standards required would be the Iowa Legislature. Therefore, if a data point from the public feedback came out that respondents wanted the standards to be required versus recommended or if that was a common thread from the public forums, the team could choose to include that finding in its final report but it would not be something the Board could act on.

The team then took a fist-to-five vote of its findings/recommendations:

- 1) K-12 professional development: All 5s
- 2) K-12 findings: In order to implement the standards as recommended, the amount of time students spend in physical education class needs to increase. One 4; rest 5s. Martens told the team that the required minutes in a subject area are not directed by the Legislature. Bates told the team they could include a suggested amount of time based on best practices in a guidance document that would accompany the recommendations.

- 3) Rest of findings: All 5s
- 4) Anchor standards and K-5: All 5s
- 5) Anchor standards and 6-8: All 5s
- 6) Anchor standards and 9-12: All 5s – took out the word health
- 7) Health standards: All 5s

Agenda item: Closing

Kilibarda thanked Bates for her work. She told the team members to think about their recommendations based on the public review between now and their February meeting. They will then consider all of the recommendations and write their final recommendations at that meeting. The team also will review a draft introduction, the procedure process and the recommendations/findings that came out of the public review that will be included in their final report.

The team also will review ideas for professional development, the players who will be involved, provide guidance on how to move forward with the standards implementation and an action plan for implementation.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.