

**Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, February 27, 2012**

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson Street, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

Members Present:

Ms. Amy Hamilton
Superintendent Huppenthal
Ms. Eileen Klein
Mr. Greg Miller
Mr. Jaime Molera
Mr. Jacob Moore
Ms. Diane Ortiz-Parsons
Dr. James Rottweiler (by phone)
Mr. Thomas Tyree

Members Absent:

Dr. Vicki Balentine

PERSON
RESPONSIBLE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Molera

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hickman

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Mr. Molera

President Molera informed the Board that, as part of the Governor's AZ Ready Council, a subcommittee has been formed to look at the finance structure for funding K-12 education.

B. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Huppe

Superintendent Huppenthal shared that he spent the previous few days visiting schools on the Navajo Reservation and that it was an incredible experience. He saw students and teachers doing spectacular work in auto shops, agricultural surgery, home building and welding shops. Superintendent Huppenthal stated that these were world class educational experiences and he was thinking of ideas on how to leverage the mania for basketball.

Superintendent Huppenthal also shared that he had a chance to go to the Wigwam for the second Teacher and Principal Evaluations Summit. 600 people attended the summit and there was great work being done, and great expertise being brought to the discussions.

C. Board Member Reports

Vice President Tyree shared that he too attended the summit. He commended Dr. Karen Butterfield, ADE Associate Superintendent for Highly Effective Teachers and Leaders, and Jan Amator, ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent for Educator Excellence, for their hard work in putting together the event. There was a lot going on at the summit and it was a fabulous conference. Vice President Tyree commented that the people

representing school districts are working very hard to implement the framework. The focus was on Group B teachers and the challenges still faced. Mr. Tyree expressed concern about the Board's ability to get a framework in place by next fall.

Ms. Klein shared that on Friday, February 24th, the National Kidney Foundation of Arizona hosted a Dancing with the Stars event at which President Molera raised thousands of dollars with his award-winning performance.

D. Director's Report

Mr. Yanez

Mr. Yanez informed the Board that this would be the last Board meeting for Carrie O'Brien, the Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Board; Ms. O'Brien accepted a position with the ADE.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to approve State Board of Education minutes for January 23, 2012

Mr. Yanez

B. Consideration to approve Contract Abstracts
1. Intel® Teach Affiliate Program 2012 Grant Approval
2. National Title I Distinguished Awards

Ms. Summers

C. Consideration to re-appoint the following individuals to the WestEd board of directors:
1. Dr. Beverly Hurley
2. Dr. Wade McLean

Mr. Yanez

D. Consideration to permanently revoke any and all teaching certificates held by the following individuals, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550
1. Carl D. Mosher
2. Rodney John Reed
3. Sean Steven Johnson
4. Jessica Ann Coz

Mr. Easaw

E. Consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and deny Jeremy Gordon's application for certification as being substantively incomplete, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-534.01

Mr. Easaw

F. Consideration to accept the voluntary surrender of the teaching certificates held by Michael E. Bauer

Mr. Easaw

G. Consideration to accept funds in the amount of \$284,000 from the National Research and Development Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education, to develop and test various approaches for measuring the achievement growth of students with and without disabilities, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-204

Dr. Giovannone

H. Receipt of the Executive Summary of the Annual Performance Report as submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs

Mr. Lamer

I. Consideration to appoint Mary Lara to the Career Ladder Advisory

Dr. Butterfield

Committee

- J. Consideration to appoint the following individuals to the Certification Advisory Committee Dr. Butterfield
1. Shawn Watt
 2. Janet Crow
- K. Consideration to approve the Arizona Teaching Fellows K-12 Cross Categorical Special Education Program Dr. Butterfield
- L. Consideration to grant Professional Preparation Program approval to the Rio Salado College/Northcentral University Bachelor of Education Partnership Programs in the following areas: Ms. Amator
1. Bachelor of Education in Elementary Education
 2. Bachelor of Education in Secondary Education
 3. Bachelor of Education in Cross-Categorical Special Education
- M. Consideration to accept the recommendations of the Career Ladder Advisory Committee and approve the Career Ladder programs of the following school districts for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Dr. Butterfield
1. Scottsdale Unified School District
 2. Kyrene Elementary School District
 3. Tanque Verde Unified School District
 4. Crane Elementary School District
 5. Window Rock Unified School District
 6. Agua Fria Union High School District
 7. Dysart Unified School District
 8. Safford Unified School District
 9. Catalina Foothills Unified School District
 10. Apache Junction Unified School District
 11. Creighton Elementary School District
- N. Consideration to approve additional monies for teacher compensation for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 to districts that have submitted Statements of Assurance, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 15-952 and 15-537 Dr. Butterfield
- O. Consideration to accept funds in the amount of \$50,000 from State Farm Insurance Company, to initiate, expand, support and sustain high quality academic K-12 service learning Mr. Lamer

*Superintendent Huppenthal moved to approve the Consent Agenda
Second by Vice President Tyree
The motion passed unanimously.*

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No requests to speak

4. GENERAL SESSION

Karla Phillips, ADE Director of Cross-Divisional Leadership Initiatives, presented information to the Board regarding the application submitted to the United State Department of Education (USDE) for an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waiver. The ESEA was reauthorized in 2002. President Obama announced in September of 2011 that the USDE would be formally inviting states to apply for flexibility in meeting four key principles of the ESEA.

The four key principles of the flexibility waiver are:

1. Adopting and implementing college and career readiness standards with aligned assessments
2. Developing and implementing a system of differentiated recognition, accountability and support
3. Developing and implementing a system of teacher and principal evaluations
4. Evaluating and revising, as necessary, administrative requirements to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEA's

The waiver benefits Arizona's K-12 education community by allowing the state to have only one school accountability system, rather than two, with access for parents, teachers, administrators and the general public. Furthermore, many of the requirements of the waiver are already being met by initiatives currently underway. The waiver application process also encourages the state to raise the bar for all students, including those who are most at risk or in need, so that they can successfully compete in today's information based economy. Lastly, the waiver provides for more flexibility in deciding how to best allocate resources to meet the needs of Arizona's diverse student population.

Arizona is applying for an ESEA flexibility waiver in order to move to one aligned system of school accountability, the A-F School Accountability System. This system aligns the federal requirements of the ESEA Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures with the state's new accountability system. The application process will also allow the state to link federal accountability requirements with Arizona's Race to the Top efforts, as well as allow the state to move from a system of compliance to one of support, while providing transparency for education stakeholders.

There are twelve specific ESEA provisions proposed for flexibility waivers, most of which center on the No Child Left Behind requirement of achieving 100% student academic proficiency by 2014. Other provisions pertain to:

- Flexibility in redefining proficiency targets
- Flexibility in developing accountability formulas
- Changes to Title I school and district improvement
 - Eliminating the requirement to identify districts for improvement
 - Concentrating school improvement resources on priority (lowest achieving) and focus (greatest achievement gaps) schools
- Increased flexibility in use of federal funds.
- Increased flexibility for districts with Highly Qualified Teacher Improvement Plans.

2010 was a critical year for Arizona. The 2010 Arizona Academic (Common Core) Standards were adopted; Arizona joined two common assessment consortia, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and the National Center and State Collaborative (for alternative assessment); and the legislature passed Senate Bill 1040, regarding teacher and principal evaluations, and Senate Bill 1286, regarding letter grades for school achievement profiles. All of this activity helped lay a solid foundation for the ESEA flexibility waiver application.

Principal 1 of the flexibility waiver sets college and career ready expectations for all students, and involves the adoption of, and transition to, college and career ready standards, to include the development and administration of an annual, statewide and aligned assessment that measures student growth in knowledge and skills.

Principal 2 requires the state to develop and implement a differentiated recognition, accountability and support system. This involves setting ambitious, but achievable, annual measurable objectives (AMO's). The state will also need to identify Title 1 reward (high-performing), focus (achievement gaps/lowest-performing subgroups) and priority (lowest-performing) schools, and turn-around strategies for each category, as well as describe how the system provides incentives and support to other Title 1 schools, and how the system works to build local and state level capacity to improve student learning.

The ultimate goal is for Arizona to have only one system of accountability. Arizona is entering the second year of implementation for the A-F system and work is being done to refine the model. The goal is to close the achievement gap by ensuring that all students are on track for college and career readiness within three years, or by grade 10.

The proposed AMO's will account for a school's progress on "growth to standard" and "growth to excellence" trajectories for every student within that school. However, the proposed AMO's will not be used for accountability purposes in School Year 2012-2013. This time will be used to meet with stakeholders and to conduct pilots for the new AMO's.

The proposal is for Title 1 "A" schools to be considered "reward" schools, for Title 1 "D" schools to be considered "focus" schools, and for Title 1 "F" schools and persistently low achieving (PLA) schools to be considered "priority" schools. ADE's plan is to use the flexibility offered during the next year to evaluate the current accountability system and intervention statutes, rules and policies, and to then identify where changes can be made so that all schools, not just Title 1 schools, can receive the same level of support.

The required components of school improvement that LEA's must include in their continuous improvement plans (CIP's) have been incorporated by the ADE for use in the School Improvement Grant process. Beginning in 2013, the new school improvement process will be expanded to include all "priority" and "focus" schools. LEA's with "priority" schools will be required to set aside a portion of their Title 1 allocation to implement their improvement plan. LEA's implementing a CIP in a "priority" school must operate a school-wide program in their Title 1 school, regardless of a 40% poverty threshold. Furthermore, LEA's will no longer be required to set aside funds for Supplemental Educational services (SES). However, an alternate plan will need to be developed to provide tutoring or extended learning opportunities to students. The ADE will work with a workgroup of LEA's to develop a model plan for optional use.

An LEA with a "priority" school is required to review the effectiveness of the school's leaders and instructional staff. The review will be in collaboration with ADE school improvement staff. LEA's with "priority" schools are still required to offer school choice and comply with current transportation requirements. However, if the money set aside for transportation is not used by mid-year, it may be reallocated for school improvement purposes.

Principle 3 sets requirements for supporting effective instruction and leadership through educator evaluation, which the state is already doing through the passage of Senate Bill 1040 in 2010 and the adoption of a model framework by the Board in April of 2011. The ADE is developing a recommended model for teacher and principal evaluations, and has partnered with WestEd to build capacity for regional centers to assist with training.

To address principal 4, regarding reducing duplication and unnecessary burden, the ADE has incorporated

numerous goals and objectives into its strategic plan to streamline processes and increase efficiency, as well as to improve customer service and enhance the quality of support provided to LEA's.

The ADE is reaching out to stakeholders through the website, www.azed.gov/eseawaiver, group presentations, town hall meetings and focus groups. Questions or comments can be emailed using the address eseawaiver@azed.gov. The final application was due to the US Department of Education by midnight on Tuesday, February 28, 2012, but it is expected to be a 2-3 month process before the application is approved, so there is still opportunity for stakeholder outreach and feedback.

President Molera asked if there are plans to do a summary of the application process for legislative leaders, as some of the proposals meld with proposals at the legislature.

Ms. Phillips replied that members from the waiver application team met with Representative Doris Goodale and with staff from the Governor's office, and plans were being made for a meeting with Senator Rich Crandall and others.

Superintendent Huppenthal commented on the nature of Arizona's relationship with the Federal Government. As a state, the future of Arizona's education system must be protected; the ADE is not turning its responsibilities over to the Feds.

President Molera stated there was a request to speak from Dr. Ildiko Laczko-Kerr, Vice President of Academics for the Arizona Charter Schools Association.

Dr. Laczko-Kerr applauded the waiver application team and the ADE for their communication efforts and leadership. She commented that the ADE's statewide committee communicated effectively and seemed to have successfully gathered stakeholder feedback.

B. Presentation and discussion regarding legislative affairs. The Board may take action to support, oppose or remain neutral on specific legislative proposals.

Mr. Yanez
Ms. Cannata

Ms. Cannata, Legislative Lobbyist for the Board, shared that today, Monday, February 27th, 2012 was the 50th day of the Arizona State Legislature's 50th Session, and that so far 1,400 bills had been introduced. Only a couple had been signed, but the deadline for introducing bills had passed and bills were moving to their opposite chambers. The target date for sine die remained April 21st, 2012.

In the previous week, the Legislature passed a version of the state budget, which was anticipated to change as negotiations continued. With regards to K-12 education there were several key items missing that were included in the Governor's budget. The Legislature's budget did not include the \$50 million for reading intervention for K-3, the \$700,000 for new investigators and a teacher discipline database, the \$100 million for building renewal, the \$100 million for soft capital, nor the almost \$5 million to draw additional federal funds for adult education.

So far 2012 had been a record year for the number of bills introduced that affected the Board.

House Bill 2180 was sponsored by Representative Chester Crandell and dealt with an outcome-based funding pilot program for schools. The bill passed the house education committee and was headed to the house rules committee and then to the house floor. The bill required the Board to establish a four-year pilot program for outcome-based funding for schools and develop a competitive application process for selecting five school districts and five charter schools to participate in the program each school year. The bill also stated that each

school would receive up to \$6,500 for each student in kindergarten through eighth grade, and up to \$7,500 for students in grades nine through twelve, plus an additional \$250 per student with specified grades. The bill made an appropriation to the Board of an undesignated amount from the general fund for fiscal year 2013-2014. The bill would self-repeal on September 15, 2019.

House Bill 2270 was sponsored by Representative Doris Goodale and dealt with fiscal crisis teams for school districts. The bill passed in the house by a 57-0 vote and was referred to the senate education committee. The bill gave the Board the option to appoint a fiscal crisis team, instead of a receiver, to school districts that were insolvent or had grossly mismanaged their finances.

House Bill 2563 was sponsored by Representative Terri Proud and dealt with a school elective course about Biblical influence. The bill passed in the house by a vote of 42-15 and was on the agenda for the next senate education committee. The bill required the Board to prescribe requirements for a high school course designated as “The Bible and Its Influence on Western Culture.” Components of the course and teacher requirements were specified in the bill.

Mr. Yanez stated that he did not weigh in on the conversation about this bill when it was heard in the house education committee. As the bill was drafted, the Board would be responsible for developing academic standards for the course. If the bill progressed through the legislative process, the Board would need to convene experts from the field to assist the Board with developing standards. Such standards would have to specify that they do not apply to typical world history or English classes, only to this particular course.

House Bill 2599 was sponsored by Representative J.D. Mesnard and dealt with personal finance instruction. The bill passed the house education committee and was waiting to be heard on the house floor. A strike everything amendment to this bill would exempt districts who received an “A” rating for three years from certain statutes and rules. The exemption would come to the Board for approval. The Board would determine from which statutes and rules districts could not be exempted. Exemptions would be discontinued when the district fell below an “A” rating, or if it became a “C,” “D” or “F” rated district. The Board would be required to submit an annual report.

House Bill 2663 was sponsored by Representative Kimberly Yee and Senator Rich Crandall, and dealt with the reclassification of underperforming districts. The bill passed in the house with a vote of 55-1, and was waiting to be heard in the senate education committee. The Board would be authorized to assign a letter grade of “F” to a school assigned a letter grade of “D” for less than three consecutive years, if the Board determined that there was no reasonable likelihood that the school would achieve an average level of performance within the next two years.

House Bill 2697 was sponsored by Representative Kimberly Yee and Senator Linda Gray and dealt with subject knowledge exams required for teacher certification. The bill passed in the house education committee. The bill would require the Board, by January 1st of 2013, to establish a process for persons with experience in science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) to obtain a secondary education certification to teach in rural communities. The Board could exempt these persons from taking the proficiency exam required to obtain a teaching certificate.

Mr. Yanez pointed out that there was an issue with how these individuals would still meet the highly qualified requirements. Also, from a functional perspective, there was no definition of “rural” were there to be a certificate just for rural areas. Representative Yee had agreed to amendments to take out the rural criteria and do redefinitions so there would not be any highly qualified issues. An actual amendment had not yet been made.

Senate Bill 1202 was sponsored by Senator Lori Klein and dealt with prohibiting teachers from teaching partisan doctrines. The bill was headed to a vote of the full senate. The strike everything amendment to this bill prohibited public school teachers from using partisan books or any partisan doctrine. The bill prescribed penalties for teachers, school districts and charter schools that violated the prohibition on partisan instruction. Teachers in any LEA would be found guilty of unprofessional conduct and the bill included an enforcement mechanism modeled after the ethnic studies legislation.

Mr. Miller asked if the prohibition was specifically meant for classroom instruction or if it included other activities. Ms. Cannata replied that it applied in the classroom and during extracurricular activities.

Mr. Yanez added that the described behavior was already defined as unprofessional conduct under existing rules. The changes proposed by this bill would limit the Board's options in terms of disciplinary action. Furthermore, it would require the revocation of individual certificates.

Mr. Moore asked if such issues would be brought before the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (PPAC), and Mr. Yanez replied that if it was a matter of revoking a teaching certificate, then yes, the issue would be brought before the PPAC.

Senate Bill 1204 was sponsored by Senator Lori Klein and dealt with parental options for schools. The bill was ready to be heard in the senate rules committee. This striker bill established a petition process that would allow parents and legal guardians of students in a "D" or "F" school to require the school district governing board to make certain changes at the school, such as either close the school, convert the school to a charter, or replace the school principal. The district governing board would be required to notify the superintendent and the Board if they received such a petition. This bill also changed the definition of "qualified student" for Arizona Empowerment Accounts.

Senate Bill 1255 was sponsored by Senator Rich Crandall and dealt with the mastery of competency with regards to school courses. The bill was ready to be heard by the house. This bill would require the Board to adopt rules to define competency-based educational pathways that may be used by schools. The Board would be authorized to enter into an agreement with a private organization to carry out this requirement.

Mr. Yanez shared some of his concerns about this bill with Senator Crandall. For example, how the Board would establish rules without amending school finance rules. For this bill to work, amendments would have to be made to define a funding structure.

Senate Bill 1259 was sponsored by Senator Rich Crandall and dealt with the requirements for funding online courses. The bill passed the senate education committee and was ready to be heard in the senate appropriations committee. For school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, school districts and charter schools would be required to allow students in grades 7 through 12 to enroll in up to two online courses each academic year. Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, the Board would be required to determine the maximum number of online courses students could take. The bill established requirements for online course providers to receive state and local education funding, and the ADE would be required to issue a request for proposals by December 31st of 2012 for online course providers who wished to offer online courses under this system.

The strike everything amendment to this bill would require the Board to limit online courses, but then in 2015-2016 the Board could expand to include electives. The Board could charge a fee to online providers, adopt criteria related to the approval of online providers, set a maximum price that could be charged, and select and contract with a nonprofit organization to charge a minimal fee, 50% of which would be used by ADE to maintain a master list of providers, and 50% would go to the nonprofit organization. This bill would establish a process to remove courses from the master list.

Mr. Yanez stated that this bill would bring accountability to the quality of courses provided online. It would limit the courses that could be offered in a given year to two, and it would put the Board in the business of approving courses - something the Board had never done. Mr. Yanez added that carrying out this bill would be a significant time burden.

President Molera asked if the bill referred to specific courses, or just to general areas.

Mr. Yanez replied that after two years, the bill would expand to areas other than just the core areas. The striker amendment included approved categories, but it was still not clear. Ultimately, it would require the Board to look at specific courses.

Ms. Klein asked the Board members what direction they wanted to give their lobbying team. She stated that most of these issues sounded like they should be up to LEA's to decide, and the Board should not be in that position. She recommended that some time be spent with the bill's sponsor.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that there was market competition for grades K-8 & 9 because parents were seeking the best online education for their kids. Parents wanted to make sure online credits were transferable from entity to entity. In grades 10-12, however, kids were not necessarily looking for an education; they were looking for credit to graduate. The state had an obligation to step in. Superintendent Huppenthal added that he would like the Board to stay out of regulating online courses for grades K-9, but if they must step in, to focus on grades 10-12.

Mr. Miller stated that he supported Ms. Klein's position. This was not a state level problem; it was a district-level problem. If there were policies in place at the local level which were not adaptable between entities, it could be a problem. Another problem was the course content. But Mr. Miller believed that was not the Board's problem. That was a local issue. If there must be something in statute, the Board should not be involved.

Senate Bill 1457 was sponsored by Senator Rich Crandall and dealt with the delay of a pilot evaluation system for teachers and principals. The bill passed in the senate education committee and was heading to the floor of the senate. The bill would require the Board to develop a pilot evaluation instrument that complied with specified statutory requirements. School boards would be authorized to postpone the implementation of otherwise required teacher and principal evaluations until the 2013-2014 school year by a majority vote at a public meeting held before December 31st of 2012, if the school district or charter school was participating in the pilot evaluation instrument during the 2012-2013 school year.

Superintendent Huppenthal had discussions with some LEA's who wanted to keep the deadline for the 2012-2013 school year. Superintendent Huppenthal mentioned that national research indicated students could evaluate teachers. Some LEA's should be allowed to have an alternative timeline if they could show they were on the right path. Superintendent Huppenthal commented that he would like to reshape the bill to include alternative timelines for flexibility, but keep the fall deadline.

Vice President Tyree agreed that there may be LEA's ready to go. The question was how to define "ready." Did those LEA's have a plan in place? What was the quality of their plan? Vice President Tyree was struck by the fact that it was requiring so much effort to generate some consistency. There was disparity with respect to LEA's ability to implement an evaluation. Some LEA's said they were ready to go, but they really were not. If there were districts like that, what would the quality of their product be? And if there were others that were truly not ready, the Board must consider that they needed more time.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that the ADE had done a lot of research, and staff had a good idea of what was in the range of quality evaluations and what was not. The Board could use an alternative timeline to

leverage quality.

Vice President Tyree commented that there was a disconnect between policy makers and people in the field.

President Molera agreed and put it on organizations at the local level to meet with policy makers.

Ms. Klein reported that the position of the Governor's office was to keep the deadline, but that it might be acceptable to give some districts another deadline in the not-too-distant future. A way to reward those who finished early would also be nice.

Mr. Miller stated that his concern about the extension was that schools that would not be ready were C, D and F schools.

Superintendent Huppenthal thought the Board could come up with an alternative timeline that kept all the intensity.

Ms. Klein agreed with Mr. Miller on the importance of keeping a deadline, but she liked the idea of consulting with some schools. The Board needed to have multiple models of excellence available to LEA's.

President Molera reminded the Board that they were also asking the Legislature for the ability to be more aggressive for schools that were failing. The Board would like to intervene sooner for D schools. Those things had to come together with educator evaluations.

Ms. Cannata continued. House Bill 2823 was sponsored by Representative Goodale and dealt with the framework for teacher and principal evaluations. The bill was headed to the house floor with a substantial proposed amendment that reflected stakeholder discussions. By December 31st of 2012, the framework for a teacher and principal evaluation instrument adopted by the Board would include definitions for the four performance classifications to be used in the instrument. By school year 2013-2014, LEA's would be required to adopt definitions for the classification and apply them in their evaluation instruments. The bill prescribed options for contracts for teachers and principals receiving various performance classifications, and prohibited principal and teacher transfers to other schools within a district under specified circumstances.

Mr. Yanez stated that one question was whether to wait until after the legislation passed or to implement the classifications sooner. The federal government already required reporting based on highly effective, effective, partially effective, and ineffective. Additionally, the Board's rightful place was to develop a framework, but not get involved in what an instrument looked like.

Mr. Yanez stated that another issue was the use of data. There was a portion of the evaluation framework that talked about appropriate use of data in teacher evaluations and highlighted the need for data to be valid and reliable. The amendment applied data in a high-stakes manner on the teacher side, if not so much for the principal side. Mr. Yanez informed the Board that he had cautioned stakeholders about the current data availability for Group B teachers.

President Molera noted that unless Superintendent Huppenthal received the necessary resources for his data system, it would be very difficult to implement this bill.

Superintendent Huppenthal remarked that he was concerned about Group B teachers. Accurate feedback resulted in organizational excellence and employee satisfaction. But with Group B, it was the opposite.

Mr. Moore agreed with the Superintendent regarding how to go about the process to develop something

appropriate for Group B teachers, who account for 60-70% of teachers, without being onerous. It was important to hold teachers accountable without holding them responsible for all the problems in schools. Teachers had so many requirements already, and were struggling every day to keep up with policies.

President Molera stated there were requests to speak from the public.

Janice Palmer, Director of Public Relations and Government Affairs for the Arizona School Boards Association (ASBA), stated that ASBA was on the record for not wanting a delay. ASBA wanted to continue to move forward and put pressure on field. Ms. Palmer agreed with comments that the default should be the original deadline with specific exceptions. With regards to the four classifications, ASBA hoped the Board would take action sooner rather than later

Lisa Guzman, Organizational Consultant for Quality Teaching and Learning from the Arizona Education Association (AEA), stated that AEA would like the classifications to be highly effective, effective, developing and ineffective. Kentucky, Virginia, Wisconsin and Ohio were currently using these classification labels. Their reasoning was that new teachers were developing in the profession, and AEA would like to honor that.

Joe Thomas, Vice President of AEA, thanked Representative Goodale for the stakeholder meetings. Mr. Thomas stated that there was tension between quality, expediency and timelines, and that a framework had not yet been fully implemented, but there was already a rush to tie in consequences to the framework. Mr. Thomas asked the Board to consider asking the Legislature to give the Board the tools needed so they would not end up tying the hands of LEA's.

Mr. Thomas suggested that one application could be a blue ribbon task force to study what a high-expectations evaluation could look like. AEA's concern about the rush was whether House Bill 2823 was truly supporting good teaching that would lead to student growth, or if it was something that was punitive in nature. He stated that it could and should be used to remove ineffective teachers, but the primary role was to ensure quality teaching. The data was not there yet for high-stakes decision making. Research showed a lot of fluctuation in data, in terms of how a given teacher performs, and it really was not fair to teachers. He urged the Board to think about a task force moving forward, which could inform the Board and help them make the best policies.

Superintendent Huppenthal commented that organizations that were on an arc of improvement had great leaders powering them, but people were also getting honest and accurate feedback. In the beginning they reduced the threat level and gave feedback, allowed a few cycles to take their course and then the accountability came in. Going in from the beginning with high threat levels was not effective.

C. Presentation and discussion regarding the 2011 NAEP Results in Reading and Mathematics

Ms. Pollnow

Ms. Pollnow, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) State Coordinator for the ADE, presented information regarding Arizona's 2011 NAEP results in reading and mathematics. She began by presenting the results for reading.

Fourth grade students scored higher in 2011 than in 2005. Hispanic, African American and Asian fourth graders scored at the national average for their peer groups.

Eighth grade students scored significantly higher in 2011 than in 2007. White, Hispanic, and African American eighth graders scored at the national average for their peer groups. Eighth grade Hispanic students showed a significant increase in NAEP reading scores since 2007, and formerly ELL eighth graders showed a decrease in NAEP reading scores since 2007.

Ms. Pollnow presented graphs showing trends in the national public average for fourth and eighth grade NAEP reading scores compared to each of the following: Arizona overall, Arizona's Hispanic fourth graders who have shown a significant increase of 6 points, Arizona's students with disabilities, students who were eligible for Arizona's National School Lunch Program, Arizona's ELLs, and Arizona's formerly ELL students. Each graph compared Arizona students to their peer groups nationally. Ms. Pollnow also presented graphs for Arizona's fourth and eighth grade NAEP reading scores by race and ethnicity.

Superintendent Huppenthal asked the Board members to make a mental note of the trends for fourth graders with disabilities.

President Molera commented that there may be key issues affecting the scores that the Board might want to address, and that some additional information about what is being done well might be helpful for the Board. For example, early intervention reading programs or special education, and whether it lead to a drop off in scores when these programs ended.

Dr. Giovannone shared that there were not enough students in the random sample for ELL grade eight students, so ADE is attempting to get some sort of over-sampling of ELL students from NAEP for 2013. When they report results, however, ELL data would still be weighted proportionately to the population.

Superintendent Huppenthal added that ADE will need to do a rigorous analysis to inform the ELL task force; there is a substantial dissonance in the data.

Ms. Pollnow presented the results for mathematics. Fourth grade students showed greater growth since 2009 than their peers in any other state, and scored significantly higher in 2011 than in 2009. Hispanic fourth graders showed an increase in NAEP mathematics scores from 2009. Fourth graders of all races and Hispanic ethnicity, aside from Native American, scored at the national average for their peers. Fourth grade students also showed an increase in the percentage of students who are "at or above basic" and "at or above proficient" since 2009.

Ms. Klein asked how Arizona's Native American students might be impacting the overall trend, since there is such a significant population in this state.

Dr. Giovannone replied that the Arizona Native American population is 6%, and that Arizona is second to Oklahoma. NAEP sampling is representative, and it would be equally weighted as in every other state.

Mr. Moore added that part of the issue is the comparison to other states. Oklahoma is different in that they do not have Native American reservations. In Arizona, tribes consider individuals to be Native American if they are one quarter blood, while in Oklahoma individuals can be considered Native American if they have one sixty-fourth blood. Arizona is consistent with other states that have tribal reservation affiliations.

Ms. Pollnow continued with the mathematics results for eighth grade students. Arizona's eighth grade students scored significantly higher in mathematics in 2011 than in 2007, and have continued to show a steady upward trend since 2000. Eighth grade African American students continue to score above the national average for their peers, while White and Asian eighth graders scored at the national average. Formerly ELL eighth graders showed a decrease in scale score from 2009.

Ms. Pollnow presented graphs showing trends in the national public average for fourth and eighth grade NAEP mathematics scores compared to each of the following: Arizona overall, Arizona's students with disabilities, students who were eligible for Arizona's National School Lunch Program, Arizona's ELLs, and Arizona's formerly ELL students. Each graph compared Arizona students to their peer groups nationally. There were

also graphs for Arizona's fourth and eighth grade NAEP mathematics scores by race and ethnicity.

Mr. Moore commented that Superintendent Huppenthal had mentioned earlier that he would like to address the achievement gap differently than by comparing one ethnic group to another, and Mr. Moore asked how that would apply here.

Superintendent Huppenthal replied that while the achievement gap was calculated by ethnic group, it was important that the goal was not to close the gap by bringing the top achievement score down. Rather than comparing one race to another, consider where a group was at with regards to college and career readiness. The only way to close the gap was to raise achievement.

Ms. Pollnow continue by stating that in mathematics as well, ADE was pursuing oversampling for ELL's so as to have a large enough sample.

Superintendent Huppenthal commented on the importance of the Board understanding what was going on with English Language Learners.

Mr. Miller stated that he would be interested in seeing the results from tracking the same cohort of students. Comparing, for example, fourth graders in 2004 to eighth graders in 2008 and seeing what happens between fourth and eighth grade.

Ms. Pollnow replied that NAEP results use a random sample of students, and so could not track quite the same cohort, but would just give a snapshot. She also shared that twelve percent of Hispanic eighth grade students in Arizona are ELL's, and two percent of all eighth grade students are ELL's, as reported by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that what seems to be happening is that as students go from the ELL classification to the formerly ELL classification, results go down for both groups, even though those students are showing good academic growth.

President Molera pointed out that compared to the national average for formerly ELL students in the eighth grade, Arizona's formerly ELL students in the eighth grade have shown a significant drop from 2009 to 2011.

Ms. Pollnow replied that she did a gap analysis and found that it actually was not significant. The gap between the national average and Arizona has remained about the same.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that Arizona had the largest reclassification rate in the nation. The ADE would have to keep track of ELL's in the general population and ask if their academic gains were equal to or exceeding the general population's academic gains. It was the high reclassification rate that was driving the data.

Mr. Yanez pointed out that formerly ELL students were kids who had been classified as proficient for two years and were now in the general population.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that the real test would be whether there was improvement on AIMS, and that the problem with NAEP results were that they do not track a cohort.

Mr. Moore commented that there seemed to be a significant effort to get students into English language learning and then get them out. He asked if students are in fact proficient when they are reclassified, because according to the information presented on the graphs, those students were not performing well in the general population

and it could be a trend that they are pushed out before they are proficient.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that as the ADE brought analyses forward in future, it would be nice to do some additional analysis and find out where Arizona ranks on all of NAEP's metrics. For example, how many of Arizona's students are in the advanced category? These differences may have policy implications, so it would be helpful to know Arizona's ranking in status and improvement over the last two years.

Superintendent Huppenthal added that the theory of the standards-based movement was to hold a standard in place, and then over the years the percentage of students above that standard will increase. ADE could test the theory and look to see if the percentage of advanced students increased. ADE would especially like to know how peer states who also use the letter grade system are doing and how they are trending.

- D. Presentation and discussion regarding the AZ LEARNS School Accountability Formula. Discussion may include, but is not limited to, alternative schools, small schools, ELL reclassifications, AIMS A students and growth model points. The Board may take action to approve proposed modifications. Dr. Giovannone

Dr. Giovannone, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Research and Evaluation for the ADE, presented information about the A-F Letter Grade Accountability System, also known as the AZ LEARNS School Accountability Formula. She shared that progress has been made since October of 2011, when A-F was publicly released. During that month, Lee McIlroy, Director of Accountability for ADE, presented the A-F model to the field and gathered feedback.

The Accountability Advisory Group (AAG) was formed and has been meeting since November of 2011, and has been reconsidering the criteria for the A-F System. Impact data has been run and the AAG has been meeting with special interest groups, including the Arizona Alternative Education Consortium (AAEC). They met with Dr. Amy Schlessman, President of the Board of Directors for the AAEC, and with Dr. Schlessman's colleagues, who have submitted an alternative model that the AAG has now been considering. Dr. Schlessman is going to be a part of the upcoming AAG meetings.

The AAG also met with ADE's Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS) group to discuss ELL reclassifications. The AAG also met with ADE's Exceptional Student Services group as well as with representatives from small schools and a number of other field members.

The AAG is working on some adjustments to the current model that they would like to bring before the Board at the meeting in March. The Board's AZ LEARNS Subcommittee is reconvening and the AAG wants to work closely with the Subcommittee to help expedite questions from the Board.

Over the next two Board meetings, the AAG will bring forward recommendations for approval for a K-2 model, an alternative school model and a small school model. The AAG has a lot of work to do to put parallel models into play and would like to troubleshoot before running them in June. They are bringing up their deadline for state and federal accountability to July, so they have an aggressive timeline ahead of them. They want to work closely with the Board and take everything into consideration.

Dr. Giovannone stated the Board members had in their materials a list of the AAG members.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that, in his opinion, it was okay to not label a school in certain situations.

President Molera added that in such circumstances it would be necessary to be clear to constituents about why a

school was not labeled.

Mr. Yanez stated that the law requires the Board to give schools a label. He added that there could be some caveat in terms of the quality of data used to label small schools. That has been a challenge since the beginning of AZ LEARNS.

Mr. Yanez also commented on the reconvening of the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee. There are several recommendations coming forward that have been outlined and the Board has appointed the Subcommittee to look at issues that have to deal with AZ LEARNS and the formula, and vet those before they come before the Board for approval. The Subcommittee is chaired by Mr. Miller and Mr. Yanez has had conversations with Mr. Miller and with President Molera about that process.

President Molera asked Dr. Giovannone whether the alternative school model is based on statute.

Dr. Giovannone replied that state statute designates that there must be a parallel model for alternative schools. The AAG has sought guidance from their assistant attorney general on exactly what that means and so the AAG is trying to work on something that is parallel, but it may not be exactly the same.

President Molera asked Mr. Miller, as the chair of the Subcommittee, to consider looking at what would be an appropriate definition of alternative schools.

E. Presentation, discussion and consideration to adopt the National Evaluation Systems Assessment of Professional Knowledge-Elementary and Assessment of Professional Knowledge-Secondary exams for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements delineated in A.R.S. § 15-533

Dr. Butterfield

Ms. Amator, ADE's Deputy Association Superintendent for Educator Excellence, reminded the Board that teachers must take a subject knowledge test and a professional knowledge test to become certified. The professional knowledge test has to align with Arizona professional knowledge standards, which were changed on December 5, 2011. Therefore, ADE needs to align the professional knowledge exams to the new standards.

Because these are closely aligned with national standards, it makes sense that, rather than changing the Arizona Educator Proficiency Assessments (AEPA), ADE should adopt the National Evaluation Systems (NES) national professional knowledge test for elementary and secondary certification.

The test is computer based, so the testing windows are open more often, and there are opportunities for out of state people to take the test. The fee is \$20 less. The practice tests are full length rather than a 20 question walk-through, and they give specific feedback. There are a lot of diagnostics available specifically for this test. People can access and download their reports at no charge. Pearson Education, Inc. has developed a virtual walkthrough for going to a testing center so people can get comfortable with it. Higher education will still have access to results analyzers to look at how their program is preparing teachers to take the test.

ADE is asking the Board to adopt this test, effective September 2012, and use the national benchmark cut-score of 52 for multiple choice and 10 for constructed response.

Superintendent Huppenthal asked if this would change the percentage of teachers passing the professional knowledge test.

Sherry Downs, from Pearson Education, Inc., replied that Pearson has looked at the national passing scores compared to the AEPA, and they are within one point of each other. It is meant to be a different test with equal

challenge.

Superintendent Huppenthal asked for a summary on the change being made.

Ms. Downs explained that rather than creating a customized test for Arizona, Pearson can use a national standard test that already exists. They can reduce the timeline and reduce cost for those taking the test.

Mr. Moore asked if this is an exam teachers would take after four years of college to determine whether they would be certified to teach.

Ms. Amator replied that there are several things a prospective teacher must do, including coursework, a program and a content exam, and an exam on the professional knowledge they have gained. There are two proficiency tests, one of which is the content knowledge exam. The professional knowledge standards currently align with national standards, which opens up availability and reduces cost for candidates.

Mr. Moore asked what the process is if people do not pass the exams.

Ms. Amator explained that they get a score report. To get a detailed breakdown, they must pay a fee. There are very high passage rates for people who take the state approved course, and there are many resources available to help people pass. They can retest, but they cannot get certified unless they pass the test or a comparable test in another state.

Mr. Moore stated that he knew that Bryan Brayboy, Co-director of the Center for Indian Education at Arizona State University, mentioned that they have grow-your-own programs which are recruiting teacher aids from tribal and rural communities to participate in college programs to become teachers for their own communities. They have a significant rate of failure on the test. Mr. Moore was not sure which test, but they had over 200 individuals who had not been able to pass. Mr. Moore wondered if that was because of the test, or because of the quality of the program that is preparing them.

Ms. Amator replied that sometimes with the those types of programs, people do not have the necessary basic skills, which is why they asked the Board several years ago to adopt an optional AEPA basic skills test. Sometimes it is a language issue, since the tests are in English.

Beth Driscoll, Program Specialist with ADE's Educator Excellence unit, oversees the AEPA program and reviews higher education teacher and administrator preparation programs. Ms. Driscoll stated that the issue is that it is a measurement of liberal arts, which many individuals studied years prior to taking the exam, and doesn't necessarily correlate with the quality of the preparation program. Grow-your-own programs attract individuals who are re-careering, and their liberal arts experience may have been decades before their entrance into a teacher preparation program. To help bridge the gap, a greater degree of preparation materials is being offered through ADE's website so that people can tutor and self-study and get automatic feedback. Sometimes such individuals have to take a refresher course. This pertains to the subject knowledge test.

Ms. Driscoll added that the professional knowledge test does have direct correlation with the quality of the preparation program, and that is the test Ms. Amator was talking about changing. The pass rate for professional knowledge is much higher.

Vice President Tyree commented that the description of grow-your-own is one way that people might re-career, but he was more familiar with programs for people who may not have a degree, but have been working with schools in another fashion and want to use that experience. There is one program for special education students called PRIZE, for example. Vice President Tyree asked what Ms. Driscoll and Ms. Amator see with those

students - whether those students have the same central challenges Mr. Moore was asking about.

Ms. Driscoll replied that what is seen in grow-your-own programs is typically somebody without a bachelor's degree who has been an assistant or aide in a classroom. That is why ADE encourages those kinds of programs. Ms. Driscoll added, however, that the Yuma model often is different. With the Yuma program it is more likely to have students coming out of high school going to a community college, and then transferring on to teaching. Those individuals tend to have had their liberal arts recently, compared to someone who has raised a family and then decided to pursue a bachelor's degree. The big difference is how long it has been since the individuals have taken liberal arts courses, and their retention of it.

Superintendent Huppenthal moved to approve the National Evaluation Systems Assessment of Professional Knowledge-Elementary and Assessment of Professional Knowledge-Secondary for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements delineated in A.R.S. § 15-533.

Second by Mr. Miller

The motion passed unanimously.

F. Presentation and discussion regarding proposed rules to establish the following teaching certificates/endorsements:

Mr. Yanez

1. Native American Language Certificate/Endorsement
2. Online Instruction Endorsement

Mr. Yanez presented two issues, the first being a proposed Native American language certificate. Mr. Yanez brought forward a recommendation from the Board's Certification Advisory Committee (CAC) and explained why the recommendation had not been put on a Board agenda in terms of a rulemaking proposal.

Late last year, the CAC met and developed proposed language regarding the creation of a Native American language certificate. The requirements they set out are minimal. It is an optional certificate. The requirements are a valid fingerprint clearance card and proof of language proficiency. Since the issue is regarding Native American languages, it would have to be verified by the appropriate tribal authority, which is the same process for other certificate endorsements.

Mr Yanez stated that he had not brought this certificate language before the board because there are other requirements either as a result of court rulings or Arizona law that he wanted to analyze in terms of legality, and whether there were other items that would need to be included in the certificate language; specifically, the Structured English Immersion endorsement requirement, the testing requirements and the many other requirements in Title 15 that apply to teaching certificates. There are some items that would have to be amended and included in this particular certificate.

Ms. Carrie O'Brien, Assistant Attorney General for the Board, mentioned two specific issues. As a result of the Flores case and the consent order that the state entered into back in 2000, all teachers are required to receive training in Structured English Immersion. That is standard for every certificate that Arizona has had for many years. Ms. O'Brien was not sure how this certificate could have an exemption to that consent order. Teachers have to pass a US and Arizona Constitution exam. Statute specifically has exemptions for adult education classes, but again, Ms. O'Brien did not know if that exemption could apply to this certificate. Ms. O'Brien added that there is also already a bilingual education endorsement for a standard teaching certificate similar to this.

Mr. Yanez acknowledged that there is an interest in creating this certificate so that there is some ability for schools to provide instruction in their native language.

President Molera raised the topic of the online instruction endorsement. He stated that in his opinion, unless there was a real need for the endorsement, he did not like the fact that the Board was going to start creating barriers to entry without a clear explanation of why.

Mr. Yanez informed the Board that this topic was on the agenda for the purpose of starting the conversation. There had not yet been any work done to define what this online endorsement would look like.

Mr. Yanez continued by explaining that because there had been such a huge expansion in online course offerings in the last several years, there had been some interest in defining a course of study that would not be required, but that could be helpful in terms of instructional practice in the online environment. That is what the proposed certificate or endorsement would be. It would be optional.

In addition, there were requests from the field to create this endorsement as well as requests from legislators. Representative Heather Carter was very interested in the creation of some type of certificate or endorsement along these lines.

President Molera stated that it would be good for the Board to first figure out what and why they would want to do and then pursue that path.

Mr. Moore commented on the first issue that Mr. Yanez had brought up, regarding the certificate for Native American language, and how it was intended for those individuals who are not in the teaching profession, but are proficient in their language and looking at the potential of being in the classroom. Mr. Moore explained that it was his understanding that in New Mexico there is something similar that they are able to do which is probably related to statute. Mr. Moore acknowledged that part of problem for the certificate is that it must be consistent with state law, and he suggested that maybe another option would be to have some type of amendment go through the Legislature that might be a creative fix.

Mr. Moore asked if there was a similar model for Career and Technical Education (CTE).

Mr. Yanez replied that the exemption, with respect to CTE, had to do with course requirements, and that there are federal laws that allow work experience to take the place of course requirements for specific CTE areas. But the issue with the Native American language certificate is the AZ/US Constitution exam which applies to CTE as well. The Flores consent order applies to CTE as well.

Mr. Miller asked if rather than having the certificate be controlled by the state, whether there was the option of having individual tribes provide their own certificate in their native language, and then anyone who wanted to hire such an individual could do so.

Mr. Moore replied that the question was whether all tribes have that ability.

G. Board comments and future meeting dates – The executive director,
presiding officer or a member of the Board may present a brief summary
of current events pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K) and may discuss
future meeting dates and direct staff to place matters on a future agenda.
The Board will not discuss or take action on any current event summary.

Mr. Molera

President Molera stated that as the Board approached their annual retreat, it was important to have all of the positions filled on the Board. He asked for the assistance of Ms. Klein in obtaining the Board appointments from the Governor.

President Molera also asked the Board members to share with Mr. Yanez any items they felt strongly about, in order to assist Mr. Yanez in planning for a facilitator for the Board retreat. One item President Molera would like to discuss at the retreat was the issue of reforming the Professional Practices Advisory Committee's policies.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated that he would like to put the Group B teachers issue on the agenda with regards to the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness. The Superintendent also admitted to having missed Item 2C from the Consent Agenda regarding the reappointments to the WestEd Board of Directors. Before finalizing the re-appointments, Superintendent Huppenthal stated he would like to talk to the individuals more in-depth.

Superintendent Huppenthal moved to reconsider Item 2C.

Second by Ms. Ortiz-Parsons

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Moore recommended having a presentation from WestEd.

Superintendent Huppenthal moved to table Item 2C.

Second by Mr. Miller

The motion passed unanimously.

5. ADJOURN