

EDUCATOR RETENTION AND RECRUITMENT REPORT
Prepared by the Arizona Department of Education
Educator Retention and Recruitment Task Force

Second Report

January 2016

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Every student in Arizona deserves a highly effective teacher in their classroom.

Every educator deserves to be compensated for their performance, academic preparation, time and professionalism.

As schools across Arizona start the second half of a new school year, a severe shortage of effective teachers continues to lead the list of critical issues impacting their work. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Educator Retention and Recruitment Task force, composed of ADE staff, school and district personnel and other education stakeholders, persisted in researching nationally and locally to further inform our citizens of this crisis. One of the key findings from the Educator Retention and Recruitment Initial Report (January 2015) was the need to focus on the retention of our current teachers, hence the reversal of recruitment and retention in our task force name and second report to retention and recruitment. Nationally, 46% of new teachers leave the profession within the first five years of teaching (Hill, 2011). Salary, working conditions, and administration are the top three reasons teachers leave the profession (ERR Survey, 2015). With state universities only able to produce enough graduates to fill 50% of the open teaching positions, it is imperative to retain teachers (ADE Highly Qualified Teachers report, 2014). Based upon the research found in the Educator Retention and Recruitment Initial Report (January 2015), several topics surfaced as needing further research.

The Task force focused on four critical areas: economic impact; salaries, experience and quality; professional learning; and promising practices. Summaries of relevant research are included in each of the four critical areas. The report closes with recommendations to policymakers, educators and parent and community groups designed to ensure that all Arizona classrooms are guided by effective teachers, who are properly prepared, compensated and respected. Collective action on these recommendations is imperative to address the challenges that are impeding a quality public education system for all children and that ensures the economic future of Arizona.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

It is difficult to quantify the impact the K-12 system has on a local community but there are a few economic impact studies that shed some light on this area. The Flagstaff Unified School District (FUSD) published an economic impact study in May of 2012 and the Cave Creek Unified School District published a similar study in May of 2015. Lake Havasu City Unified School District also published its economic impact study in September 2015. There are some noteworthy findings.

In Flagstaff:

- The total impact on the local area during FY2011 was nearly 1800 jobs and approximately \$132.3 million.
- The graduating class of 2011 at Flagstaff's two high schools will earn an additional \$321 million between the ages of 18 and 65.
- Over their working lives, the past 20 graduating classes at FUSD should earn a combined \$8.5 billion in incremental earnings when compared to taxpayers without a diploma.
- If the entire FUSD class of 2011 stayed in Arizona until age 65, the state would collect \$13.6 million more in income tax, on the incremental income enabled by the earning power of a diploma.

In Cave Creek:

- The estimated contributions of all budget expenditures in the local economy were 888 jobs and \$58 million in overall economic activity.
- The estimated incremental earnings expected by the graduating class of FY2014 are over \$3 million annually and \$147 million by age 65.
- The five graduating classes between FY2010 and FY2014 are estimated to have incremental earnings of over \$15 million annually and \$704 million by age 65.
- The incremental state income tax collection enabled by increased earnings attributable to Cave Creek Unified graduates for FY14 is \$4.9 million by age 65.

In Lake Havasu City:

- FY2014 study showed contribution of 1037 jobs and \$58 million in overall economic activity.
- Graduating class of 2014 will earn \$2.6 million annually and over \$1 billion by age 65.
- Graduates of 2014 will have income tax earnings by age 65 of \$4 million.

Education is a critical economic driver in communities across Arizona. As this data shows, an educated, employed workforce contributes several million dollars not only to overall economic activity, but to state income tax collections. Without quality educators to prepare K-12 students for graduation and to enter the workforce, either through college or career pathways, the economic growth of a community will suffer.

Salary Comparison

In a recent news article by the local CBS affiliate, teachers reported leaving the profession due to low salaries. Andrew Morrill, president of the Arizona Education Association, reported his organization found that the top reason teachers leave the profession was that Arizona teachers' salaries are so low. "The average beginning teacher salary in the state of Arizona is \$31,874. We have teachers coming out of university with debt and they are struggling to make ends meet. With the cuts from various areas teachers have had to delve into their own funds to supplement their classrooms." (Loew 2015).

Graduates compare the annual salaries of a variety of professions to determine where they will make gainful employment. MIT compared the typical annual salary of a variety of occupations:

Occupational Area	Typical Annual Salary
Management	\$90,830
Computer & Mathematical	\$76,010
Legal	\$73,210
Architecture & Engineering	\$72,100
Healthcare Practitioners & Technical	\$67,000
Business & Financial Operations	\$60,020
Life, Physical, & Social Science	\$58,580
Installation, Maintenance, & Repair	\$41,620
Education, Training, & Library	\$39,970
Community & Social Service	\$38,960
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, & Media	\$38,440
Construction & Extraction	\$37,770
Office & Administrative Support	\$32,900

More and more school districts are reporting teachers leaving the profession due to the opportunities in other fields. The large difference in comparative salaries is creating the incentive for many to leave the profession.

Fixed Costs

Fixed costs have an impact on school districts. Fixed costs include utilities, food, and transportation. According to the most recent State Auditor General's report, school districts are spending an average per pupil of \$923 on utilities and plant operations, \$405 per pupil on food services, and \$373 per pupil on transportation. Since 2009, there has been an increase from 11.6% to 12.2% spent on plant operations. This is due to the increases for heating and cooling and other costs related to building maintenance and operation. In 2014, Arizona districts spent 5.3% of their maintenance and operations budget on food services. This is an increase from 2009 when 4.6% was spent by school districts. The increased food costs come primarily from the 23 cent increase per meal from 2009 to 2014. With the increase of fuel prices and transportation costs, the auditor general report states that Arizona school districts are spending approximately 4.9% of their maintenance and operations budget on student transportation, up from 4.3%. The report also stated that among rural districts fuel costs could be as high as 17% percent of their budget due to the length of travel and increasing fuel costs (State of Arizona Office of the Auditor General 2015). As fixed costs continue to rise, they will have a greater impact on every student's education as funds are taken away from the classroom.

SALARIES, EXPERIENCE, AND QUALITY

Cost of Living vs. Salary Comparison

The living wage, as an hourly rate, for an individual to support two adults and two children, if he/she is the sole provider and is working full-time in Phoenix, AZ is \$19.55 (Glasmeier & MIT, 2015). The poverty rate for an individual supporting two adults and two children and working full-time in Phoenix is \$10.60 (Glasmeier & MIT, 2015). The typical hourly wage of an educator in Phoenix is \$18.72 (Glasmeier & MIT, 2015). The typical teacher's salary is insufficient to support two adults and two children if he/she is the family's sole provider. While the hourly rate of the typical educator in Phoenix is \$8.12 an hour above the poverty rate, over a 40 hour work week a teacher, who has earned at least a bachelor's degree, makes only \$328.80 a week more than an individual living in poverty.

Inflation of Salaries in Education vs. Other Professions

Between 2004 and 2013, many professions and the minimum wage experienced an increase in starting salaries. While starting teacher salary increased from \$26,711 in 2004 to \$32,073 in 2013, this 20% increase was far less than the increase in salaries of other professions during this time frame (NACE, 2004; NACE, 2013; ASBA, 2013). The following table provides a summary of the increase in salaries between 2004 and 2013, and starting teacher salary is firmly entrenched in the bottom position.

	2004*	2013**	% Change
Minimum Wage	\$5.15	\$7.90	53
Psychology	\$25,032	\$37,200	49
Marketing	\$36,071	\$51,900	44
Finance	\$40,596	\$58,100	43
Liberal Arts	\$30,153	\$43,200	43
Nursing	\$37,253	\$52,000	40
Computer Engineering	\$53,117	\$70,300	32
Chemical Engineering	\$52,563	\$66,900	27
Accounting	\$42,045	\$53,500	27
Starting Teacher Salary	\$26,711	\$32,073	20

Cost of High Teacher Turnover

According to Dr. Richard Ingersoll, roughly half a million U.S. teachers leave the profession each year, costing American school districts approximately \$2.2 billion per year on teacher turnover (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014; Philips, 2015). According to Profiles of Teachers in the U.S. (2011), the \$2.2 billion annual expense on teacher turnover stems from 17% of all public school teachers and 20% of urban teachers quitting yearly. Teacher turnover expenses include teacher recruiting, training, mentoring, separation processing, and orientation. The high turnover rate is disproportionate in high-poverty schools (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014). While the monetary costs are extremely high, the effect on student learning is equally high.

Teacher turnover has many costs: financial costs for schools and districts, emotional and psychological costs for teachers and students, and achievement costs for students, especially those in low-income and low-performing schools as well as at-risk students (Watlington, Schockley, Gugliemino, & Felsher, 2010). According to Greenlee and Brown (2009), high turnover rate disproportionately affects high-poverty schools and compromises the capacity to ensure that all students have access to skilled teaching. Without access to highly effective and effective peers, mentors, and opportunities for collaboration and feedback, teachers' performance in high-poverty schools plateaus. High-poverty schools experience a teacher turnover rate of about 20 percent per calendar year, roughly 50 percent higher than the rate in more affluent schools (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014).

In 2007, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) completed an 18-month study of the costs of teacher turnover in which they examined the costs of recruiting, hiring, processing, and training teachers at both the school and district levels. In *The High Cost of Teacher Turnover* they found that the cost of turnover varies from district to district, largely dependent upon the size of the district and the types of induction programs the district implements. When the costs of teacher turnover are known, the cost-effectiveness of teacher induction and mentoring programs—designed to keep teachers in the classroom and improve classroom instruction—can be determined.

As a result NCTAF developed a *Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator* to help education leaders determine costs, so that they are in a better position to manage their resources to reduce teacher turnover and improve teaching quality. The Calculator enables school leaders and the general public to estimate the cost of teacher turnover in their own schools and districts.

Alliance for Excellent Education estimates that each teacher leaving a school costs the district \$12,546. (Average teacher salary in 1999–2000 = \$41,820 x .30 = \$12,546.) In the 1999–2000 school year, approximately 173,439 public school teachers left the profession, not including retirees. Thus, the number of leaving teachers (173,439) multiplied by the average cost of attrition (\$12,546) yields the total cost of attrition, \$2.17 billion, rounded to \$2.2 billion. A total of 394,140 left public schools in school year 1999–2000 (394,140 x \$12,546 = \$4.9 billion).

Due to the costs associated with teacher turnover, combined with teacher shortages, it is imperative that budgets fund and school districts design programs targeted to support and keep effective teachers in the classroom.

Comparison of Arizona’s Teacher Salary Structures and Salary Schedules

The vast majority of Arizona public school districts are classified as an elementary, unified, or union high school district. Public school districts can also be classified as accommodation or JTED districts. Elementary school districts typically serve grades kindergarten through eight, unified grades kindergarten through twelve, and union high school grades nine through twelve. The Arizona public school system is comprised of 97 elementary school districts, 95 unified school districts, 15 union high school districts, 8 accommodation districts, and 14 JTED districts. While the average starting salary in the districts only differs by \$764, the minimum and maximum starting salaries differ greatly. The table below breaks down the average starting salary based on district type (Arizona Education Association, 2012).

District Type	Minimum Starting Salary	Maximum Starting Salary	Average Starting Salary
Elementary K-8	\$25,414	\$42,000	\$33,150
Unified K-12	\$23,440	\$51,000	\$32,549
Union 9-12	\$28,370	\$38,828	\$33,313

Arizona school districts vary greatly by size and are categorized as small, medium, or large districts. The state public school system is comprised of 86 small school districts, 64 medium school districts, and 50 large school districts. Of the 86 small school districts, salary information was available for 81. Of the 64 medium school districts, salary information was available for 61. Forty-nine of 50 large school districts also provided salary information. Salaries increase with district size and there is a disparity amongst the districts in minimum and maximum starting salaries. See the table below for a summary of the differences (Arizona Education Association, February 2015).

District Size	Minimum with BA Starting Salary	Maximum with BA Starting Salary	Average Starting Salary
Small	\$23,440	\$42,000	\$31,699
Medium	\$25,414	\$51,000	\$32,813
Large	\$28,873	\$40,000	\$34,522

District Size	Minimum with MA Starting Salary	Maximum with MA Starting Salary	Average Starting Salary
Small	\$25,940	\$45,000	\$34,549
Medium	\$27,260	\$54,000	\$35,348
Large	\$31,645	\$42,617	\$36,679

Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers

Public school districts are required to self-report the evaluation classification of teaching staff to the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) on an annual basis. Each teacher in the state receives one of four performance classifications at the conclusion of each teacher's evaluation process. The performance classifications are ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective. An examination of the data from 2013 demonstrates an inequity between schools in the quartile with the lowest number of students living in poverty (Quartile 1) and the quartile containing schools that have the highest poverty rates (Quartile 4) (ADE, 2013). The tables below summarize the percentage of teachers in each performance category for both Quartile 1 and Quartile 4 (ADE, 2013).

Quartile 1	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly
14,718 Teachers	228	818	8,461	5,211
117,707 Students	1.5%	5.6%	57.5%	35.4%

Quartile 4	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly
10,535 Teachers	244	1,278	6,433	2,580
207,759 Students	2%	12%	61%	24%

High poverty students are taught by teachers classified as less than effective at a rate double that of students in Quartile 1 (14% > 7%). The ratio of students to teachers in Quartile 1 is 8:1 while the ratio of students to teachers in Quartile 4 is 20:1.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

While funding is at the top of the list, there are other reasons teachers leave the profession according to Ingersoll (2013). They are:

- Administration
- School climate and culture
- Respect and valued
- Resources and support

Teachers identify support as one of the top five reasons they leave the profession. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) is committed to providing teachers with the support they desire and need, as stated in Superintendent Diane Douglas' education plan, AZ Kids Can't Afford to Wait! (October 2015).

ADE is piloting models of support to implement promising practices in three key areas: leadership development, beginning teacher mentoring and induction, and teacher leadership. Through a three-year grant funded by American Express, in partnership with Learning Forward and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, a principal leadership program based on a systems approach for sustainability will provide training for 70 principals serving areas of high poverty and high minority populations in the metro Phoenix area. This program will provide training in building a positive school culture and climate. Principals will also acquire strategies that support teachers in an encouraging, collaborative environment.

Although many districts and schools offer a form of induction and mentoring support, Arizona does not require a formal induction or mentoring program for beginning teachers. The National Council on Teacher Quality, in their 2014 State Teacher Policy Yearbook, suggests setting a goal to require an effective induction program for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools. They suggest that such a program should ensure frequent mentoring support, especially in the first few weeks of school, that mentors be selected based on their own level of classroom effectiveness, and that only strategies that can be successfully implemented should be part of the program. A successful example is South Carolina, which requires all new teachers be assigned a mentor for one year. The state also mandates release

time for classroom observations, collaboration, and supportive conversations. Mentors are evaluated and provided stipends.

In survey results, many teachers again shared that a lack of professional growth opportunities was a significant reason for leaving education (ADE, 2015). Teachers expressed that they desired more opportunities to improve their teaching and grow professionally. They recognize that learning their content and pedagogy does not stop after graduation from a preparation program. Professional development opportunities offered at their schools and districts need to be aligned to the needs of the teachers to improve their effectiveness, and should not simply be mandatory trainings that do not directly impact their ability to improve student success. A “one size fits all” approach does not meet the needs of teachers any better than it does students. Teachers need differentiated support based upon identified areas of growth.

Teacher leader models of promise are being piloted to foster retention of highly effective and effective teachers. In partnership with the Arizona K12 Center, ADE is supporting the NT3 Seed Grant to increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers in classrooms across Arizona.

Master and mentor teachers are being used in many districts and schools to provide support and professional learning for improving teacher effectiveness. These teacher leaders often are partnered with teachers who have specific growth needs. As exemplar, experienced teachers, they can provide specific coaching based upon multiple observations of their mentee teachers and can also model effective teaching strategies within their mentees’ classrooms.

LEAs are implementing “grow your own” programs to build the teacher pipeline. Teachers who go back and teach in the communities they grew up in tend to stay in the profession. They already have built relationships and often have a system of support, working alongside teachers they had as students in the school system. Parents and community members who serve the schools as paraprofessionals and substitute teachers are key candidates to be teachers. There are several programs, both traditional and alternative, that help them earn their teacher credentials. All Arizona universities, as well as some outside the state through online courses, offer these programs. The community colleges also work closely with the universities for seamless transfer by offering a 2 year + 2 year model. ADE is a repository of information on these programs and can help potential teacher candidates select a program that meets their needs.

Several high schools offer the Educator Rising (formerly Future Educators Association) program as part of Career and Technical Education (CTE). These programs support growing your own by encouraging high school students to choose a career in teaching. As an example, the education professions program at Paradise Valley Community College has developed a partnership with Paradise Valley High School. The community college students, who are working towards their teaching degrees, plan activities with the high school students to promote teaching as a career.

ADE intends to support LEAs by being a repository of best practices for retaining and recruiting both beginning and veteran teachers and by providing technical assistance with teacher support programs. Partnerships with parents, educators, community members, and business and education organizations will remain a high priority as we all work together to address the educator shortage crisis in Arizona.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In its January 2015 report, the Educator Retention and Recruitment Task force identified a number of activities that policymakers, community members and educational leaders across Arizona could pursue to address factors that impact the current shortage of qualified educators. In this paper, the Task force has prioritized its recommendations to address the most critical issues.

Recommendations for Policymakers (legislators, State Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, local governing boards):

- Publicly acknowledge the value of the teaching profession and the critical need for effective teachers in all Arizona classrooms.
- Increase K-12 funding to address teacher compensation issues and make Arizona competitive in the marketplace.
- Support the Title 15 review to reduce the administrative burden on LEAs.

Recommendations for Parents and Community Members:

- Implement teacher appreciation and action coalitions (e.g., Tucson Values Teachers, Arizona Parent Network).
- Support educators – 98% of parents are satisfied with their teachers and schools as reported in the 2015 annual Title I surveys on parent satisfaction.
- Speak with legislators on education issues (e.g., students have too many substitute teachers).

LEA Retention Strategies:

- Commit to building the best possible work environment for educators.
- Develop and fund high quality structured induction (sustained, multi-year mentoring) programs for new educators.
- Arrange budget priorities to provide job-embedded, on-going, focused, relevant professional development for both teachers and principals.
- Provide opportunities for teacher leadership without leaving teaching.

LEA Recruitment Strategies:

- Review current salary/benefits packages – understand competition and identify local advantages
- Describe how educators are supported throughout their career and what advancement opportunities are provided in your district.
- Develop/expand an internal system to "grow your own," including partnering with higher education, and encourage instructional aides and substitute teachers to investigate what would be needed for certification.
- Develop high school programs such as Educators Rising to encourage students to evaluate the field of education as they review their options for post-secondary studies.
- Be strategic in recruitment efforts – advertise on the ADE website, attend career fairs, and form regional consortiums to support recruitment efforts.

ADE CERTIFICATION

In addition to providing technical assistance, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) is committed to reducing barriers for educator certification. In 2015, The State Board of Education adopted a variety of rule changes based upon educators' input and the recommendations of ADE. These changes were all designed to make renewals and reciprocity easier and provide more opportunities for teachers in order to improve the pipeline of quality educators.

- Secondary Certificate change: This certificate now covers grades 6-12 instead of grades 7-12.
- Substitute Grade Range change and Exemption Request: The Substitute Certificate now covers grades PreK-12. An exemption can be requested for an individual who only holds a Substitute Certificate if they will be in the SAME classroom beyond the 120 day limit. An exemption can only be granted for the same individual three times. The exemption CANNOT be requested for Emergency Substitute Certificate holders. An Exemption Request form is completed and must be signed by the Superintendent.
- Special Education Certificates: Changes were made as the latest research studies indicate that teacher training should not be based on disability category but on level of student support needed. Nationwide trends show that two thirds of states offer non-categorical certifications. Teacher recruitment from other states should increase due to the ease in reciprocity. Also, there were inconsistencies among Arizona universities in terms of teacher training. New certification requirements will increase the rigor and relevance of teacher training and this, in turn, should increase retention of special education teachers.
 - Effective January 1, 2016, the following six certificates were collapsed into two certificates, Mild-moderate Disability and Severe-profound Disability:
 - Cross-categorical
 - Severely and Profoundly Disabled
 - Emotional Disability
 - Learning Disability
 - Mental Retardation
 - Orthopedic Impairments or Other Health Impairments (OI/OHI)The hearing impaired and the visually impaired certificates will remain the same.
- ESL/Bilingual Endorsement: Allows individuals to demonstrate second language proficiency for the ESL and Bilingual Endorsements by submitting a passing score on appropriate NES foreign language subject knowledge exam or comparable out of state exam.

- SEI Endorsement: Changes the SEI Endorsement requirement to ONE 45 clock hour or 3 semester SEI course to qualify for the Full SEI Endorsement.
- Early Childhood Endorsement: Creates a Provisional Early Childhood Endorsement which would require an individual to take and pass the AEPA Early Childhood Subject Knowledge Exam in order to qualify. Eliminates the July 1, 2012 time frame in which three years full time early childhood teaching experience can be used to qualify under Option C.
- Reciprocal Administrative Certificates: Reciprocal Administrative Certificate rules will be moved out of the Administrative section of State Board rule and placed in the Reciprocal section. The time-frame for Reciprocal Administrative Certificates will change from one year to three years.

The following statutory changes were enacted by the legislature and signed by the governor:

- SEI Endorsement Time Frame: Extends the time frame from one year to three years to meet the SEI requirement. This timeframe aligns with other deficiency time frames.
- Reciprocal Teaching Certificate Time Frame: Extends the time frame of the Reciprocal Teaching Certificate from one year to three years to align with other deficiency time frames. Eliminates “Fingerprint Reciprocity” option and requires all applicants to have an IVP fingerprint card before applying for a certificate.
- STEM Certificate Technical Change: Expands the grade level of the STEM Certificate from 6-12 to 7-12 to align with the Secondary Certificate.

Future Recommendations

We need to explore ways the field of education can attract competent professionals. How do we address competition from other professions for people with the skill set we desire? Further research needs to be done to analyze the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. We will continue seeking ways to elevate the teaching profession so that it is valued and respected.

As we continue gathering and reviewing data, we intend to highlight what is working in retention and recruitment, both in Arizona and across the nation, so that districts and schools can replicate effective strategies.



Educator Retention and Recruitment Task Force Members

Dr. Lisa Aaroe
Director of Recruitment & Retention
Exceptional Student Services
Arizona Department of Education
Lisa.aaroe@azed.gov
Professional Learning Working Group

Sharon Boomer
Principal
Spectrum Elementary School
Gilbert Unified School District
Sharon.boomer@gilbertschools.net
Stories Working Group

Dr. Debbi Burdick
Superintendent
Cave Creek Unified School District
President Elect - AZ School
Administrators
dburdick@ccusd93.org
Stories working group

Dr. Renee' Clift
Associate Dean
College of Education
University of Arizona
rtclift@email.arizona.edu
What's Working? How? Working group

Dr. April Coleman
Instructional Leader
Mathematics Department
South Mountain High School
Secretary, Classrom Teachers Association
acoleman@phoenixunion.org
Professional Learning Working Group

Debbie D'Amore
Chief Deputy
Pima County Superintendent of Schools
Debbie.damore@schools.pima.gov
Stories Working Group

Nancy Diab
Principal
Sossam Middle School
Higley Unified School District
Nancy.diab@husd.org
Economic Impact Work Group

Melani Edwards
Director of Curriculum & Instruction
Casa Grande Union High School District
medwards@cguhsd.org
Professional Learning Working Group

Jaime Festa-Daigle, NBCT
AZ Master Teacher
Assistant Principal
Lake Havasu High School
Jfesta@havasu.k12.az.us

Stories Working Group

Stan Goligoski
Executive Director
Yavapai County Education Service Agency
Stan.goligoski@yavapai.us

What's Working? How? Working Group

Dr. Jennifer Gresko
Faculty Chair
Teacher Education and eLearning Design
Rio Salado Community College
Jennifer.gresko@riosalado.edu

Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Marjaneh Gilpatrick
Executive Director of Educational
Outreach
College in Education
Grand Canyon University
Marjaneh.Gilpatrick@gcu.edu

Economic Impact working group

Jason Hammond
Director of Human Resources
Phoenix Elementary School District
Jason.hammond@phxschools.org
Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Dr. Connie Harris
Director
AdvancED Arizona
charris@advanc-ed.org
Economic Impact working group

Erin Hart
Chief Operating Officer
Expect More Arizona
erin@expectmorearizona.org
Stories working group

Michael Henderson
Director of Initiatives
Rodel Foundation
mhenderson@rodelfoundations.org
Economic Impact working group

Dr. Jennifer Huber
PLS Director of Recruitment and
Retention
Exceptional Student Services
Arizona Department of Education
Jennifer.huber@azed.gov
Professional Learning working group

Dr. Beverly Hurley
Director of Academic Alliances
Strategic Educational Alliances
Grand Canyon University
Beverly.Hurley@gcu.edu
Professional Learning working group

Nora Jaramillo
Teacher Mentor Curriculum/Instruction
& Professional Development
Erickson Elementary School
Tucson Unified School District
Nora.jaramillo@tusd1.org
Professional Learning working group

Dr. Cecilia Johnson
Associate Superintendent
Highly Effective Teachers & Leaders
Division
Arizona Department of Education
Cecilia.johnson@azed.gov
Chair – ERR Task force

Dr. Jennifer Johnson
Executive Director of SOSAz
drjennifer.johnson33@gmail.com
What's Working? How? Working group

Dawn Lambson
Clinical Assistant Professor
Arizona State University
Dawn.lambson@asu.edu
Professional Learning working group

Dr. Susan Lugo
Director of Human Resources
Creighton School District
slugo@creightonschools.org
What's Working? How? Working group

Kristie Martorelli
2012 Teacher of the Year &
Professional Development Coordinator
Dysart Unified School District
kristie.martorelli@dysart.org
Chair – Professional Learning working group

Mark McCall
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Educator Excellence/Title II-A
Arizona Department of Education
Mark.McCall@azed.gov
Professional Learning working group

Sentari Minor
Director of Engagement & Education
Social Venture Partners of Arizona
sminor@svpaz.org
Stories working group

Mitchell Moore
Owner
Score Finance, LLC
mrmmdmoore@msn.com
Economic Impact working group

Shelly Morgan
Higher & Post-Secondary Education/
Regional Director
AZ TEACH.org
Shelley.morgan@teach.org
Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Dr. Kelly Olson-Stewart
Director of Curriculum & Innovation
Avondale Elementary School District
kstewart@avondale.k12.az.us

Stories working group

Martin Perez Jr.
Educator Fellow
Expect More Arizona

Martinprz89@gmail.com

Economic Impact Working Group

Connie Pangrazi
Assistant Dean of Teacher's College
Arizona State University

connie.pangrazi@asu.edu

Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Robin Peterson
Site Director
TNTP Teaching Fellows

Robin.peterson@tntp.org

Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Robbie Ramirez
Curriculum Facilitator
Maldonado Elementary School
Tucson Unified School District

Robbie.ramirez@tusd1.org

Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

Daniela Robles
Teacher Retention & PD Coordinator
Balsz School District

drobles@balsz.org

Stories working group

Maria Salzman
Executive Director
Tucson Values Teachers
msalzman@tucsonvaluesteachers.org

Economic Impact working group

Alma Sandigo
BME/ESL Assistant Clinical Professor
Northern Arizona University – Yuma

Alma.sandigo@nau.edu

What's Working? How working group

Dr. Margarita Jimenez-Silva
Associate Professor - Barret Honors
College

Arizona State University

Margarita.jimenez-silva@asu.edu

What's Working? How? Working Group

Dianne Smith
Executive Director
Greater Phx Educational Management
Council

dismith@pesd92.org

What's Working? How working group

Dr. Jeff Sprout
Executive Director of Human Resources
Laveen Elementary School District

jspout@laveeneld.org

Chair – What's Working? How? Working group

Dr. Paul Stanton
Superintendent
Washington Elementary School District

paul.stanton@wedschools.org

Chair – Economic Impact working group

Lorian Steider-Brady
ELD Specialist
Gateway Pointe Elementary
Lorian.steider-brady@husd.org
Salaries, Experience & Quality Working Group

Anthony J. Trifiro
Program Director
Arizona State University
ajtrifir@mainex1.asu.edu
Professional Learning working group

Lori Walk
Education & Reading Faculty
Glendale Community College
lori.walk@gccaz.edu
What's Working? How? Working group

Andrew Ward
Master Teacher Director
Arizona K-12 Center
award@azk12.org
Stories working group

Tanya Whiteford
Instructional Coach
Rogers Ranch Elementary
Laveen Elementary School District
twhiteford@laveeneld.org
Co-chair – Stories working group

Dr. Kathy Wiebke
Executive Director
Arizona K-12 Center
kwiebke@azk12.org
Co-chair – Stories working group

Dr. Traci Williams
School Psychologist
Tempe School District
1twillia@templeschools.org
drtraciwms@gmail.com
Stories working group

Justin Wing
Director of Human Resources
Washington Elementary School District
Justin.wing@wesdschool.org
Economic Impact working group

Michael Winters
Executive Director of Curriculum &
Instruction
Madison School District
mwinters@madisoned.org
Chair – Salaries, Experience & Quality working group

References

- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2014). Teacher attrition costs United States up to \$2.2 billion annually. Retrieved from all4ed.org/press/teacher-attrition-costs-united-states-up-to-2-2-billion-annually-says-new-alliance-report/
- Arizona Department of Education. (October 2015). *Arizona Kids Can't Afford to Wait*.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2013). Distribution of educator performance levels by county.
- Arizona Department of Education. (January 2015), Educator Recruitment and Retention Task Force Report
- Arizona Department of Education. (2015) Educator Retention and Recruitment Task force survey.
- Arizona Education Association. (2012). The AEA salary manual.
- Arizona Education Association. (2015). The AEA salary manual.
- Arizona Rural Policy Institute (2015) *The Regional Economic Contributions of Cave Creek Unified School District*.
- Arizona Rural Policy Institute (2015) *The Regional Economic Contributions of Lake Havasu Unified School District #93*.
- Arizona Rural Policy Institute. (2012) *The Economic Impact of Flagstaff Unified School District #1 on the Flagstaff Area Economy*.
- Arizona School Board Association. (2013). Salary survey.
- Barnes, G., Crowe, E., & Schaefer, B. (2007). The cost of teacher turnover in five districts: a pilot study. Retrieved from nctaf.org/wpcontent/uploads/CTTExecutiveSummaryfinal.pdf
- Glasmeier, A. & Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2015). Poverty in America living wage calculator. Retrieved from livingwage.mit.edu/places/0401355000
- Greenlee, B. & Brown, J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging schools. *Education*, 130, 96-109.
- Ingersoll, R. (October 18, 2013), Why do teachers quit? *The Atlantic Magazine*, interview by L. Riggs.
- Loew, M. (2015, June 11). AZ teacher Exodus Leaves More Than 1k Valley classrooms Vacant. CBS 5. Retrieved from: <http://www.kpho.com>.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2015) (<http://livingwage.mit.edu/metros/38060>)
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2004). NACE Salary survey. <https://careers.washington.edu/sites/default/files/all/editors/docs/2013-september-salary-survey.pdf>

National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2013). NACE Salary survey. Retrieved from <https://careers.washington.edu/sites/default/files/all/editors/docs/2013-september-salary-survey.pdf>

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2015). Teacher turnover cost calculator. Retrieved from nctaf.org/teacher-turnover-cost-calculator/

Phillips, O. (2015). Revolving door of teachers costs schools billions every year. Retrieved from www.npr.org/blogs/ed/2015/03/30/395322012/the-hidden-costs-of-teacher-turnover

State of Arizona Office of the Auditor General. (2015) *Arizona School District Spending (classroom dollars) Fiscal Year 2014*.

State Teacher Policy Yearbook (2015), National Council on Teacher Quality.

Watlinton, E., Shockley, R., Guglielmino, P., & Felsher, R. (2010). The high cost of leaving: an analysis of the cost of teacher turnover. *Journal of Education Finance*, 36, 22-37.