

**Minutes  
State Board of Education  
Monday, April 23, 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 9:02 am.

PERSON  
RESPONSIBLE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Molera

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hickman

**Members Present:**

Superintendent Huppenthal  
Mr. Jacks  
Ms. Klein  
Mr. Miller  
Mr. Moore  
Ms. Ortiz-Parsons  
Dr. Rottweiler  
Vice President Tyree  
President Molera

**Members Absent:**

Ms. Hamilton

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Mr. Molera

President Molera was named Most Admired CEO in a recent issue of *Phoenix Business Journal*. President Molera stated that this was an honor for the Board and the Executive Director. The Board has been influential in the last few years and effective in promoting good policy.

President Molera also reported that Governor Brewer made appointments to the Board. Ms. Amy Hamilton was re-appointed, and Mr. Roger Jacks was newly appointed. Mr. Jacks was present and President Molera asked Mr. Jacks to introduce himself.

Mr. Jacks shared that he had been the superintendent in the Kingman Unified School District for four years, and that he had been involved in education in Arizona for the past nineteen years. Mr. Jacks stated he was honored to be part of the Board and would try to be a contributing member.

B. Superintendent's Report

Supt. Huppenthal

Superintendent Huppenthal welcomed Mr. Jacks to the Board and stated he appreciated Mr. Jacks' leadership.

Superintendent Huppenthal then went on to report on three items: an update on the flexibility waiver for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), how he spent two days with a reporter from *Time* magazine, and an update on his request to the Legislature regarding funds for the AELAS modernization efforts.

Feedback and interactions with the federal government regarding the ESEA flexibility waiver had been positive. Arizona's application for a flexibility waiver was on a good track. One of the intended outcomes was that ADE would not have to ask the federal government for permission all the time.

Joe Klein, a reporter with *Time* magazine, spent two days conducting career and technical education visits. He and Superintendent Huppenthal met with representatives from the Peoria Unified School District, where great work was being done to improve graduation rates. Superintendent Huppenthal also visited the Four Corners area with Mr. Klein, where they witnessed high school students performing a veterinary surgery. School districts in that area are working on an agreement for a veterinary program with the universities. Mr. Klein got to trim the hooves of a two ton bull, and shared that the story may be moving from a column to a full page story.

Lastly, Superintendent Huppenthal stated that he had made good progress convincing the Legislature that the problem with the AELAS system is indeed a problem. The ADE IT Team is now in phase two of the project, which involves roll out of the plan. They have a solid plan, which ADE needs to communicate to the Legislature.

### C. Board Member Reports

The Members had nothing to report.

### D. Director's Report

1. Status of proposed amendments to K-12 procurement rules Mr. Yanez
2. Other items as necessary

Mr. Yanez gave a brief update regarding the drafting of new procurement rules. The field had been raising this issue for some time. Representative Crandell proposed a bill at the beginning of the legislative session, but it was put on hold to allow the Board to go through the process of amending the rules. Mr. Yanez received a draft of the amended rules from the business directors of a few school districts. The draft contains almost entirely new language and is 119 pages long. Mr. Yanez has been meeting with the Attorney General's office to review the draft, but it is going to take some time. They would have liked the new rules to be done in time for the next fiscal year, which begins July 1<sup>st</sup>, but that is unlikely. However, a draft of the new rules will be ready for Board review by that date. There is a lot of interest in this issue from the field. The new rules will result in a better, more streamlined procurement process.

Mr. Yanez also asked that Item 4E2 be removed from the agenda as the individual involved, Mr. Derrick Elliot, had withdrawn from the offered settlement agreement and the case was going to proceed to a hearing.

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Consideration to approve Arizona State Board of Education minutes for March 26, 2012 Mr. Yanez
- B. Consideration to approve the contract abstract for the 2012 Migrant Education Program Summer School Program Allocations Ms. Summers
- C. Consideration to re-appoint the following individuals to the WestEd board of directors: Mr. Yanez
  1. Dr. Beverly Hurley
  2. Dr. Wade McLean

3. Mr. Robert Rice

- D. Consideration to approve applications to participate in the Arizona Online Instruction program of the following school districts, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-808: Ms. Poplin
1. Amphitheater Unified School District
  2. Apache Junction Unified School District
  3. Flowing Wells Unified School District
  4. Littlefield Unified School District
  5. Queen Creek Unified School District
  6. Sunnyside Unified School District
  7. Yuma School District One
- E. Consideration to approve capital transportation adjustments for small school districts, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-963 Ms. Cloutier
- F. Consideration to accept funds from the United States Department of Agriculture for the State Cost of Implementation of New Meal Patterns for the National School Lunch Program and the National School Breakfast Program, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 15-1152 and 15-1153 Ms. Szafranski
- G. Consideration to approve the Interagency Service Agreement between the Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board (First Things First) and the Arizona Department of Education Ms. Corriveau
- H. Consideration to permanently revoke any and all teaching certificates held by the following individuals, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550 Mr. Easaw
1. Joseph A. Chanecka
  2. Michael A. Brown
- I. Consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and grant the teacher certification applications for the following individuals: Mr. Easaw
1. Colin Clayburn
  2. Sondra Lemke
- J. Consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee to deny Alrick Gladden’s application for certification as being substantively incomplete, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-534.01 Mr. Easaw
- K. Consideration to accept the voluntary surrender of the teaching certificates held by Thomas Warner Mr. Easaw

*Vice President Tyree moved to approve the Consent Agenda.  
Second by Ms. Ortiz-Parsons  
The motion passed unanimously.*

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No requests to speak

#### 4. GENERAL SESSION

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

Mr. Yanez

Monday, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 marked the 106<sup>th</sup> day of the Legislative Session. More than 300 bills had been passed and about 17 were vetoed by the Governor. During the previous week, the Governor announced she would veto any bills sent to her before a budget deal was reached. While the Legislature continued to move bills through the process, they were not transmitting those bills to the Governor.

House Bill 2270, regarding school districts and fiscal crisis teams, gives the Board the option of appointing a fiscal crisis team, instead of a receiver, to a school district that is insolvent or has grossly mismanaged its finances. It passed the Senate by a vote of 30 to 0, and was signed by the Governor on March 21<sup>st</sup>.

House Bill 2663, regarding underperforming school districts and reclassification, allows the Board to accelerate an F label for schools in certain circumstances. It passed the Senate by a vote of 28 to 1, and was signed by the Governor on March 21<sup>st</sup>.

House Bill 2161, regarding teachers and specialized certification, requires the Board rules governing teacher certification to provide for the issuance of a specialized teaching certificate for classroom teachers with expertise in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The bill was signed by the Governor. Mr. Yanez will begin working on these rules after the general effective date for the bill.

House Bill 2500, regarding poorly performing schools and intervention strategies, requires D and F schools to implement a STEM strategy under the supervision of the Board. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 5<sup>th</sup>.

House Bill 2563, regarding school electives and the subject of Biblical influence, requires the Board to include in the history or English/Language Arts curriculum standards, concepts about the history and literature of the Old Testament era and the New Testament era. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 17<sup>th</sup>.

House Bill 2598, regarding school improvement plans and parental involvement, requires school improvement plans to include a parental involvement strategy. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 18<sup>th</sup>. This bill does not imply direct Board involvement, but school improvement plans are part of the overall plan the Board sees when a school becomes failing, so this is something the Board has influence over.

House Bill 2697, regarding teacher certification and subject knowledge exams, allows the Board to exempt persons applying for a secondary education certificate from the subject knowledge portion of the proficiency exam, if the Board determines that the person has work experience in science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) and can demonstrate knowledge of a particular subject through a post secondary education degree or twenty-four credit hours of relevant coursework. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. This is essentially a waiver for certain subject areas to have teacher certification if a person comes from a STEM field and can demonstrate that.

House Bill 2823, regarding the teacher and principal evaluation framework, requires the Board, on or before

December 1, 2012, to adopt four performance classifications (highly effective, effective, developing and ineffective), as well as guidelines for school districts and charter schools to use in their instruments. The bill also incorporates concepts from Senate Bill 1457, which allows districts and charters to delay implementation of the instrument for one year if they adopt a plan and meet certain benchmarks, and allows the Department of Education to develop a model instrument that may be pilot tested. The bill was signed by the Governor on April 12<sup>th</sup>.

There are a host of other provisions in the bill; these are the ones that directly impact the Board. The bill does include requirements that local governing boards adopt policies regarding how evaluations will be used. There are some criteria dealing with retention and transfers for teachers that mandate certain consequences for teachers that are in either the lowest or second lowest performance categories. This will require the Board to look at the existing framework and make some changes. Based on the language of the bill, those changes are not drastic, but the primary change will be that the Board will have to identify the four performance classifications, which the bill spells out. At a future meeting, Mr. Yanez will present proposals to be incorporated into the evaluation framework.

Senate Bill 1255, regarding mastery of competency, directs the Board to adopt rules to define competency-based educational pathways that may be used by schools, identifies four options for those pursuing a competency-based diploma, and specifies the per-pupil distribution and other requirements for each option. This bill was signed by the Governor on March 29<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Yanez added that the process set forth in this bill is no different from processes currently in Board rule, and that the Board simply needs to figure out how to apply the rules to middle school grades.

Senate Bill 1259, regarding on-line course requirements and funding, establishes a process for students in grades seven through twelve to enroll in online courses as part of their regular course load beginning July 1, 2013, and outlines the process and funding mechanism. The bill, as amended, places responsibility for course approval on the Department of Education, and requires the Board to establish a master rubric to be used by the Department for course approval, and adopt criteria to ensure quality and effectiveness. The bill also requires the Board to set an administrative fee, specifies distribution of that fee and allows the Board to retain one quarter of the fee. The bill passed the House on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, on reconsideration, and was waiting for final action by the Senate. Mr. Yanez added that, depending on the number of courses providers submit for approval, this could be a burden on the Board and the Department.

Ms. Klein asked if SB 1259 put the Board in the position of approving curriculum instead of overall standards, and whether there was an opportunity to make changes before the bill went to the Governor to be signed.

President Molera replied that the Board should look at significant areas that need to be modified to focus on academic achievement. The Board should not be in the curriculum design business, although it would be appropriate if it was aligned with other reforms. President Molera stated that the Board should build on this, look at tools that might be helpful for improvement plans and look at how it is used to improve kids in failing schools.

- B. Presentation and discussion regarding policy implications for the transition from Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) to Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). Discussion may include, but is not limited to, policy implications for school accountability, high stakes testing, norm-referenced testing and school readiness.

Mr. Yanez  
Ms. Alley

Mr. Yanez reminded the Board that at the last meeting, the Board had asked for a spreadsheet of the policy issues and a timeline of when the policies would need to be addressed. The current presentation was a high level overview of the issues raised by the transition to PARCC. There are five main areas impacted by the transition to PARCC: high school exams, accountability, norm-referenced test requirements, communication and computer based assessments.

With regards to high school exams, one issue is the transition to end-of-course assessments and whether the Board should mandate a single course sequence for mathematics. Some LEAs offer an "integrated math" class that incorporates elements of two or more traditional math courses (e.g. Algebra I and Geometry). PARCC is planning to build an assessment to accommodate these integrated courses; however, each state must decide whether to offer the specialized assessment. Concerns about permitting the integrated model center on the comparability of the test results. A decision should be made before this fall, as entering freshman will take the new assessments during their junior year. Furthermore, schools need a heads up to prepare for what their course sequence is going to be. If an integrated sequence is not allowed, schools need to know.

Another issue related to high school exams is high school graduation requirements and which end-of-course assessments should comprise the high stakes requirement. The existing high stakes requirements for reading, writing and mathematics are set at the tenth grade level. The Board will be required to determine whether to maintain the requirement at the existing level, or whether to raise it to the level of college/career readiness. The deadline for Board consideration is summer of 2013.

The third issue related to high school exams is which cohort will be required to meet the PARCC requirements as opposed to the AIMS requirements. The Board must ensure that each student has an opportunity to learn those standards that will be used to comprise the high stakes graduation requirement. This makes a clean transition from AIMS to PARCC during the 2014-2015 school year problematic. The Board should make a decision this fall.

With regards to accountability, the first issue is the impact of the PARCC assessments on the school accountability system (A-F system) and whether the formula should be modified to account for the increased rigor of the assessments. It is expected that the composite side of the current model will be most impacted by the new assessments, likely resulting in a downward trend in A-F labels. A final decision cannot be made until after standards setting is completed. The timeline is pushed to 2015 because that is when standards setting will occur for PARCC. The Board also needs to decide how to assess the impact of the break in trend lines that will begin in 2015 (measuring academic growth).

The next accountability issue is the impact of the PARCC assessments on the new teacher/principal evaluation systems, and whether the teacher evaluation framework should be modified to account for the new assessments. The Board would need to make this decision by fall of 2013. Furthermore, the transition has bearing on the adopted framework. The Board may be required to update the existing teacher/principal evaluation framework to include the new assessments. Updates would need to be done by the spring of 2014.

The other issue regarding the impact of PARCC on the teacher/principal evaluations is what information needs to be conveyed to LEAs in advance of full implementation to prepare for the new assessments. This should be included as part of a comprehensive communication plan for implementation of the new standards and assessments.

With regards to accountability and the impact of the PARCC assessments on the Move on When Reading initiative, the issue is what will constitute "falls far below the third grade level." A final decision cannot be made until after standards setting is completed. Once this is complete and performance levels are established

the Board can determine whether to use the lowest performance level (current practice), or to set an alternative score that would mandate retention at third grade. An interim decision will have to be made since standards setting will occur after retention decisions will be made for the 2015-2016 school year. An interim decision must be made by the Board by the summer of 2014. A final decision must be made by the summer of 2015.

With regards to norm-referenced test (NRT) requirements, there is a statutory requirement for the administration of an NRT; presently the SAT 10. The Board needs to decide whether to look at alternative methods to meet this requirement. The current "dual purpose assessment" model will not be possible with PARCC. If PARCC cannot meet the NRT requirement schools will be forced to administer a separate NRT and assessment costs will increase. This decision needs to be made by October, before the 2013 Legislative Session begins.

Regarding communication, it is important for the PARCC assessments to be meaningful to higher education. Cut scores on the PARCC assessments need to culminate in scores that demonstrate college and career readiness. Cut scores will be set cooperatively with the other participating PARCC states. Arizona IHEs need to be engaged in this process to ensure the assessments have value to students moving into post-secondary work. Cut scores will be established through the PARCC Consortium during the 2014-2015 school year.

With regards to managing public and political expectations, a comprehensive communication plan is needed to ensure the K-12 community, the general public, and policy makers understand the initial impact of the new standards and assessments. The AZ READY Council has agreed to coordinate this work among the key stakeholders.

The last communications issue is LEA preparation for full implementation of the new standards and assessments. Beyond training on the new standards, decisions need to be made as to what information needs to be communicated to LEAs in advance of full implementation to prepare for the new assessments. The impact of new standards and assessments on teacher/principal evaluations, third grade retention, high school graduation and school accountability labels must be considered.

Finally, the issue with computer-based assessments is statewide readiness. Different options must be considered in the event Arizona cannot be prepared for computer-based assessments by 2014-2015. ADE and Pearson are currently conducting a readiness assessment. This assessment will assist in determining the state's needs with respect to staffing, infrastructure and device needs. Options will be ready for Board consideration by the fall of 2013.

President Molera commented that the Board and ADE need to have an honest conversation about the costs associated with implementing PARCC, and then communicating that to the Legislature.

Superintendent Huppenthal asked Ms. Alley for a rough estimate of the current cost of AIMS and what PARCC would be.

Ms. Alley replied that the preliminary data indicates the cost of assessment will go up about \$10-12 per student. There is hand-scoring associated with PARCC that results in a higher cost, and was not part of AIMS. Not only is the cost per student going up, but the number of students is going up as well, because ninth and eleventh graders will be assessed when they were not with AIMS.

President Molera stated he would like to set up meetings and deadlines around dates when the Board needs to make key decisions; meetings that include input from staff and the field.

Superintendent Huppenthal commented that the shift in standards can give the illusion that academic gains in Arizona have gone down when in reality they are improving, and that it is important to consider this and deal with the impact on the public.

- C. Presentation and discussion regarding proposed parallel accountability models for small and alternative schools, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-241(G).  
The Board may take action to approve related recommendations from the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee.

Dr. Giovannone

Dr. Giovannone, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Research and Evaluation for the Arizona Department of Education, presented information on the proposed parallel accountability models for small and alternative schools.

Small schools are defined as having 100 or fewer students enrolled in the first day of the AIMS testing window in the current school year. This is to capture the majority of students across all grades tested as late in the school year as possible. This definition will also apply to high schools, and refers to actual enrollment days, not average daily membership (ADM). There are 214 schools that fit this definition, and they serve approximately 11,385 students. This excludes 73 schools that are both small and alternative. 98 of the small schools are located in rural areas and 116 are located in urban areas. 134 small schools are charter schools.

The composite side of the model is composed of a pooled three year average of the percentage of students passing AIMS and AIMS A, ELL reclassification, graduation rate and dropout rate. The percent passing will be a pooled 3-year average for grades 3-8 and 10 using AIMS and AIMS A test scores. For grades 11 and 12, the better of fall or spring AIMS test scores will be used.

Small schools can earn 0-3 points for their ELL reclassification rates, 0-3 points for their graduation rates and 0-3 points for their dropout rates. The same criteria are used for small schools as are used in the traditional model for each of those three areas.

On growth for all students, a pooled 3-year median growth percentile would be used. On growth for the bottom 25% of students, a pooled 3-year median growth percentile would also be used. The growth component will be bound by 1.

For schools or small schools that have fewer than 30 records after calculating pooled 3-year average percent passing the recommendation is to base percent passing and median growth calculations on five years of pooled data. Additional points and other relevant A-F components would be earned and calculated in the same manner as presented and included in the calculation of a school's final letter grade. Schools not meeting the minimum count of 30 students after pooling five years of data would not be assigned a letter grade; they would be labeled 'Not Rated' (NR).

Mr. Miller shared that the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee was able to come to an agreement on the small schools model as it was presented by staff, and the members of the Subcommittee recommend to the Board that they approve the model as it was presented. There was a concern about having a large distribution of schools falling into the D category, which may be a result of a lot of small schools really being alternative schools. Those schools should consider applying for alternative status, because, based on input from the field at the Subcommittee meeting, most of the kids they serve fall into alternative status.

President invited members of the public to speak.

Ms. Henderson, from the governing board of Concordia Charter Schools, asked the Board to look at the number of small schools that are charters; more than two thirds. Ms. Henderson argued that no charter representative had been allowed to be part of the group that made recommendations to ADE staff. Charter schools that are small, but not necessarily alternative, are about student and parent choice. There are few students being served at the lower end of the alternative model. The concern with labeling a small K-6 school as an alternative school is having to tell a kindergartener they are an alternative student. Ms. Henderson asked the Board to wait before approving the small school model, and recommend to ADE staff that they involve small charter schools in the process, bringing the topic back after there had been a greater chance for input.

Superintendent Huppenthal stated the policy mandates that the Board has to grade every school and ADE staff applied the best science to the mandate.

Ms. Henderson commented that she had heard the data may not be pure. Data for one or two students in a school of 87 students has a huge impact on the school's overall score.

Superintendent Huppenthal replied that ADE is working on the computer systems that may have been responsible for creating faulty data, but the science applied by staff to create the small schools model is independent of that computer system. Superintendent Huppenthal asked what specific recommendations Ms. Henderson had for the small schools model.

Ms. Henderson answered that she and her colleagues would recommend looking at growth outcomes and at different outcomes, for example, persistence year to year. Another recommendation was to consider the progress of students who, prior to entering the small school, had been retained by other districts.

Ms. Klein asked Mr. Miller for his feedback.

Mr. Miller stated that the conversation to which Ms. Henderson was referring was held by ADE and the Attorney General's Office in making recommendations to the Subcommittee. In all but one Subcommittee meeting there had been some representation from small schools, and the Subcommittee could not find any reason not to implement the small schools model. The major concern was the n count, but once the Subcommittee worked through that issue, the model still meets the requirements and is fair to the schools. Mr. Miller added that, in his opinion, most of the kids being serviced at these schools fall under the alternative population category and need a small school environment, and that a significant majority of the numbers would end up being alternative.

*Mr. Miller moved to approve the recommendations of the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee and approve the parallel accountability model for small schools and extremely small schools as presented.*

*Second by Superintendent Huppenthal*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

Dr. Giovannone presented information about the proposed alternative schools model.

Schools that apply to ADE for Alternative School Status have educational programs and support services that match their stated missions. These schools must serve students with behavioral issues (documented history of disruptive behavior), students identified as dropouts, students in poor academic standing who are either severely behind on academic credits (more than one year) or have demonstrated a pattern of failing grades, are pregnant and/or parenting students, or are adjudicated youth.

There are currently 151 alternative schools open and in operation (87% serve high school students). Their average number of students is 168. 16% are special education students. 46% are eligible for Free/Reduced Lunches. 38 of the schools are located in rural settings, and 113 are located in urban settings. 93 of the alternative schools are charter schools. The average dropout rate is 15%. The 5-yr graduation rate from the 09-10 school year was 40%, and the 3-yr average graduation rate (5-yr rate) was 38%.

ADE recommends a 70/30 weighting, with the growth score making up 70% of the grade and the composite score making up 30% of the grade. On the growth side will be growth for all students, which will be a pooled 3-yr median, and improvement, which will be the increase in AIMS performance level. For high schools, this will be improvement across performance levels. On the composite side is academic outcomes, which include the percent passing AIMS and AIMS A, ELL reclassification, graduation rate and academic persistence.

The current definition of Full Academic Year (FAY) is limiting in three important ways. It limits the proportion of alternative students included for school accountability, does not represent the reality for many alternative schools given the circumstances of their students, and some Arizona Online Instruction (AOI) schools lack any FAY students under current definition because of open-entry/open-exit policies in some schools.

The recommendation is an alternative full academic year based on the percentage of membership days a student is enrolled in a school in the current academic year. It would be the number of membership days a student is enrolled in the current year, divided by the number of instructional days in the current school calendar. The threshold, then, is that the student is enrolled for at least 54 instructional days (30%) in the current school year. The average percentage of students enrolled in alternative high schools is 68%, with a standard deviation of 38%.

For percent passing, the model will use a pooled three year average for grades 3-8 and 10 on AIMS and AIMS A test scores. For grades 11 and 12, the model will use the better of fall or spring AIMS test scores. This pooled three year average is similar to other models.

For the ELL reclassification rate, the same criteria will be used as is used in the traditional A-F letter grade model. It will use a school wide *n* count equal to or greater than 10 ELL students; the school must have 95% of their students tested on the AZELLA end-of-year testing, to include all ELL students (SEI, ILLP, bilingual and parent withdrawn; and 30% reclassification of FAY (traditional definition) ELL students.

For graduation rates, the threshold is set at one half of a standard deviation above the alternative schools' statewide average graduation rates.

With regards to academic persistence, it is intended to be a proxy for an effective alternative school and an indicator of school quality. It incentivizes alternative schools to keep students engaged in a school setting across school years. A school would have to meet a 70% threshold (72% is the statewide alternative school average). The recommendation is to define an academically persistent student as one who returns to any public school the following school year (includes retained students).

On the growth for all students, the model uses a pooled three year median growth percentile, based on the test scores from grades 3-8 and 10. With regards to the improvement measure, it would capture the academic improvement across performance bands from one performance level to a higher performance level, such as FFB to Approaches, Meets, or Exceeds, or Approaches to Meets or Exceeds, or Meets to Exceeds. Students in Grades 11 and 12 must have test scores in the two most recent test administrations; spring AIMS 2010 to fall

AIMS 2011, which would be across school years, or fall AIMS 2011 to spring AIMS 2012, which would be within the same school year.

With regards to which weighting procedure to apply for the calculation of an alternative school's final letter grade, equal weighting places the same emphasis on the composite and growth components of the proposed model so that each is worth 50% of an alternative school's final letter grade. Differentiated weighting places greater emphasis on either the growth or the composite component of the model. The recommendation is 70% weight on growth and 30% weight on composite.

For the letter grade scale, it would need to be determined whether an alternative school's final letter grade is based upon a traditional scale or an adjusted scale reflective of alternative school performance. A traditional scale would include the same letter grade thresholds as the traditional A-F letter grade scale, and the total number of points possible would be equal to 200 points. The recommendation is to use a distribution-based scale that would include letter grade thresholds based upon the mean and standard deviations of the total point distributions. The total number of points possible would still be equal to 200 point

The value of additional points in the composite portion would also need to be determined, as well as how these points are treated in the calculation of an alternative school's final letter grade. The decision is whether additional points are worth three points per category or ten points per category. Also to be decided is whether the additional points are added within the weighting or outside of the calculation of total points. The recommendation is for schools to be able to earn zero or three points for ELL, graduation rate, and academic persistence, with additional points added after the weighting procedure.

President Molera appointed Mr. Jacks to be a member on the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee, replacing Dr. Balentine.

Dr. Schlessman, president of the board of directors for the Arizona Alternative Education Consortium, spoke on behalf of the Consortium's Alternative School Accountability Committee. The committee members are extremely encouraged that their voice has been heard by ADE's Research and Evaluation Unit. Many things in the presentation corresponded to the framework the Consortium recommended. The Consortium supports the model. Dr. Schlessman commented that the area that still needs work is the new definition of FAY. The Consortium received information about the new definition earlier the previous week, and had not had an opportunity to give feedback to ADE staff. The Committee members have looked at models used in other states. For example, in California, they use an 85 or 90 day model. The Committee members were eager to have that conversation.

D. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and revoke the certificates held by Bruce J. Fleming

Mr. Easaw

Mr. Easaw, Chief Investigator for the Board's Investigative Unit, stated that Mr. Fleming had issues with language in front of students, and had also failed to follow through with recommended counseling. At the hearing on March 13<sup>th</sup>, the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (PPAC) recommended that Mr. Fleming's certificate be revoked.

*Mr. Moore moved to approve the revocation of the teaching certificates held by Bruce Fleming.  
Second by Vice President Tyree  
The motion passed unanimously.*

E. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the proposed settlement agreements and suspend the teaching certificates held by the following individuals:

Mr. Easaw

1. Christine Mazza
2. Derrick Elliott

Mr. Easaw stated that Ms. Mazza had issues with her teaching career on only one day, when she used an inappropriate choke hold on a six-year-old autistic student. The PPAC hearing was held on March 13<sup>th</sup>, at which it was decided to recommend a two year, partially retroactive suspension of Ms. Mazza's teaching certificates.

Ms. Klein clarified that Ms. Mazza would be able to start teaching the following month; that although the suspension was just now being approved, it would be concluded the following month.

Mr. Easaw confirmed that was the case, but that negotiations in this matter had started in June of 2011; the case had been ongoing for some time.

Ms. Klein asked what was reflected on Ms. Mazza's record; whether it would show that her license had been suspended and if it would be up to the potential employer to hire Ms. Mazza or not.

Mr. Easaw responded that the suspension would be reported to the national association and entered into the national database, and that each state and territory will have knowledge that her license was suspended for a period of time. Typically what other jurisdictions will do is call the Investigative Unit to find out the basis for the suspension.

Mr. Yanez added that any Arizona school district would see the suspension on Ms. Mazza's record, and that school districts are required to verify the status of an individual's certificate prior to hiring them. Anyone looking at Ms. Mazza's certificate will see the suspension.

Ms. Klein stated that the Members did not have a police report regarding the incident and asked if there was one.

Mr. Easaw stated there was no report in the materials given to the Board Members.

Mr. Yanez explained that this was a negotiated settlement agreement, and all the facts were agreed to between the parties. If the case had gone to hearing, the Board Members would have all the records, including a police report, but because this was a settlement agreement, the Members were only given the documents from the agreement.

President Molera commented that it was the preference of the Board not to accept retroactive suspensions, and that the Board would be discussing reforming the PPAC process.

*Mr. Moore moved to accept the proposed settlement agreement and suspend the teaching certificates held by Christine Mazza.*

*Second by Vice President Tyree*

*Ms. Ortiz-Parsons opposed, all others approved*

*The motion passed.*

F. Presentation and discussion regarding the initial draft of the Next

Ms. Wieser

## Generation Science Standards

Ms. Wieser, the Science Education Specialist for ADE, stated that Arizona is one of the twenty-six lead states in the development of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). The first public draft of the NGSS was going to be released on May 7<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Wieser wanted to provide the Board with information regarding the vision, content and structure of the standards so the Board would have that information prior to the public release.

The framework for NGSS has a new vision of science learning that leads to a new vision of teaching. The NGSS is designed to help realize a vision for education in the sciences and engineering in which all students, over multiple years of school, actively engage in science and engineering practices and apply crosscutting concepts to deepen their understanding of the core ideas in these fields.

The National Research Council (NRC) is responsible for the development of the framework. The NRC is the staff arm of the National Academy of Sciences. The NGSS development team was an NRC team of 18 nationally and internationally known individuals in their fields, including practicing scientists, two Nobel laureates, cognitive scientists, science education researchers, and science education standards and policy experts. Four design teams, in physical science, life science, earth/space science, and engineering developed the framework for their respective disciplinary area.

A public draft was released in July of 2010. The NRC reviewed comments and considered all feedback prior to releasing the final framework on July 19, 2011. The framework contains three dimensions: scientific and engineering practices, crosscutting concepts and disciplinary core ideas.

The first dimension, scientific and engineering practices involves asking questions and defining problems; developing and using models; planning and carrying out investigations; analyzing and interpreting data; using mathematics and computational thinking; developing explanations and designing solutions; engaging in argument from evidence; and obtaining, evaluating, and communicating information.

The second dimension, cross cutting concepts, has applications across all domains of science. They are a way to link the different domains of science, and they include patterns, similarity, and diversity; cause and effect; scale, proportion and quantity; systems and system models; energy and matter; structure and function; and stability and change.

In order to be considered a cross cutting concept, the concepts need to be explicit for students to provide an organizational schema for interrelating knowledge from various science fields into a coherent and scientifically based view of the world. They must also cross disciplinary boundaries and contribute to the sense making that leads to students valuing and using science and engineering practices. Lastly, crosscutting concepts must have value in supporting understanding of the natural sciences and engineering to use science to explain novel phenomena.

The third dimension, disciplinary core ideas, focuses K-12 science curriculum, instruction and assessments on the most important aspects of science. Disciplinary ideas are grouped in four domains: the physical sciences; the life sciences; the Earth and space sciences; and engineering, technology and applications of science.

To be considered core, the ideas should meet at least two of the following criteria and ideally all four: have broad importance across multiple sciences or engineering disciplines or be a key organizing concept of a single discipline; provide a key tool for understanding or investigating more complex ideas and solving problems; relate to the interests and life experiences of students or be connected to societal or personal concerns

that require scientific or technological knowledge; be teachable and learnable over multiple grades at increasing levels of depth and sophistication.

The disciplinary core ideas for the physical sciences are matter and its interactions; motion and stability: forces and interactions; energy; and waves and their applications in technologies for information transfer. The disciplinary core ideas for the life sciences are from molecules to organisms: structures and processes; ecosystems: interactions, energy, and dynamics; heredity: inheritance and variation of traits; and biological evolution: unity and diversity. The disciplinary core ideas for the Earth and space sciences are Earth's place in the universe; Earth's systems; and Earth and human activity. The disciplinary core ideas for engineering, technology and applications of science are engineering design; and links among engineering, technology, science and society.

The vision for the NGSS is to have a collaborative, state-led process, rich in content, and to provide all students access to a challenging science education. The NGSS will be based on the Framework for K-12 Science Education and arranged in a coherent manner across grades, integrating all three dimensions. The NGSS are anticipated to be completed in late 2012.

The lead states are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington and West Virginia. These states have agreed to seriously consider adoption of NGSS once they are complete at the end of 2012. These states have also created committees that are responsible for reviewing and providing feedback about draft versions of NGSS to Achieve.

Arizona stakeholders represent education, science, business and industry and have interest in the NGSS. They include elementary, middle and high school science teachers from district and charter schools in urban and rural communities; science coordinators/directors and administration; postsecondary educators, including professors of science education, life science, physical science, Earth/space science and engineering and technology; representatives from business, industry and workforce development; informal education and non-profit foundations; and professional organizations in science education and engineering. Arizona stakeholders will critique confidential drafts of the standards and provide feedback to the writers and Achieve.

The standards will be open for two rounds of public feedback to help guide the writing team. Feedback will be aggregated and made public, and the first public draft of the standards will be available on [www.nextgenscience.org](http://www.nextgenscience.org) in late April 2012.

President Molera asked what impact NGSS would have on the existing science standards.

Ms. Wieser replied that Achieve's hope is that states would adopt NGSS in total so that they become common across the states in order to leverage scalability. At this point there are not any funding requirements, unlike with the common core. It depends on the final standards, but the hope is to have the Board approve NGSS. Depending on the leadership committee, the recommendation may be to adopt NGSS with revisions, or use them as a basis for a new standards development process.

President Molera commented that the Board cannot ignore the budget implications of introducing these standards into the new assessment system that is being introduced, and asked that ADE give the Board recommendations about how to integrate NGSS with the Common Core Standards and PARCC.

Ms. Wieser replied that the leadership committee is having those discussions with Achieve.

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

Mr. Yanez shared that June 5<sup>th</sup> appeared to be the best date for the upcoming Board Retreat, although he was still waiting to hear back from a couple of Board members regarding which date would work best for them.

## 5. ADJOURN

*Ms. Ortiz-Parsons moved to adjourn.*

*Second by Mr. Miller*

*The motion passed unanimously.*