

Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, March 28, 2011

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:05 AM.

Members Present:

Dr. Vicki Balentine
Mr. Jacob Moore
Ms. Amy Hamilton
Ms. Eileen Klein
Mr. Gregory Miller
Mr. Jaime Molera
Mr. Thomas Tyree
Dr. James Horton

Members Absent:

Supt. Huppenthal
Ms. Ortiz-Parsons
Dr. Shelton

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

ROLL CALL

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Mr. Molera state the issues he would like to discuss were imbedded in the agenda and he would further discuss when each item was presented.

B. Superintendent's Report

No report.

C. Board Member Reports

Mr. Tyree attended the National Association for Alternative Certification Conference held in Chicago. Mr. Tyree provided a presentation at the conference regarding the consortium created in Yuma which assisted approximately 21 teachers to become highly qualified. Approximately 20 teachers are expected to participate next year in the consortium.

D. Director's Report

1. Special Meeting, June 10, 2011
2. Cedar Unified School District, report of school district insolvency
3. Other items, as necessary

Mr. Yanez said the State Board will be hold a Special meeting on June 10th to discuss the AIMS Writing standards setting. The meeting would likely be scheduled in the morning or early afternoon.

Mr. Yanez stated the Board office received a letters from the Navajo County and the attorneys for the Cedar Unified School District. The letters were to report financial insolvency.

The Cedar USD has a cash shortage not a situation of over expenditure. The district has exhausted their line of credit. Mr. Yanez read a section of the letter received from the Deputy County Attorney's office. After conversations with representatives of the County office and the school district, all parties have agreed to place the district in receivership if approved by the State Board. Mr. Yanez stated the district would be meeting with the department and legislative staff to determine what the district will need in order to continue to operate through the current school year. Mr. Yanez said it was probable for the Board to receive the request to place the district in receivership within the upcoming weeks.

Mr. Molera asked if there was a way to expedite the process. Mr. Yanez stated the quickest way would be to include

Mr. Molera asked if parents have been notified of the situation with the district. Mr. Yanez said he was unaware of any communication to parents. Mr. Molera asked if a statement to parents and the community could be made a priority to inform them of the district's situation.

Dr. Balentine asked if the department could provide the Board information of districts that may be in the same situation as the Cedar Unified School District.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Consideration to approve State Board of Education minutes for February 28, 2011
- B. Consideration to Approve Contract Abstracts:
 - 1. Adult education integrated basic education and skills training incentive grant
 - 2. Intel® Teach affiliate program 2011 grant
 - 3. 2013 Charter school incentive program continuation awards
 - 4. 2014 Charter school incentive program awards
 - 5. Learn & Serve America grant continuation
- C. Consideration to accept the recommendations of the Career Ladder Advisory Committee and approve the following Career Ladder programs for fiscal year 2011 - 2012:
 - 1. Dysart Unified School District
 - 2. Payson Unified School District
 - 3. Pendergast Elementary District
- D. Consideration to approve additional monies for teacher compensation for fiscal year 2011-2012, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 15-952 and 15-537
- E. Consideration to permanently revoke the teaching certificates held by Chris C. Hass, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550
- F. Consideration to grant the Cottonwood-Oak Creek School District permission to offer instruction in high school subjects, grades nine through twelve, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-447
- G. Consideration of the final report from the Task Force on Reading Assessment, pursuant to 2010 Arizona Session Laws, Chapter 296, §2

Mr. Molera requested to pull item 2C2 for further discussion.

Mr. Tyree moved to approve the consent agenda with the exception of item 2C2.

Motion second by Mr. Moore

Motion passes

Mr. Molera stated **Mr. Casey O'Brian**, Superintendent of the Payson Unified School District (PUSD) was present to speak in regards to item 2C2 on the Consent agenda.

Mr. O'Brian stated the PUSD has district sponsored charter school which also participates in the career ladder program. A budget report from the ADE finance department reflected a budget reduction and after

further inquiry the district was informed the reduction was due to the charter school sponsored by the district. A statement from the ADE said Payson Center for Success High School would no longer qualify to participate in the career ladder program. The notice to the district regarding this matter was made after the budget reduction.

Mr. O'Brian said the school has been allowed to continue with the program for one year with the understanding that the school would no longer qualify after that year due to certain status. Mr. O'Brian stated the district asked the County Attorney General's office an informal opinion about the matter and their office found there was no reason to exclude Payson Center for Success High School from the districts career ladder program and a representative from the County Attorney's office was present to provide further information.

Mr. O'Brian stated the district was aware of the realities of the career ladder program, however for the teachers who have exemplary performance this reduction would represent an immediate 10% pay cut and on behalf of the teachers for the Payson Center for Success High School, Mr. O'Brian requested continuation of the program.

A representative from the County Attorney General's office said that after reviewing the statutory requirements the Payson District has met the specific criteria applicable to the career ladder program. The informal opinion and information provided to the district would be provided to the Board in a formal response upon request.

Dr. Horton asked what the authority of the Board was in regards to this situation. Mr. Yanez stated the Board is authority and oversees career ladder plans. Mr. Yanez provided further information regarding the situation for the Payson District. The Board has the option to approve the recommendation of the advisory committee to approve the career ladder plan for the Payson District with exception of the charter or have the district request a formal opinion of the Attorney General's office and postpone any action on the districts career ladder program until further information is received from the Attorney General's office.

Dr. Balentine asked if postponing action for the district would affect schools. Mr. Yanez stated the action postponed was for the funding for the next school year therefore holding the item would not affect schools this year. Mr. Molera stated he was inclined to hold action and allow time to receive the opinion from the Attorney General's office regarding the matter.

Mr. O'Brian stated the district would make a formal request from the Attorney General's office to review the plan.

Item 2C2 was tabled.

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No requests to speak.

4. GENERAL SESSION

A. Presentation and discussion regarding standard setting procedures for the AIMS high school and AIMS 5th – 7th grade writing tests

Ms. Alley provided an overview of the process for the AIMS high school and 5th through 7th writing tests and stated the Board approved the new writing rubric. Ms. Alley said the academic standards for writing will remain the same the only change will be in the actual assessment. Ms. Alley stated Dr. Steven Fitzpatrick, Principal Research Scientist with Pearson would provide further information as to the process of the new assessments.

Dr. Fitzpatrick provided an overview of the methods that would be used to set the performance standards on the new writing assessments. The overview included information on the distinction between content standards and performance standards. Dr. Fitzpatrick stated there are three strands for writing:

- The writing process
- Writing Elements
- Writing Applications

Information of the following areas of the process was further explained:

- Concepts within the writing elements
- Arizona performance levels
- Performance level descriptors

Dr. Fitzpatrick stated the new AIMS writing assessment will be administered in high school and grades 5, 6, and 7. The assessment will have 27 multiple choice questions and an extended response writing sample. A weighted total score will be reported with the MC questions contributing approximately 40% and the extended response essay contributing approximately 60%. A copy of the writing test blueprint was presented and Dr. Fitzpatrick said the scoring would use a six-point holistic rubric.

Mr. Molera asked for further information regarding the training for the people who are scoring the assessments for writing. Ms. Alley stated establishing the anchor sets is the core of the training process.

Mr. Molera asked if there are audits of the evaluators. Ms. Alley stated educators do not score they are a crucial part of the development of the scoring process but do not score the assessments.

Ms. Alley introduced Ms. Merilee Beach to further explain the training process.

Ms. Beach stated the information is very specific and the anchor papers are available for the scorers at all times. Training is extensive and during the scoring there is an intricate system of checks and balance.

Dr. Horton asked what the interrelated scoring statistic. Ms. Beach stated it is over 60%. Two readers read each high school paper.

Pearson and the ADE will be meeting on April 21 and 22 to develop the high school writing standard setting and the outcome will be presented to the Board on April 25th consideration to approve. The standard setting for grades 5, 6 and 7 will take place June 8 and 9 and the results will be presented to the Board at a Special Board meeting June 10th.

Dr. Fitzpatrick stated the Item Mapping procedure, also known as the Bookmark method was used in the development. Educators from across Arizona will be convened to form a standard setting panel; one for high school and one for grades 5 through 7. Further detail information regarding the procedures for standard setting was provided.

- Establishing recommended cut scores: Finding the cut
- Three rounds of ratings
- Vertical articulation
- PLD revision

Mr. Tyree asked how many assessments is each evaluator responsible for. Ms. Beach stated usually averages of 20 papers per hour are reviewed. Mr. Tyree asked if data sets will be available. Ms. Beach stated the outcome would be as a whole per class.

Ms. Alley stated teachers continue to be encouraged to use the six by six trait model. Ms. Alley stated free training is being offered for the non-tested areas.

Mr. Moore asked how often the changes to the standard settings are. Mr. Fitzpatrick stated any time there is

a major change to the content or format. Mr. Moore asked if once common core is in place would this process be necessary. Ms. Alley stated the process will be different once those changes take place. The process will be made with the collaboration of the other states involved.

Mr. Molera stated Board members were welcome to attend the standard setting meetings.

B. Presentation and discussion regarding Arizona Department of Education policies and procedures related to test security and Administration

Ms. Alley provided an overview of the process each school must follow, how incidents are handled and stated most of the incidents are not intentional. All school district test coordinators attend mandatory training and every school administrator that will be in contact with the assessment is required to sign a test security agreement and this agreement is based on Board rules established for test security.

The Board was provided copies of the power point presentation and handouts used for the training provided to the field. Ms. Alley stated all calls regarding test security are addressed and the district test coordinators are contacted immediately. The ADE believes in a monitoring the assessment in collaboration with the school districts.

Mr. Molera asked for further information regarding the gains made that would reflect a discrepancy and how to determine if the gains are due to a significant school improvement.

Ms. Alley stated there are many variables to the significant gains including at the 9th grade students have teachers focused on each subject area.

Mr. Molera asked if data is kept on year to year data regarding such incidents. Ms. Alley stated all data is kept as far back as four years. The data is used to make edits and improve the assessment process if necessary.

Mr. Miller asked if the teacher incidents are handled by the district and if administration incidents are handled by the ADE. Ms. Alley said if the incident is at the district level the ADE will take a more direct approach and work with the district test coordinator.

Mr. Moore asked department uses longitudinal data to determine discrepancies; Ms. Alley stated the department does not unless requested by a specific source.

Mr. Molera thanked Ms. Alley for explaining the process.

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

Ms. Cannata stated the Senate has made a lump sum cut to the ADE in the amount of approximately \$985 thousand. A soft capital suspension of \$47 million; these reductions are in addition to the current \$165 million reduction. Ms. Cannata said a career ladder phase down was also approved and the savings will be of approximately \$5.6 million. Corral and additional assistance reductions total close to \$200 million. The Senate budget includes an appropriation of \$8.6 million for the home owners rebate for small schools and full funding for part-time AOI students, \$3.5 million. A qualifying tax rate off-set for JTED's and that budget amount is approximately \$4.5 million.

Ms. Cannata informed the Senate will continue funding for the Board at the FY 2011 level and that is of approximately \$908 thousand.

Some of the policy changes made in the K-12 budget reconciliation bill include permanently repealing the optional teacher performance pay program and the excess utility formula. This bill also creates the ADE Technology Fund, for support of a statewide information system for public education. Each state university

and community college will be required to transmit \$6 per student to the fund. The department has been directed to transfer \$5 million of their basic state aid appropriation to the tech fund for FY 2011. An additional requirement of the reconciliation bill includes the ADE by February 2012 to issue an RFP for providing school districts and charters schools with language and literacy software designed to provide a learning system for ELL students. This contract is to be awarded by June 30, 2012.

The Senate budget bills of negotiations with the House and the Governor.

Ms. Susie Cannata provided the Board a review of the following legislative bills.

HB 2234 – Regarding persistently lowest achieving schools; this bill allows the Board to assign a school a letter grade of F if the school meets the criteria for persistently lowest achieving school under the federal accountability standards. The bill passed the house and was subject of amendment, which would require providing instruction in grades 1, 2 or 3 in a school assigned a D or F letter grade to obtain supplementary training in reading instruction as prescribed by the Board. The bill sponsor decided this amendment not be attached to bill 2234.

HB 2501 – Requires ambiguous rules, ordinances or laws to be construed in favor of the person applying for a permit license or zoning approval. The intent is not capture rules by this Board and there has been an assurance that a floor amendment in the Senate would take place to exclude the Boards rules from HB 2501.

HB 2706 – Directs the Board to implement guidelines for supplementary reading instruction for teachers in an underperforming or D school that teaches grades K, 1, 2 or 3 as part of an improvement plan. The bill passed the Senate Education Committee and is waiting is final action form the Senate.

HB 2710 – Study committee on outcome based funding; the Boards' Executive Director has a position on this study committee. The task of the committee is to develop legislation that will transition public school funding from a system based on instructional hours to a system based on student achievement. The committee is to report to the legislature by December 31, 2011.

SB 1303 – This bill allows school districts and charter schools that offer online instruction for high school pupils to offer a dropout recovery program. The Board will be required to prescribe standards and achievement testing requirements for these programs to ensure they are compatible with public school education goals and requirements.

SB 1452 – The Board would be required in conjunction with other groups to develop and issue a separate certification endorsement for teachers who provide instruction in hybrid e-learning. Ms. Klein asked if there was an appropriation to the Bill. Ms. Cannata stated there was not.

SB 1520 – The bill creates an option for state agencies to utilize a background check system in place of the finger print based system. K-12 education is exempt from the option and all current processes for schools in the state would remain the same.

- D. Presentation and discussion regarding preliminary evidence suggesting that Global Renaissance Academy of Distinguished Education may be in breach of one or more provisions of its charter contract, federal, state, or local laws regarding payroll tax requirements, state employer unemployment contribution requirements, and Arizona State Retirement System member and employer contribution requirements. The Board may take action as it deems appropriate or necessary under state law, which may include withholding of up to 10% of the monthly apportionment of state aid and requiring a corrective action plan pursuant to A.R.S. §15-185(H), and/or issuing a notice of intent to revoke the charter pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-183(I).

Ms. Deanna Rowe, Executive Director for the AZ State Board for Charter Schools stated Global Renaissance

Academy of Distinguished Education (GRADE) is a non-profit corporation and serves approximately 70 students in grades 6 through 12. The charter contract became effective in August of 1997 and is set to expire in August of 2012.

Ms. Rowe provided information regarding the academic progress of GRADE and stated the Charter Board did not have concerns in this area.

The matter of concern presented was regarding the information received from the annual audit for the charter. According to the audit report GRADE has been delinquent in its payment of taxes required to be deducted and withheld from the wages of its employees and related taxes into the Treasury of the U.S. for the last 3 fiscal years. The federal payroll tax liability has grown from approximately \$\$81,250 in fiscal year 2008 to nearly \$102,250 in fiscal year 2010. Additionally, the fiscal year 2010 audit indicated GRADE has failed to make the required employer stated unemployment contributions to the AZ Department of Economic Security. GRADE has been delinquent in its payment of AZ taxes required to be deducted and retained from the wages of its employees to the AZ Department of Revenue.

GRADE currently owes:

- IRS \$300,000
- DOR \$6,000
- DES \$3,500
- ASRS \$12,000

Ms. Klein asked if there was a calculation made for monies owed to the ASRS. Ms. Rowe stated she did not have that information other than the monies paid to date. Ms. Klein asked for further investigation as to the monies for ASRS.

Other issues identified through the audit were discrepancies with their student attendance records retention and their fingerprinting clearance records for one assistant teacher on staff at time of audit.

Mr. David Gordon, director of GRADE stated legal counsel for the school would present the case.

Mr. Clint Smith attorney for the school stated a corrective plan of action is in place to become compliant and provided an overview of the plan.

Mr. Miller asked if there could be further investigation as to the deductions made to employee's paychecks.

Ms. Klein asked how many students would need to be in rolled in order to make the corrective action plan work. Mr. Gordon stated approximately 80 students would need to be enrolled.

Ms. Klein asked for further information as to the academic aspect for the school. Mr. Gordon stated the school is currently performing academically. Mr. Gordon said the all of the teachers are highly qualified and all but one has a master's degree. Ms. Klein asked if the academic progress has been steady.

Ms. Rowe stated the Board was provided information regarding the school's academic performance in the past five years.

Mr. Moore asked how many employees the school had. Mr. Gordon stated there are 8 full time employees.

Mr. Smith stated he was aware staff recommended a 10% reduction but that would significantly hurt the school.

Ms. Klein stated an audit of attendance records and other actions would be needed.

Mr. Miller said he would be in support of a 90 day letter since this is the schools' second year of financial mismanagement.

Mr. Molera asked for further information regarding the process of the 90 day notification. Ms. Rowe stated a 90 day notice of intent to revoke a charter is legal document to notify the charter holder that the Board plans to proceed with the revocation of the charter after 90 days. The school has 90 to provide the corrective action that the Board would request to demonstrate the charter is back in compliance with state and federal laws. If the school comes to terms and meets the requirements the Board has the opportunity to enter into a settlement agreement with the charter holder. If the school does not meet or comply with the 90 day notice the Board could proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Miller stated the 90 day notice could also require the school to notify parents of the schools discrepancies.

Mr. Tyree stated he was concerned 90 days may not be sufficient time and asked what the plan would be after the 90 days to monitor the school.

Ms. Rowe stated the school has expressed an issue and a challenge to come in compliance within 90 days. The plan of reorganization the school has proposed is to start in July of 2011.

Mr. Miller asked if held funds would be returned to the school once it was in compliance. Ms. Rowe stated the funds would be returned.

Mr. Moore asked if the USFR options for withholding funds could be used. Mr. Yanez stated the situations are not similar.

Dr. Balentine asked for clarification of the renewal for the school. Ms. Rowe stated the contract would affect the 2013 school year.

Mr. Molera stated he was in support with moving forward with option #2.

Ms. Klein asked if the Board would have the opportunity to review the situation before the beginning of the school year. Ms. Rowe stated a monthly update could be provided to track the process of the school. Ms. Rowe stated option #2 does not have a specified requirement to notify parents.

Mr. Miller asked if parents were notified the school was in danger of loosing the charter. Mr. Gordon stated parents were notified via-email.

Dr. Balentine moved to find Global Renaissance Academy of Distinguished Education in noncompliance with state and federal law for its failure to comply with federal and state payroll tax requirements, state employer unemployment contribution requirements and Arizona State Retirement System member and employer contribution requirements and approve withholding 5% of Global Renaissance Academy of Distinguished Education's monthly state aid apportionment until compliance is demonstrated. Compliance will be demonstrated as follows:

- *Provision of a Plan of Reorganization approved by the bankruptcy judge, and*
- *Demonstration of six months of timely payments in accordance with the approved Plan of Reorganization*

Motion second by Mr. Miller

Mr. Miller asked to amend the motion to include time-line statement, consequences and notice to all parents including new students.

Mr. Molera stated Board staff would work to create this notification.

Motion passes as amended

- E. Presentation and discussion regarding policies and procedures related to teacher certification investigations and the Professional Practices Advisory Committee

Mr. Yanez stated Ms. Sheila Rogers and Mr. Mark Joraanstad, members of the Professional Practices Committee (PPAC) were present.

The PPAC was established by Board rule and has seven members; five education representatives and two lay members. This committee meets as needed on a monthly basis.

Mr. Yanez provided an overview of the PPAC process and the presentation included an overview of the following areas:

- State Board's Powers and Duties
- Case review process
- Disciplinary hearings
- Other processes such as negotiated settlement agreements, surrenders and automatic revocations

Mr. Yanez stated legal counsel for the PPAC is provided by the Attorney General's office.

The PPAC process for each case is much more extensive than what is presented to the Board. Deliberations of the PPAC are public. Board rule was developed to assist with determining unprofessional conduct.

Mr. Molera asked when Board rule was adopted and if it was time to update. Mr. Yanez stated rules were adopted in 1999 or 2000 and there was some reference to correspondence.

Mr. Yanez stated typically when an applicant is recommended for denial the Board does not see the recommendations since at that point applicants generally withdraw their applications. Mr. Yanez stated reports of these cases will now be provided to the Board.

Ms. Rogers stated she participated when the rules were created and she believed the process was carefully created. Ms. Rogers said the PPAC hearings provide the members the opportunity to listen to the testimony of the applicant and the others involved in any particular case.

Mr. Joraanstad stated the PPAC members prepared thoroughly and the priority is student safety. People's careers are in the hands of the PPAC members and the outmost responsibility is to weight the facts.

Mr. Joraanstad stated the process is not adversarial but PPAC members do question and challenge the applicants veracity if need be. Mr. Joraanstad stated the disagreement of the Board validates the process as a checks and balance. The evidence the PPAC reviews is very extensive.

Mr. Molera asked if there could be improvements for the process. Ms. Rogers stated the time-line could be improved.

Mr. Molera asked if the composition of the membership for the committee was appropriate. Ms. Rogers stated the combination has worked. Mr. Joraanstad stated a consistent process is crucial applicants are all treated in the same manner.

Mr. Moore thanked the PPAC members for their work and dedication. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Yanez if the time-line of time-frame could be revised to be improved. Mr. Yanez stated there are specific time-frames for reviews. The bulk of the work is for the disciplinary cases. The case load per investigator is approximately 150 per person. Cases are placed in categories of priorities.

Mr. Yanez stated the number of cases has increased in part due to the training provided to districts to teach

them what types of situations need to be reported.

Ms. Klein asked if statistic information could be provided in order to advocate for the necessary funds when they are available. Ms. Klein thanked Mr. Molera for providing the opportunity for this presentation.

Ms. Klein asked if the victims have an advocate and a process or means by which the PPAC would suggest remediation for certain applicants. Ms. Klein asked if applicants are aware of the process and understand the seriousness of the hearings.

Ms. Rogers stated ethics courses could be part of the training for new teachers, and she would be putting such a course together for her district and was willing to assist the Board if they wanted to offer these classes around the state.

Mr. Tyree said it would be helpful to be consistent with the criteria used by the PPAC for their decisions. Mr. Tyree asked rehabilitation could not always be the best option to allow an individual return to the classroom. Mr. Tyree also thanked the PPAC members.

Mr. Molera stated he would like Ms. Rogers and Mr. Joraanstad to discuss the Boards feedback with the other PPAC members and continue making improvement to the process. Ms. Rogers thanked the Board for having the opportunity for serving on the committee.

- F. 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.

No items considered.

5. STUDY SESSION

Presentation and discussion regarding proposed model framework for teacher and principal evaluations, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-203(A)(38)

Mr. Molera thanked Dr. Balentine for taking the responsibility and tremendous amount of work this task required.

Dr. Balentine stated each one of the members of the task force is thoughtful and committed to the students of Arizona. The recommendations and final implementation is in the best interest of students.

Dr. Balentine said the final report was being created and would be presented to the Board in April. The goal is to implement the framework at the beginning of the 2012 – 2013 school year. The task force interest is to ensure LEA's throughout the state have the appropriate time to incorporate the framework in their own evaluation instrument for teachers and students.

The focus of the task force is for the teacher and principal evaluation to improve performance that yields higher quality education. Dr. Balentine stated the work the task force is submitting reflects evaluation is most effective as one part of a systemic approach to improving the performance that is critical to student success.

Dr. Balentine also reviewed the Vision and Goals of the task force. Dr. Balentine said the purpose of the Goals is to come away with an understanding that while the focus is student academic progress in the evaluation process the task force is also aware of the importance to reflect fairness, flexibility and results which are research based.

Dr. Balentine stated one of the major areas the task force has discussed is to create a culture where data

drives instructional decisions.

An overview of the Components of Effective Evaluations section was provided and Dr. Balentine said 50% of the evaluation is the teaching component and the other half is made up of the learning component which is 33% classroom level data, required by legislation and 17% school level data.

Dr. Balentine stated the Arizona professional teaching standards are currently out of date and will need to be updated. The InTASC professional teaching standards were listed as part of the 50% component but the list will need to be updated.

Possible measures were listed for the 33% classroom level data and 17% school level data components. Ultimately if the data is available at the state level it shall be used as part of the evaluation process.

Mr. Molera asked what the survey data would involve. Dr. Balentine stated the survey data was included as an example. Currently there are school quality level surveys and these may be included. Mr. Molera asked if the survey would be determined by the state. Dr. Balentine said at this time the survey would be optional.

Dr. Balentine provided an overview of Group A and Group B. Group A, teachers with state-level test data available and Group B, teachers with no state-level test data available.

Dr. Balentine reviewed the framework for principal evaluations and explained 50% of the framework is leadership and the IsLLC standards were listed. The final report will include a recommendation to the Board to review the IsLLC standards and consider updating the list.

Further recommendations will be added to an appendix but there will be a critical emphasis on the recommendations made to LEA's. As implementation occurs in the next few years there must be a shared effort to support the development and revision of evaluation instruments.

Dr. Balentine reinforced the following recommendations made to the LEA;s:

- When available, state-level data shall be used to inform the evaluation process
- Professional development and the importance of data reliability

The recommendations made to the Board were reviewed and Dr. Balentine highlighted the third bullet which stated the Board scheduled periodic reviews of the evaluation framework an implementation in order to make modifications deemed necessary based upon the best available data.

Specific recommendations to the Department are:

- Expand data and assessment resources to increase the number of teachers with valid and reliable student level achievement data
- Ensure review of the Framework and implementation with LEA's that are in Corrective Action or are identified as "persistently low achieving."

Mr. Yanez stated there is a recommendation stating the department will work with school districts and charters on how to get started. Dr. Balentine stated some examples will be provided on a separate appendix section of the final report. This section of the appendix will also include resources and links that will be helpful to all districts and charters.

Dr. Balentine thanked the task force members for their time and commitment to the creation of the framework.

Mr. Moore asked what the impact will be once the common core assessments are in place. Dr. Balentine

stated these assessments are considered as part of the performance review if they are a common assessment.

Mr. Molera asked Dr. Karen Butterfield if she had information to provide on behalf of the department.

Dr. Butterfield stated Supt. Huppenthal would like to take a strong role in the training for the framework and the roll-out of the work to ensure that what is listed is also in alignment with ADE.

- Ms. Katie Cavanagh, Executive Director for Stand for Children stated the task force was focused, committed and understood the crucial aspects of teacher and principal evaluation to the future of students. Stand for Children supports and thanks the task force for giving access to excellence through the evaluation framework. Ms. Cavanagh stated they look forward to the future conversations in regards to data.

Mr. Molera stated it would be helpful to provide a joint presentation to the Senate and House Education Committees.

- Mr. Andrew Morrill, President of the Arizona Educators Association (AEA) and task force member. Mr. Morrill stated the framework focuses on ownership of the outcome. AEA is in full support of the work developed by the task force particularly the consistent attention to increasing performance, that leads to academic learning that is part of a systemic approach. Mr. Morrill stated the AEA will take responsibility for communicating that this work can be successful and that is part of a systemic approach to evaluation and results can result in elevating the profession, teaching and learning and may lead to increase success. Districts will have the responsibility for successful implementation which means collaboration.

Mr. Molera asked Mr. Yanez for the timeline to approve the final framework, Mr. Yanez stated the framework will be brought for approval in April.

Mr. Molera stated a presentation to the legislature would be beneficial before the approval of the framework in April.

Mr. Molera returned to item 4F.

Mr. Tyree moved to adjourn

Motion second by Mr. Moore

Motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 12:48 PM