



Arizona State Board of Education

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING **AMENDED AGENDA**

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona State Board of Education and to the general public that the Board will hold a meeting, open to the public, on **Monday, February 27, 2017, at 9:00 A.M. at the Arizona Department of Education, Room 122, 1535 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007.** A copy of the agenda for the meeting is attached. The Board reserves the right to change the order of items on the agenda, with the exception of public hearings. One or more members of the Boards may participate telephonically. Agenda materials can be reviewed online at <http://azsbe.az.gov>

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02 (H), the Board may discuss and take action concerning any matter listed on the agenda.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-41.03(A)(3), the Board may vote to convene in executive session, which will not be open to the public, for discussion or consultation for legal advice concerning any item on this agenda.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the State Board Office at (602) 542-5057. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

DATED AND POSTED this 23rd day of February, 2017.

Arizona State Board of Education

By: _____

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "K. Schmidt", written over a horizontal line.

Dr. Karol Schmidt
Executive Director
(602) 542-5057

AMENDED AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

February 27, 2017

Page 2

Monday, February 27, 2017

9:00 AM

Arizona Department of Education, Room 122

1535 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, NATIONAL ANTHEM,
PRAYER AND ROLL CALL

1. BUSINESS REPORTS: The Board may discuss and take action concerning any matters listed on the agenda for Business Reports.

A. President's Report

1. Retreat Planning – Agenda Item Recommendations
2. Cancellation of March 27, 2017 Regular Board Meeting
3. Joint Presentation of 2017 Polly Rosenbaum Creative Writing Contest Awards

B. Superintendent's Report

1. Update regarding Department activities

C. Executive Director's Report

1. Update on NASBE activities
2. Public hearings for A-F School Accountability draft plan

2. CONSENT AGENDA: All items on this Consent Agenda will be considered by a single motion with no discussion, unless an item is removed and discussed as a regular agenda item upon the request of any Board member.

A. Approval of the University of Phoenix, Elementary Education Post Degree (Alternative Pathway) elementary educator preparation program leading to Arizona educator certification

B. Approval of the following secondary educator preparation programs leading to Arizona educator certification:

1. Arizona Christian University, Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education
2. Arizona State University, Bachelors of Arts in Education, Secondary Education

AMENDED AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

February 27, 2017

Page 3

3. Arizona State University, Masters of Education, Secondary Education
 4. Pima Community College, Post-Degree Secondary Teacher Certification
 5. Rio Salado Community College, Post Baccalaureate Secondary Program
 6. Rio Salado Community College and Northcentral University, Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education
 7. Teach Now, Secondary Teacher Certification
 8. University of Arizona, Masters of Education in Secondary Education, Teach Arizona, M.Ed.
 9. University of Arizona, Bachelors of Science or Bachelors of Arts in Mathematics with Secondary Certification
 10. University of Arizona, Master of Arts in French with Secondary Certification
 11. University of Arizona, Master of Arts in German with Secondary Certification
 12. University of Arizona, Master of Arts in Latin with Secondary Certification
 13. University of Phoenix, Secondary Education Post Degree (Alternative Pathway)
- C. Acceptance of the Special Education Advisory Panel Annual Report for FY 2015-2016
- D. Approval of recommended appointment of Susan Voirol to the Special Education Advisory Panel to fill the position of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities until June 30, 2018
- E. Acceptance of the report on Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS) development and implementation
- F. Authorization of receipt and expenditure of funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and authorization to the Department of Education to disburse funding to eligible recipients for Child Nutrition Programs (National School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Milk, U.S.D.A. Foods, Child and Adult Care Food Program and Summer Food Service Program)
3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC: This is the time for the public to comment. Members of the Board may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing

AMENDED AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

February 27, 2017

Page 4

staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

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.

B. Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the draft A-F School Accountability Plan for 2016-2017:

1. Approval of securing public comment on a working draft plan for K-8 schools
2. Approval of securing public comment on a working draft plan for 9-12 schools
3. Extending the approval date of an accountability plan for alternative schools and Arizona online instruction schools until August, 2017

C. Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding policies and procedures for the Menu of Assessments for school year 2017-2018

D. Presentation, discussion and possible action to approve a Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan pursuant to Board Rule R7-2-614(K) for:

1. Northern Arizona University
2. University of Arizona
3. Grand Canyon University
4. Arizona State University

E. Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding discipline guidelines on certification enforcement actions

F. Presentation, discussion and possible action to initiate rulemaking procedures for the proposed amendments to Board rule R7-2-619 regarding renewal requirements

G. Discussion and possible action to direct staff to procure video recording equipment

5. CONSENT AGENDA – CERTIFICATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS:
All items on this Consent Agenda will be considered by a single motion

AMENDED AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

February 27, 2017

Page 5

with no discussion, unless an item is removed and discussed as a regular agenda item upon the request of any Board member.

A. Approval of the voluntary surrender of the educator certificates held by:

1. David A. Coffman
2. Zachary T. Goertz
3. Terry J. Lindsey
4. Crystal Riley
5. Ariana M. Speranza
6. Amy Young
7. Juan Zazueta

B. Approval of the permanent revocation of any and all educator certificates, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550, held by:

1. Gregory Scott Tibbetts
2. Jason Scott Webb

6. GENERAL SESSION – CERTIFICATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

A. Presentation, discussion and possible action on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee to approve the revocation of certificates held by:

1. Christopher A. Heavin
2. Susan Yonker

B. Presentation, discussion and possible action on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee to approve the suspension of certificate held by Cassandra Dodson.

C. Presentation, discussion and possible action on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee to approve the application for certification of Danielle Sierra.

D. Presentation, discussion and possible action to approve the Negotiated Settlement Agreements for:

1. John M. Boggess
2. Renee Hollander

AMENDED AGENDA

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

February 27, 2017

Page 6

3. Lauren Sieberg

7. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, FUTURE MEETING DATES AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS. 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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of recommendations to approve or deny elementary educator preparation programs leading to Arizona educator certification

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Educator preparation programs seeking Board approval must provide evidence that their program meets the relevant standards and prepares future educators to be classroom and school ready. The Department's educator preparation program review process evaluates the degree to which evidence submitted by professional preparation institutions aligns with the appropriate standards in three domains:

1. Organizational Structures and Systems: Evidence of program entry criteria, internal and external evaluation and monitoring processes, communication processes, and response to needs of the field.
2. Instructional Impact: Evidence that candidates have instruction and practice in the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, additional relevant standards, technology integration, data literacy, and content knowledge and pedagogy.
3. Clinical Practices and Partnerships: Evidence that candidates have ample, authentic opportunities to develop the skills, knowledge and dispositions in order to be effective in the classroom. Evidence that field and capstone experiences take place in education settings that are appropriate for the certificate candidates are seeking with appropriate support from the preparation program and the local education agency.

Arizona State Board of Education Rule R7-2-604 states:

R7-2-604.01 (B): "Educator preparation programs of professional preparation institutions requesting Board approval shall be reviewed by the Department and the Department shall recommend Board action."

R7-2-604.02 (G): "The Board may grant educator preparation program approval for a period not to exceed six years or deny program approval." This is dependent upon a biennial review as described in R7-2-604.02 (K).

R7-2-604.02 (K): "Each approved professional preparation institution shall submit a biennial report with the Department documenting educator preparation program activities for the previous two years." The biennial report is submitted in years two and four of the current approval period and describes any substantive changes to courses, seminars, modules, assessments, field experiences or capstone experiences. The report will also

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent- Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent- Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

include relevant data which includes stakeholder surveys, completer data, and student achievement data.

R7-2-604.01 (A): “Professional preparation institutions shall include, evidence that the educator preparation program is aligned to standards described in the Board approved professional teaching standards or professional administrative standards and relevant national standards, and provides field experience and a capstone experience.”

The following educator preparation program has met the standards and is being recommended for program approval through July 31, 2022:

- University of Phoenix, Elementary Education Post Degree (Alternative Pathway)

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board approve the elementary educator preparation program listed above through July 31, 2022.

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent- Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent- Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Phoenix	
Educator Preparation Program	Alternative Pathway/Elementary Education	
Date submitted	4/31/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Alternative	
Certificate	Elementary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/1/2016	
		Final Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.20
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.30
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.10
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.20
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.10
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.11
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.30
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.25
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.33
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.47
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.33
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.20
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.20
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.12
Total Score		2.23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of recommendations to approve or deny secondary educator preparation programs leading to Arizona educator certification

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Educator preparation programs seeking Board approval must provide evidence that their program meets the relevant standards and prepares future educators to be classroom and school ready. The Department's educator preparation program review process evaluates the degree to which evidence submitted by professional preparation institutions aligns with the appropriate standards in three domains:

1. Organizational Structures and Systems: Evidence of program entry criteria, internal and external evaluation and monitoring processes, communication processes, and response to needs of the field.
2. Instructional Impact: Evidence that candidates have instruction and practice in the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards, additional relevant standards, technology integration, data literacy, and content knowledge and pedagogy.
3. Clinical Practices and Partnerships: Evidence that candidates have ample, authentic opportunities to develop the skills, knowledge and dispositions in order to be effective in the classroom. Evidence that field and capstone experiences take place in education settings that are appropriate for the certificate candidates are seeking with appropriate support from the preparation program and the local education agency.

Arizona State Board of Education Rule R7-2-604 states:

R7-2-604.01 (B): "Educator preparation programs of professional preparation institutions requesting Board approval shall be reviewed by the Department and the Department shall recommend Board action."

R7-2-604.02 (G): "The Board may grant educator preparation program approval for a period not to exceed six years or deny program approval." This is dependent upon a biennial review as described in R7-2-604.02 (K).

R7-2-604.02 (K): "Each approved professional preparation institution shall submit a biennial report with the Department documenting educator preparation program activities for the previous two years." The biennial report is submitted in years two and four of the current approval period and describes any substantive changes to courses, seminars, modules, assessments, field experiences or capstone experiences. The report will also include relevant data which includes stakeholder surveys, completer data, and student achievement data.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

R7-2-604.01 (A): "Professional preparation institutions shall include, evidence that the educator preparation program is aligned to standards described in the Board approved professional teaching standards or professional administrative standards and relevant national standards, and provides field experience and a capstone experience."

The following educator preparation programs have met the standards and are being recommended for program approval through January 31, 2023:

- Arizona Christian University, Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education
- Arizona State University, Bachelors of Arts in Education, Secondary Education
- Arizona State University, Masters of Education, Secondary Education
- Pima Community College, Post-Degree Secondary Teacher Certification
- Rio Salado, Post Baccalaureate Secondary Program
- Rio Salado, Northcentral University, Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education
- Teach Now, Secondary Teacher Certification
- University of Arizona, Masters of Education in Secondary Education, Teach Arizona, M.Ed.
- University of Arizona, Bachelors of Science or Bachelors of Arts in Mathematics with Secondary Certification
- University of Arizona, Master of Arts in French with Secondary Certification
- University of Arizona, Master of Arts in German with Secondary Certification
- University of Arizona, Master of Arts in Latin with Secondary Certification
- University of Phoenix, Secondary Education Post Degree (Alternative Pathway)

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board approve the secondary educator preparation programs listed above through January 31, 2023.

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Arizona Christian University	
Educator Preparation Program	Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education/ Post Bachelor	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/8/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.20
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.00
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.04
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	3.50
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	1.88
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	1.88
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.18
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
Total Score		2.07

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Arizona State University- Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College	
Educator Preparation Program	BAE in Secondary Education	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/11/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.20
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.07
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.05
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.17
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	3.33
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	1.88
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	3.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.93
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.76
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.10
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.20
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.13
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.10
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.09
Total Score		2.30

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Arizona State University-Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College	
Educator Preparation Program	MED in Secondary Education	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/11/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.20
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.07
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.05
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.20
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.10
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.20
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.36
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
Total Score		2.14

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Pima Community College	
Educator Preparation Program	Post-Degree Secondary Teacher Certification	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Both	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/28/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.00
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.20
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.04
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.30
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.20
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.25
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.50
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.40
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.52
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.20
	Field Experience Matrix	2.80
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.17
Total Score		2.24

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Rio Salado College	
Educator Preparation Program	Post Baccalaureate Teacher Certification, Secondary	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Both	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.33
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.00
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.07
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.20
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.31
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
Total Score		2.13

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Rio Salado College and Northcentral University	
Educator Preparation Program	Bachelor of Education in Secondary Education with Teacher Certification	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/28/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.33
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.00
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.07
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.25
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.32
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
		Total Score
		2.13

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	Teach-Now	
Educator Preparation Program	Secondary Teacher Certification	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Alternative	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/8/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.00
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.00
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.00
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.25
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.32
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	1.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		1.83
Total Score		2.05

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

- Education Preparation Program Scoring**
- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
 - Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
 - Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
 - A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
 - The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Arizona	
Educator Preparation Program	Masters of Education in Secondary Education, Teach Arizona, M.Ed.	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	11/28/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.70
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.20
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.18
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.29
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Matrix	3.00
	Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.10
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.30
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.23
Total Score		2.23

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

- Education Preparation Program Scoring**
- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
 - Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
 - Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
 - A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
 - The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Arizona	
Educator Preparation Program	Secondary Mathematics Education Program, Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelors of Science (BS) in Mathematics	
Date submitted	7/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.50
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.00
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.10
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.30
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.50
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.30
	Data Literacy Matrix	1.75
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	1.75
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.37
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.10
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.20
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.10
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.07
Total Score		2.18

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

- Education Preparation Program Scoring**
- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
 - Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
 - Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
 - A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
 - The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Arizona	
Educator Preparation Program	Master of Arts in French with Secondary Teaching Certification	
Date submitted	7/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.25
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.20
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.09
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.29
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
Total Score		2.13

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

Education Preparation Program Scoring

- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
- Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
- Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
- A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
- The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Arizona	
Educator Preparation Program	Masters of Arts in German with Secondary Teaching Certification	
Date submitted	7/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.25
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.20
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.09
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.29
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
		Total Score 2.13

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

- Education Preparation Program Scoring**
- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
 - Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
 - Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
 - A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
 - The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Arizona	
Educator Preparation Program	Masters of Arts in Latin with Secondary Teaching Certification	
Date submitted	6/1/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Traditional	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.25
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.20
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.09
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.00
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.00
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.00
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.00
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.00
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.00
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.29
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.00
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.00
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.00
		Total Score
		2.13

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
15

- Education Preparation Program Scoring**
- All worksheets and matrices within each domain are scored on a 0-3 scale.
 - Scores for each domain are averaged to determine a domain score.
 - Domain scores are then averaged to determine the program score.
 - A score of 2.0 equals a “meets”.
 - The Relevant Standards Matrix score is weighted (doubled) to reflect the degree to which the program addresses the Arizona Professional Teaching Standards.

Professional Preparation Institution	University of Phoenix	
Educator Preparation Program	Alternative Pathway/Secondary Education	
Date submitted	5/27/2016	
Type of Approval	Initial Program Approval	
Program Pathway	Alternative	
Certificate	Secondary Education	
Program Summary Date	12/15/2016	
		Initial Score
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain		
Program Review Requirements Worksheets	Program Overview Worksheet	2.00
	Program Entry Criteria Worksheet	2.00
	Statement of Assurance Memo and Form	2.00
	Institutional Recommendation Signature Worksheet	2.00
Evaluation Procedure Component	Evaluation Procedures & Monitoring Plan	2.30
Organizational Structures and Systems Domain Total Score		2.06
Instructional Impact Domain		
Relevant Professional Standards Component	Relevant Standards Matrix	4.25
	Content Knowledge Worksheet	2.20
	Content Knowledge Matrix	2.10
Data Literacy Component	Data Literacy Worksheet	2.35
	Data Literacy Matrix	2.25
Technology Integration Component	Technology Integration Worksheet	2.30
	Technology Integration Matrix	2.00
Instructional Impact Domain Total Score		2.49
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain		
Local Education Agency (LEA) Partnerships Component	LEA Partnership Worksheet	2.00
Field Experience Component	Field Experience Worksheet	2.00
	Field Experience Matrix	2.30
Capstone Readiness Assessment Plan Component	Capstone Readiness Worksheet	2.00
Capstone Component	Capstone Experience Worksheet	2.20
	Capstone Remediation Plan	2.20
Clinical Practice & Partnerships Domain Total Score		2.12
Total Score		2.22

Contact Information:

Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent - Student Achievement and Educator Excellence
 Peter Laing, Deputy Associate Superintendent - Educator and School Excellence Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) Annual Report FY 2015-2016

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Summary of SEAP activities July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016.

Information was pulled from meeting minutes.

Attached: SEAP Annual Report FY 2015-16 FINAL

Recommendation to the Board

This item is presented to the Board for information only, and no action is requested.

Contact Information:

Alissa Trollinger, Deputy Associate Superintendent
Mike Mannelly, Associate Superintendent

Special Education Advisory Panel Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) duties:

- i. advise the State educational agency of unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities;
- ii. comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities;
- iii. advise the State educational agency in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618;
- iv. advise the State educational agency in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal monitoring reports under this part; and
- v. advise the State educational agency in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.

During the 2014-2015 SEAP year, the panel held 5 public meetings with a quorum. This Annual Report briefly summarizes key points from the meetings. Further detail about any topic can be found in the meeting minutes posted at <http://www.azed.gov/special-education/seap/>.

Meeting Summaries

September 2015

Meeting had to be cancelled due to delay with submission and approval of new members to SBOE.

November 18, 2014

Three new panel members were welcomed to the board, Patrice Robinson, Robert Gilmore, and Cathy Humphrey. The panel recognized the members who left the panel: Ashley Hafner, Amy Breitzman, Patricia Carey, Kim Peaslee, and Laura Schweers.

Nancy Williams was re-elected co-chair of the panel and Leanne Murillo was re-elected vice chair after nominations and election votes.

Reports from the field indicated challenges with staffing, providers, and retention of staff. Members echoed issues with compensation, workload, caseloads, and a lack of support driving the issues with staffing. There were concerns expressed about administration attendance at IEP meetings by the members. Sophie talked about the University of Arizona Focus Transition program.

John Copenhaver from TAESE covered the top current issues he is seeing across the country in special education which included:

1. Recruitment/Retention, 49 states are reporting teacher shortages
2. Implementation Science, improving teaching through research driven practice
3. Accountability, the change since 2004 to focus on the system instead of the system.
4. Re-authorization, no IDEA re-authorization on the radar
5. Mental Health, 1/5 children have a mental health need during k-12

Special Education Advisory Panel

Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

6. Technology Challenges with available tech, resources, software and training
7. MTSS/RTI, goal is to reduce inappropriate referrals
8. State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), AZ is in phase 2, there are high stakes for SEA
9. Focus on Holistic Education, affective education and the focus on play is changing.
10. Increasing Demands on the State Director, 57 state directors, 18 have left in the last year
11. Early Childhood and Post-Secondary Education, emphasis moving to cradle to college/career

Audra Ahumada, ADE/Assessment and Accountability provided the Panel updates regarding Arizona Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching. The state is reviewing the career readiness standards. What tests will be pursued is unknown at this time.

Ann Brusca, ADE/ESS Federal Initiatives presented on the SPR/APR indicators for FFY 2013, and the SIMR, she gave a brief overview and then fielded member questions about metrics, measurements and systems.

January 19, 2016

Angela Denning, ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent of ESS has resigned. Robin Kauakahi is the new Associate Superintendent of ESS.

Leanne Murrillo reviewed the current vacancies on the Panel and requested help in finding potential candidates.

Kacey Gregson reviewed the state compliant process, provided data and updates that will appear in the SPR/APR. 80 signed complaints were filed, 52 issues were investigated and 36 had 1 finding of non-compliance, 28 were withdrawn or dismissed. Mediation usage is increasing and the state is seeing positive results. Ms. Gregson reviewed the mediation process, and how it works.

Pat Reynolds, ADE/Assessment Accessibility Specialist, reviewed the challenges faced by moving to a computer based test. She reviewed that UDL/Accommodations task force has been developed and the next meeting is 2/2/2016.

Lisa Yencarelli, ADE/ESS Director of Federal Initiatives provided updates for retention and recruitment efforts. She discussed the Southern AZ job fair and Great Arizona Teach-in events that are coming up to recruit teachers. She also reviewed SSIP goals and Indicators, she requested input from the panel on the SIMR goals for the next four years.

The 2014-2015 Annual Report was reviewed, some minor edits were made and the report was approved.

The panel agreed to approve and develop a Parent Capacity Subcommittee based on reports from the field and on-going concerns regarding options and availability to attend state special education conferences like the Transition Conference and Directors institute.

Subcommittee reports were tabled for the next meeting.

Proposed future agenda items.

Secondary transition
Available resources

Special Education Advisory Panel

Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

Successful programs

Symposium for parents connected to the transition conference

Parent recommendations

Parent capacity building

Post-secondary outcomes

Employment first initiatives

AZ-Merit

March 15, 2016

Member reports from the field:

Judith Shideler – Parents need more information at the transition level. There is confusion for parents about what other services are available for our students. It would be nice to have a better way to educate schools in how to inform parents in post-school resources.

Wendi Howe – Complaint system -- When a complaint is filed by a parent with the school, and the investigation happens, the findings are sent back. The document is not very parent friendly and it is difficult to understand the next steps. Even the school has said it doesn't know what the next step is. It can be confusing with the next step. Perhaps a section can be added of suggested next steps? A little more guidance might be something to add to the document if possible.

Amanda Heyser – Transition concern -- parent told her that a high school in Tucson area said they were under-manned and could not do transition. Big concern if they are saying this to parents. Another issue is supervision of students at lunch time that affects students with disabilities.

Ed O'Neill – Hearing from OTs at the school level- the outside services seem to be dropping and it is impacting progress in the schools. Parents are expecting more from schools because of funding cuts, therapists not available, etc. A lot of therapists feel trapped but should only be delivering school-based therapy.

Patrice Robinson – Still hearing from people with concerns that have twice exceptional kids. Gifted and in special education. It would be great to have guidance on how everything fits together. IEP meeting seems separate from gifted services.

Lara Bruner –As a parent, still waiting on OCR regarding open enrollment -- has been about 9 months now.

Kristine Blackledge -- ESA open application period is right now. There is confusion as to how that agency is requiring a re-evaluation almost a year in advance of when it is due for new applicants. That is a burden for our school districts to meet that requirement. It is perhaps creating stress on parents and schools.

Kathleen Puckett – Commend the behavioral health bill – 3 foster moms. Has been participating with the certification process. Concern is with new requirement of severe/profound. Most universities have difficulty offering this- need to have a cohort of 15 – 20 people to offer a program at ASU. Looking at language to modify the severe/profound to more of a moderate to severe to try to get more people into that area. How do you define the student teaching with inclusion when it might not be a self-contained classroom? ASU only operates with certain districts.

Special Education Advisory Panel

Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

Cathy Humphrey – bridge meetings are important for kids going from elementary to middle school and then again from middle to high school. Guidance or a best practice would be helpful.

Susan Douglas – Concerns about online testing and if it will meet the needs of the students with disabilities. Should be a special line for that in assessment department?

Nancy Williams – Jacob's Law- HB2442- going to Senate floor- allows for foster parents to refer to behavioral health so they don't have to wait on a case manager to do so. Also states that services need to begin within 21 days after the intake assessment. If not, children can go to an outside provider for the AHCCCS rate plus 30%. On Senate floor tomorrow, and if it passes it will go to the Governor to sign and become law.

Leanne Murillo –Valley transition fair. Need a contact at Social Security like there used to be. SB1166 -- service animals; Ability360 is opposing. Only 2 animals that are legit to be service animals are dogs and miniature horses.

Andi Asel, Transition Specialist, ADE/ESS. Alissa Trollinger, Director of Special Projects, ADE/ESS

Technical Assistance: all trainings are free. Trainings have taken place throughout the state.

Overview of Transition Planning – Transition planning is included in the definition of FAPE. Transition planning changes the focus from disability to ability and students must be involved in the IEP process.

Ms. Asel reviewed the nine components that are required in the IEP by age 16 and fielded questions on ECAP.

Ms. Asel reviewed the ESS Secondary Transition web page and showed the Panel where information can be found on the web page.

Ms. Trollinger talked about how the Transition conference is planned, how spots are held for parents, youth/young adults with disabilities, and provided guidance of how parents attend and can get information.

The Transition Conference is also the kick-off for the Secondary Transition Mentoring Project and College and Career Readiness Team Training (STMP/CCRTT) Grant activities for the selected LEAs. Ana Nunez, Transition Specialist, explained the intent of the grant, how teams are selected, and the makeup of the teams. Team needs to include: School/district administrator or special education administrator or designee; Transition coordinator/specialist or special education teacher; General education teacher, CTE teacher, or guidance counselor.

AzCOPT is working on the updated Transition Guide. AzCOPT members are creating examples of Agency transition plans to include on the Secondary Transition webpage. They are also developing video presentations from each of the AZCOPT members to add to the website.

Ms. Trollinger informed the Panel that Arizona has been identified as an intensive state by NTACTION. NTACTION will be working with ADE/ESS to ensure that all the initiatives that the state is working on will result in something meaningful and tangible, and provide national support.

Melissa De Vries, Director of State Initiatives, ADE/ESS

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)/State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

Special Education Advisory Panel

Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

Phase 1 of the SSIP had select ESS staff looking for root causes of poor performance. Based on the outcomes four priorities were selected:

- Effective Leaders
- Data analysis and use for instruction
- Teacher training in evidence-based reading practices
- Ongoing support for implementation

In the process of Phase 1 of SSIP being submitted and approved Arizona was in the process of writing a State Personnel Development Grant. This was based on the same data of what was effective for students with disabilities and how to support districts on those things were working in other districts.

Ms. DeVries explained areas that they reviewed in order to implement the SSIP. It was decided that ESS would use the SPDG to move the same priorities forward.

The SPDG will include professional development modules. They will include facilitation guides, resources, materials and parent components with video examples. These modules will be available statewide.

New name: AZ RISE! Arizona's Resources to Improve Systems Effectiveness

Jennifer Huber, Recruitment, Retention and Teacher Preparation Specialist

- Directors Institute, September 13-15, 2016
- Leading Change, June 28-30, 2016
- Teachers Institute, July 7-8, 2016

Team registration is encouraged.

It is now the hiring season. There is a shortage of applicants in both in general education and special education.

Teach In, April 23, 2016 – 116 LEAs registered for recruitment so far

Southern AZ Job Fair, March 19, 2016 – 28 LEAs registered for recruitment

Wendi Howe, Raising Special Kids, Family Support Specialist reviewed the role of the Parent Information Training Center (PTIC).

The Mission Principles in Action are:

- Providing reliable information to support families
- Mentoring and Educating
- Fostering collaboration between parents and professionals

Outcomes for 2015

Special Education Advisory Panel

Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

27,573 total cases supported
10,589 Contacts
 85% parents
 15% professionals
4,242 Training/Conference Attendees

Subcommittee reports

The members of the Parent Capacity Building subcommittee met by conference call. They identified the following unmet needs in the area of Parent Education and Awareness:

Parent information – knowledge of trainings, conferences available
There seems to be an inconsistency of transition services from school to school

Subcommittee suggestions:

Short term

- Have a central location for parents to find information
- Raising Special Kids, web page on ADE
- Webinar/recording transition conference

Long term

- Best Practices Committee on Transition to examine the quality and delivery of transition services in-depth. Hopefully this would result in best practices.
- IDEA requirement – LEAs are responsible for educating parents on their child's

disability

- State statute for LEAs

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Committee

A document for UDL and accommodations has been created by an ADE Taskforce. The goal is to help everyone understand the rationale. It includes different types of accommodations, alternate assessment, etc.

Ms. Murrillo reviewed the vacant positions. She asked members to send her names of interested individuals.

The dates for the 2016-2017 SEAP meetings are:

- 9/20/16
- 11/15/16
- 1/24/17
- 3/7/17
- 6/20/17

Panel approved for 9/2016 meeting moving the start time to 9:30 AM for each meeting.

Special Education Advisory Panel Annual Report FY 2015 - 2016

June 2016

Cancelled due to quorum

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) Application for Membership

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

The following category is vacant:

Representatives of a Vocational, Community, or Business Organization Concerned with the Provision of Transition Services to Children with Disabilities

Attached documents include: SEAP Recommendation Letter, Application and Resume for Susan Voirol

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board review the application and approve Ms. Voirol for the Panel effective immediately.

Contact Information:

Alissa Trollinger, Deputy Associate Superintendent
Mike Mannelly, Associate Superintendent

Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services
3300 North Central Ave
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Phone: 602-542-4013

Special Education Advisory Panel

January 24, 2017

Alissa Trollinger
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education, Exceptional Student Services
3300 N. Central Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Dear Alissa,

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) to the State Board of Education recommends the following names to become new SEAP members for School Year 2016/2017 ~

1. Susan Voirol as a **REPRESENTATIVES OF A VOCATIONAL, COMMUNITY, OR BUSINESS ORGANIZATION CONCERNED WITH THE PROVISION OF TRANSITION SERVICES TO CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES**

Sincerely,

Leanne Murrillo, CTRS
Vice Chair of SEAP

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Update on AELAS Development and Implementation

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

ADE has entered its sixth year of development of the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS). The Department continues to contract with WestEd/CELT for quarterly, independent, third-party monitoring. WestEd/CELT recently completed their site visit from January 2017, conducting project reviews and attending several meetings vital to AELAS implementation. A full report from the WestEd/CELT visit detailing their observations and quarterly findings was provided to the Executive Director via email. The team will conduct its third quarterly review for FY17 the first week of April 2017.

During its January 2017 visit, the WestEd/CELT team monitored progress on the Department's efforts in the following areas (as approved by the State Board and the Joint Legislative Review Committee):

- Ongoing AELAS support and operations
- Statewide Student Information System Implementation
- AzEDS development
- Limited School Finance refactoring discovery and design work for APOR, CHAR and Budget payment processes

The team provided commendation for the successful conversion to AzEDS. They noted that the new data reporting process is working well, and the estimates as to the amount of savings from more accurate student counts is \$40 million. This represents a one-year payback for the overall AELAS project cost to date of \$38 million. Additionally, they added that the IT division has developed tools for tracking planned and actual costs for these projects. The monitors noted that the Department very closely manages the funding it receives.

While the team conducted its normal monitoring activities, this report focuses on one main finding from the monitoring visit - the fiscal instability of the funding sources for the completion of the development work and the ongoing maintenance needs. WestEd/CELT writes, "This finding overshadows any other topic the report addresses because, without sufficient funding, the data system will cease to function, and ramifications of such an event will be problematic for education across the State of Arizona."

Contact Information:

Lisa Blyler, Deputy Associate Superintendent
(Mark Masterson, CIO/Associate Superintendent)

Quarterly Performance Review of the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System: AELAS

Submitted to the Arizona Department of Education
by WestEd and CELT

Date: January 2017



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Summary Findings.....	3
Commendations.....	5

INTRODUCTION

This report documents a quarterly performance review of the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS) by an independent evaluator as required by *Arizona Revised Statutes* (A.R.S.) 15-249 that was conducted January 18-19, 2017. WestEd, the prime contractor, and the Center for Educational Leadership and Technology (CELT), the subcontractor, were hired by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) to serve as that independent evaluator. This quarterly monitoring report is a follow-up to the initial performance review conducted in 2013, with a report submitted on September 9, 2013. This report follows all previous quarterly monitoring reports, updating commendations and recommendations.

This report has a changed structure due to the findings and focus from the monitoring visit. We have elected to not present the typical findings and recommendations for the 11 topics as we have done in previous reports. Instead, the report will specifically focus on one main finding from the monitoring visit that potentially could have adverse effects on the future usefulness of AELAS. That finding is the fiscal instability of the funding sources for the completion of the development work and the ongoing maintenance needs. This finding overshadows any other topic the report addresses because, without sufficient funding, the data system will cease to function, and ramifications of such an event will be problematic for education across the State of Arizona.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

The main findings from this monitoring visit include:

- 1. Fiscal Year 2018 Sustainability Funding:** The FY2018 budget request was \$10.1 million for the support, maintenance, and ongoing operation of AELAS and \$7.5 million for further development. This report acknowledges the importance of sustaining and continuing to build on the work of AELAS. However, during the first day of the January 2018 site visit, the WestEd/CELT team learned that the Governor's proposed budget for ADE IT for fiscal year 2018 is currently zero dollars. This will leave the ADE IT group with less than \$3.6 million in the recurring operating budget to maintain daily operations and to support all existing systems. This amount is less than 50% of the minimum funds needed, based on the budgeted needs and in comparison with the requests of what other states require for their systems. The lack of funding means that the ADE IT department will be unable to maintain the systems it has most recently constructed (which includes the AELAS systems of AzEDS, AzDASH, ADEConnect and the new ADE ODS data marts) as well all of the other existing ADE systems and legacy SAIS applications. The budget reduction will mean that planning for layoffs and contract terminations will need to begin in February 2017 in order to prepare for the eventual transition point in the coming fiscal year. This will create a loss of talent and institutional knowledge that will be un-recoverable. Should adequate funding not be available for basic systems, the systems that have been recently developed may need to be shut down for lack of support resources. The legacy SAIS systems that previously supported payments to districts cannot (and should not) be placed back into production; the hardware and operating system components upon which the

rely are no longer sold or supported. This will result in the state of Arizona returning to the manual processes of funding calculations that pre-dated SAIS. This finding has been documented in prior monitoring reports over the past three years.

Concern for AELAS funding and ongoing support has been a finding by the WestEd/CELT reports since the first report in 2013. The following findings and recommendations have been directly extracted from that report and describe budgetary needs going forward:

Findings:

The AELAS, SAIS, and SLDS project costs, actual spend to date, funding sources and future costs are not well understood by the key stakeholders, governing bodies and legislature. This is a complex project, and the costs and funding structures are difficult to convey and to comprehend. This lack of understanding will make it more challenging over time to advocate for continuing expenditures.

The budgeted \$5.3 million for IT operations for 2014 is low compared to a recent Gartner study conducted on behalf of the State of Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This study cites a range of \$5.7 to \$6.8 million for peer state (e.g., Washington peer state) agencies for 2013.

The FY 2014 AELAS appropriation (\$7 million) does not provide the money to sustain the aggressive schedule that was planned for AELAS rollout, and will delay some of the benefits anticipated in the business plan.

The long-term sustainability for a system such as AELAS in Arizona is a serious issue. Funding streams can be in danger of being reduced or eliminated each year. Staffing for the full project and long-term ongoing support is unknown at this point.

Recommendations:

ADE should:

- * Develop a comprehensive plan for the full implementation of AELAS and the SAIS rewrite. It would include each of the projects and their accompanying resource needs, funding requirements, stakeholder resources, district resources, major deliverables and milestones over a multi-year period, and likely funding sources and funding gaps.*
- * Outline all of the projects (in progress and to be launched), the scope/deliverables, schedules, sponsors and team members, costs, and funding source. Be transparent as regards the AELAS/SAIS/SLDS budget, publishing its planned budget to date, actual spend to date, burn rate, percent complete by project for all efforts associated with these efforts, and sources of funding.*

The ongoing funding concern documented in previous reports is due to the history of SAIS, where funding for ongoing support and needed enhancements had been cut and the system was allowed to age out until it became untenable to support. A zero-budget for ADE IT would go far beyond repeating the negative effects in that it will shut down the only viable replacement for SAIS when it is successfully nearing approximately 80% of the way to replacing the SAIS systems.

Even with the full 100% of the funds needed to maintain the current systems (estimated at approximately \$7.8 million) this still leaves the ADE IT with insufficient funds to finish the migration off of SAIS. The APOR/CHAR system re-write and the replacement of the SAIS legacy applications will be shut down prior to completion and these systems will need to be

supported in their present state. This is a very risky position in which to be frozen, in that the hardware and operating system infrastructure for these applications is obsolete.

The WestEd/CELT team recommends the following:

- Allocate at least \$7.8 million to the recurring ADE IT budget beginning in FY 2018. This figure is based on the rationale for the original request for ADE IT as well as comparisons to other competitive and comparable states for their IT budgets.
 - Request that ADE submit a list of projects that are proposed for next year with each project fully estimated as to total cost to complete, even if it spans beyond FY 2018. The list should be in priority order with the impact of no funding clearly articulated for each project. APOR/CHAR and legacy application conversion should be included in the list.
 - Use the list to determine the amount of non-recurring budget to allocate to ADE IT for FY 2018.
2. **Re-write of APOR and CHAR:** The APOR/CHAR project is preparing to enter into the design phase in the 3rd quarter of FY 2017. The team elected to determine the business rules and financial calculations for APOR/CHAR prior to these systems being re-written by using a combined approach of legislative review and reverse engineering of the legacy code, followed by a gap analysis of the two results. This work needs to continue uninterrupted, and the estimate for full completion of the APOR/CHAR re-write should be provided as described in item 1 above.
 3. **Help Desk Services:** A finding in the previous report (October 2016) was that the ADE help desk services did not reflect the commonly accepted best practices and use of metrics as recommended by such frameworks as ITIL or COBIT. This had resulted in a backlog of tickets and long average resolution times. The ADE focused immediately on this issue, making organizational adjustments in November 2016. This has resulted in an improved help desk service and a better focus on KPIs for help desk operations. There is still some remaining work to be done, but it appears that the average resolution time and ticket backlog have been significantly reduced.
 4. **SIS Opt-in:** The improvement of the help desk should greatly improve the experiences of the SIS opt-in districts and increase the likelihood that additional districts might opt-in over time. Given that the ADE will no longer actively market the SIS opt-in approach to other districts, this will be an important consideration.
 5. **Legacy Apps:** Converting the legacy applications off of SAIS is an important next step for the AELAS project. This conversion has begun by pointing the legacy applications to new data marts populated from the ODS. The next phase of the legacy app conversion will look at collapsing and combining the legacy applications. This work will carry on for an as-yet undetermined amount of time. During this time, ADE will work to convert the older (2003) servers for these apps to newer servers to avoid the need to maintain unsupported system software. This legacy re-write work needs to be estimated as to its cost to complete (beyond FY 2018 if necessary) and communicated as recommended in item 1 above.

COMMENDATIONS

Commendations pertain to activities that ADE is doing especially well and are highlighted as examples of superlative performance. The WestEd/CELT team has noted the following commendations from observations during the January 2017 site visit:

1. **Conversion to AzEDS:** The new data reporting process is reported to be working well. Estimates as to the amount of savings from more accurate student counts is \$40 million. This represents a one-year payback for the overall AELAS project cost to date of \$38 million.
2. **Broadband** – The ADE is continuing its efforts to provide broadband services to school districts across the state. Progress has been made. This issue was raised in the original focus groups, and continued to be an issue for the most rural districts across the state. Broadband is a service that will greatly benefit the state and especially the smaller and more rural districts.
3. **Teacher Preparation Program** – Increasing the data literacy of educators across the state is technically not part of the WestEd/CELT monitoring. However, data literacy in the districts and at ADE is a foundational skill set that will enable broader and more effective use of AzEDS. ADE is at the cutting edge here among states. The ADE is requiring that teacher preparation programs show evidence that they provide training on data literacy for educators beyond just assessment literacy and to have data literacy embedded in all aspects of teacher preparation program, not a separate strand. ADE is one of the first, if not the first state, to collaboratively work with its colleges of education to develop a rubric and set of standards against which curricula can be built. It would be helpful, however, for ADE to ensure that data literacy skills and knowledge are included in the required skill sets for educator and have those skills sets available for dissemination via the Department’s website. ADE will be the topic of a white paper for the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, highlighting the data literacy work as cutting edge and recognizing ADE was one of the leaders in the field.
4. **Strategic Plan for ESSA** – ADE is ahead of most states in the development of the strategic directions for ESSA. ADE was the first state to submit their ESSA plan to the U.S. Department of Education.
5. **Cost Estimating and Tracking** - The ADE IT department has developed good tools for tracking planned and actual costs for the projects that they manage. These include not only cost tracking but also change request management/tracking and modeling tools to help project future costs for things such as cloud services. The department very closely manages the funding they receive. They are to be commended for continuously improving the project estimating/tracking tools and processes. This will be important going forward to be able to more accurately establish and track funding costs by major project. This level of cost planning and accountability will help to establish credibility for funding requests in the future. The site visit yielded several examples of careful project planning documents that outlined tasks, timelines, budgets, and possible challenges being used to monitoring project progress.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration to Approve Funding of the 2017 State Administration of Child Nutrition Programs.

Action/Discussion Item

Background and Discussion

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), annually allocates administrative money for the Child Nutrition Programs as dictated by (7CFR 235.5 (b)). For Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017 the allocation is \$5,801,231.

USDA's allocation schedule for the Arizona Department of Education, Health and Nutrition Services Division is as follows:

Nondiscretionary State Agency Expenditure (SAE) funding for NSLP and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)- \$4,787,446

Discretionary SAE funds support the following Health and Nutrition activities in the amount of \$1,013,785.

Administrative Reviews (NSLP)
Child and Adult Care Food Program
Food Distribution

Grand total of USDA SAE funds that will go to the Department of Education to be used by Health and Nutrition Services to administer the identified child nutrition programs is \$5,801,231.

These funds will not be sent to sub-recipients. The operational funds that pay for meals served by the sub-recipients come from a different USDA source.

Recommendation to the Board

That pursuant to ARS 15-1152 and 1153, the State Board authorizes the Department of Education to enter into an agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to operate the Child Nutrition Programs (National School Lunch, School Breakfast, Special Milk, USDA Foods, Child and Adult Care Food Program, Summer Food Service Program); allow the Department of Education to accept receipt of the funds allocated and authorize expenditures of these funds; and authorize the Department of Education to disburse these funds to eligible recipients in accordance with the federally stipulated reimbursement formulas and other USDA and Federal regulations.

Contact Information:

Tracey Nicholson
Melissa Conner, Associate Superintendent

**Allocation of Child Nutrition State Administrative Expense Funds
Fiscal Year 2017
Summary of SAE Funds Allocation**

Region	Code	Agency	Nondiscretionary SAE Allocation			Discretionary SAE				Grand Total
			School	CACFP	Subtotal	Admin Review	CACFP	FD	Subtotal	
WRO	291501	AK DOE	453,791	259,123	712,914	81,549	59,733	79,461	220,742	933,656
WRO	491501	AZ DOE	3,530,304	1,257,142	4,787,446	160,564	174,249	678,973	1,013,785	5,801,231
WRO	691501	CA DOE	18,828,850	10,017,944	28,846,794	504,315	1,179,491	3,124,905	4,808,712	33,655,506
WRO	1491501	GU DOE	200,737	32,294	233,031	74,361	33,706	30,198	138,264	371,295
WRO	1591501	HI DOE	561,068	200,649	761,716	73,013	53,023	142,758	268,794	1,030,511
WRO	1691501	ID DOE	705,366	208,312	913,678	92,942	53,902	153,060	299,904	1,213,581
WRO	3291101	NV DA	1,239,090	238,321	1,477,411	89,110	57,346	205,393	351,849	1,829,260
WRO	4191501	OR DOE	1,472,177	883,449	2,355,625	118,273	131,370	289,960	539,602	2,895,227
WRO	5391501	WA SPI	2,449,232	1,170,041	3,619,273	129,097	164,254	538,195	831,546	4,450,819
WRO Total			29,440,614	14,267,274	43,707,888	1,323,224	1,907,073	5,242,902	8,473,199	52,181,086

Item 4A—Legislative Affairs Will Be Presented At The Board Meeting

AMENDED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the draft A-F School Accountability Plan for 2016-2017

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

At the September 26, 2016 Board meeting, the Board adopted a consensus conceptual framework for the A-F school accountability system and directed the Board's ad hoc advisory committee to further develop specific multiple measures of the indicators. The ad hoc has met on:

- SEPTEMBER 20
- OCTOBER 7
- OCTOBER 24
- NOVEMBER 4
- NOVEMBER 16
- NOVEMBER 30
- DECEMBER 8
- JANUARY 4
- JANUARY 20
- FEBRUARY 1
- FEBRUARY 22

In additional, ADE has facilitated meetings with a technical advisory group providing support regarding methodology.

The A-F School Accountability Ad Hoc Advisory Committee has recommended that the Board receive public comment on the working draft components for the K-8 and 9-12 schools accountability plans.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board receive public comments on the working draft components for the K-8 and 9-12 schools accountability plans.

Contact Information:

Dr. Karol Schmidt, Executive Director, State Board of Education

Category	Component	Weight	Points/Percent
Proficiency	Weighted ELA, Math, and Science Proficiency (0, .6, 1.0, 1.3)	40%	40%
Growth Options (2)	SGP/SGT on ELA, Math	20% SGP 20% SGT	40%
	Florida Model Percentage Gains on ELA, Math	20% ELA 20% Math	
ELL	ELL Proficiency on AZELLA	5%	10%
	ELL Growth on AZELLA	5%	
Acceleration/ Readiness	Grades 5-8 students percentage accelerating on HS EOC, Grade 3 ELA Percentage Reduction in Minimally Proficient, Chronic Absenteeism	TBD	10%
Bonus Points	Based on special education enrollment at or above 80% of state average		2 points
	Performance in academic areas other than English language arts, math and science		3 points

Category	Component	Weight
Proficiency	ELA, Math, and Science Proficiency (0, .6, 1.0, 1.3)	40%
Growth Options (4)	SGP ELA, Percent Proficient Change Algebra 2 SGP on ELA, Math Florida Model Percentage Gains on ELA, Math SGP on ELA, SGT Math	10% ELA, 10% Math 10% ELA, 10% Math 10% ELA, 10% Math 10% ELA, 10% Math
ELL	ELL Proficiency on AZELLA	5%
	ELL Growth on AZELLA	5%
College and Career Ready Options* (2) *Available data for these calculations will depend on which year(s) of data is being required and timing of letter grades.	Student level scoring Available data points: SAT, ACT, CTE skills attainment assessment, AP courses, AzMERIT, postsecondary enrollment	15%
	Student level aggregated to school level: scoring based on an increase from one year to the next Available data points: the above list plus FAFSA	15%
Graduation Rate	4-year	10%
	5-year	3%
	6-year	1%
	7-year	1%
Bonus Points	Mix of college and career ready indicators Increases in post-secondary and military enrollment Based on special education enrollment at or above 80% of state average	

AMENDED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding policies and procedures for the menu of assessments for school year 2017-2018

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Under A.R.S. 15-741.02, the Board is required to adopt a menu of locally procured achievement assessments that may be utilized by eligible LEAs for assessing high school students in lieu of the statewide assessment in the 2017-2018 school year. A similar provision applies for assessing students in grades 3-8 beginning in the 2018-2019 school year.

Prior to Board approval for placement on the menu of assessments, providers of these assessments must submit evidence to the Board that the assessment is:

- high quality;
- meets or exceeds Board adopted academic standards;
- subject to equating for accountability; and
- evaluated by a third party approved by the Board.

In addition, Section 1111(b)(2)(H) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides new flexibility for a State to approve a LEA to administer a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the statewide high school assessment provided the assessment has been peer reviewed through the U.S. Department of Education.

Accordingly, the attached policy seeks to set for the procedures for vendors to submit for approval of locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments consistent with the requirements of A.R.S. 15-741.02 and Section 1111(b)(2)(H) of ESSA.

Recommendation to the Board

That the Board approve the policy and procedures for vendors to submit for consideration of placement on the menu of assessments consistent with the provisions of A.R.S. 15-741.02 and Section 1111(b)(2)(H) of ESSA.

Contact Information:

Dr. Karol Schmidt, Executive Director, State Board of Education

**ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
PROCEDURES FOR THE APPROVAL OF
LOCALLY PROCURED, NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED ASSESSMENTS
(A.R.S. 15-741.02)**

ADOPTED _____

A. Definitions.

In this Section, the following definitions apply:

1. "Board" means the Arizona State Board of Education.
2. "Department" means the Arizona Department of Education.
3. "Menu of Assessments" means a list of locally procured, nationally recognized high school assessments that may be selected by a local education agency which has been assigned a letter grade of A, B or C to meet the requirements prescribed in section 15-741.
4. "Nationally recognized high school assessment" means an assessment of high school students' knowledge and skills that is administered in multiple States and is recognized by institutions of higher education in those or other States for the purposes of entrance or placement into courses in postsecondary education or training programs.

B. Procedures.

1. The Board will establish and maintain a Menu of Assessments for 44th-grade high school end of course testing to measure pupil achievement of Arizona's ELA and mathematics academic standards that includes nationally recognized high school assessments which meet the requirements of this policy as set forth below.
2. A local education agency that is using an assessment that is not on the Menu of Assessments may request that the assessment be added to the Menu of Assessments upon approval by the Board. The Board, in cooperation with the Department, will annually evaluate locally procured assessments for consideration of their inclusion on the Menu of Assessments.
3. An assessment may be considered for inclusion on the Menu of Assessments upon a showing by the assessment provider that the following technical criteria have been met through a narrative explanation and completion of the Peer Review Template, attached as Appendix A which:
 - a. Provides evidence that the assessment is a high quality assessment by showing that
 - i. The assessment is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment regarding
 1. The coverage of academic content;

2. The difficulty of the assessment; and
 3. The overall quality of the assessment
- b. Demonstrates that the assessment meets or exceeds the Board's adopted academic standards by showing that
 - i. The assessment is aligned with the Board's adopted academic standards; and
 - ii. The assessment addresses the depth and breadth of the Board's adopted academic standards;
 - c. Demonstrates that the assessment scores can be equated for state accountability programs
 - d. Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the local educational agency that
 - i. Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment;
 - ii. Are expressed in terms consistent with the State's academic achievement standards
 - iii. Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the Board adopted accountability system
 - e. Provides evidence that the assessment is designed to be valid and accessible for use by all students, including students with disabilities and English learners; and
 - f. Provides evidence that the assessment is developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning with a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that
 - i. Provides flexibility in the ways information is presented, in the ways students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in the ways students are engaged; and
 - ii. Reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students who are English learners;
 - g. Ensures that the use of appropriate accommodations and does not deny a student with a disability or an English learner

- i. The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and
 - ii. Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not English learners
4. Submission of an evaluation from an independent third party approved by the Board that shows the assessment meets the requirements prescribed in paragraph B (3). Independent third party evaluators shall assess proposals under the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Testingⁱ and determine whether sufficient psychometric properties of the proposed test were included. All costs of the independent third party evaluators shall be paid by the assessment provider.
5. If a third party evaluation establishes that the proposed assessment sufficiently meets the technical criteria, the Department shall submit the proposed assessment to the Secretary of Education in accordance with the requirements for peer review under section 1111(a)(4) of ESSA demonstrating that any such assessment meets the requirements of ~~that section~~ **1111(b)(2)(B) of ESSA**.
6. If a third party evaluation and peer review by the Secretary of Education establishes that the proposed assessment sufficiently meets the technical criteria, the Department shall submit the proposed assessment to the Board for its consideration for approval.
7. Upon Board approval, a proposed assessment shall be included on the Menu of Assessments.
8. The assessment provider for any assessment included on the Menu of Assessments shall provide a copy of the assessment scores to the Department when scores are provided to its partnering local education agency.

ⁱhttps://www.ncme.org/ncme/NCME/Publication/Testing_Standards/NCME/Publication/Testing_Standards.aspx?hkey=c5136771-5475-4ba9-8132-9bcc1ca5a277

APPENDIX A
ARIZONA’S MENU OF ASSESSMENTS - PEER REVIEW SUBMISSION INDEX

Any assessment provider seeking inclusion on Arizona’s Menu of Assessments must provide the following evidence demonstrating that its assessment is a high quality assessment. The evidence provided will be reviewed by the Arizona State Board of Education, or its designee, and will be submitted to the United States Department of Education’s State Assessment Peer Review.

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>1.1 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The Provider’s assessment system includes a test that corresponds to each any of the following AzMERIT EOC tests: ELA 11 Algebra II ELA 10 Geometry ELA 9 Algebra I</p>		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The Provider’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of Arizona’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of Arizona’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in Arizona’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the Provider administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 		
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The Provider uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on Arizona’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>		

2.3 – Test Administration

The Provider implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the Provider:

- Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;
- Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the Provider’s general assessments receive training on the Provider’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;
- If the Provider administers technology-based assessments, the Provider has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.

2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

The Provider adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.

<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The Provider has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the Provider’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 		
--	--	--

<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The Provider has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 		
--	--	--

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The Provider has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the Provider’s validity evidence includes evidence that the Provider’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in Arizona’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the Provider’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of Arizona’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; 		
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The Provider has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in Arizona’s academic content standards.</p>		
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The Provider has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of Arizona’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>		
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The Provider has documented adequate validity evidence that the Provider’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>		

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The Provider has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for Arizona’s student population overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the Provider’s assessments estimated for Arizona’s student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the Provider’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 		
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The Provider has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>		
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The Provider has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>		
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The Provider has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results.</p>		

<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the Provider administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the Provider ensures that all forms adequately represent Arizona’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>		
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the Provider administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the Provider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The Provider has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system.</p>		

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The Provider has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the Provider’s assessments, other than students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who participate in alternate assessment, and including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;		
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The Provider has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the Provider’s assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.		

5.3 – Accommodations

The Provider makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the Provider:

- Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;
- Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners;
- Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student's need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;
- Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.

5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

The Provider monitors test administration in the districts and schools using its assessments to ensure that students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:

- Consistent with the Provider's policies for accommodations;
- Appropriate for addressing a student's disability or language needs for each assessment administered;
- Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;
- Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student's IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;
- Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (e.g., relevant document(s), page number(s) and location)	Notes, if applicable
<p>6.1 – Reporting</p> <p>The Provider's assessment results reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Provider reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the Provider also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;• The Provider provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student's achievement;○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;• The Provider follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding approval of a Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

A.R.S. § 15-203(A)(14) authorizes the State Board to supervise and control the certification of educators. At the January 23, 2017 Board meeting, the Board adopted an amendment to R7-2-614, creating a student teaching intern certificate. R7-2-614(K) requires approval by the Board of a written supervision plan from the educator preparation provider.

Consistent with the provisions of R7-2-614(K), four educator preparation providers – Northern Arizona University, the University of Arizona, Grand Canyon University and Arizona State University – have submitted a written supervision plan for Board approval. This plan includes verification of the education preparation provider’s roles and responsibilities for the program supervisor and verification that onsite mentorship and induction will be provided by the Local Education Agency (LEA).

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board approve the written supervision plan submitted by Northern Arizona University, the University of Arizona, Grand Canyon University and Arizona State University for the Student Teaching Intern Certificate.

Contact Information:

Dr. Karol Schmidt, Executive Director, State Board of Education

NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

February 14, 2017

Arizona State Board of Education
1700 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Arizona State Board of Education Members:

Northern Arizona University is pleased to submit the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan as per R7-2-614(K) for Board approval. This plan was developed in collaboration with the five state-approved Educator Preparation Providers in Arizona that offer Bachelors in Education programs leading to teacher certification. Input was also sought from administrators in Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

The attached written supervision plan includes verification of the education preparation provider's roles and responsibilities for the program supervisor and verification that onsite mentorship and induction be provided by the LEA.

We believe that this supervision plan is key to supporting student teachers' success in completing the final capstone requirements and to be retained in the profession.

Thank you for your consideration of this request to approve the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan. NAU is committed to developing high quality, first year ready teachers to help meet the needs of our schools and provide a quality education for all our children in the State of Arizona.

Sincerely,



Ramona Mellott, Ph.D.
Dean, NAU College of Education



Cynthia Conn, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Provost, NAU Professional Education Programs

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

1430 East Second Street
PO Box 210069
Tucson, AZ 85721-0069

Tel: 520-621-1081
Fax: 520-621-9271

www.coe.arizona.edu

February 14, 2017

Arizona State Board of Education
1700 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Arizona State Board of Education Members:

The University of Arizona is pleased to submit the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan as per R7-2-614(K) for Board approval. This plan was developed in collaboration with the five state-approved Educator Preparation Providers in Arizona that offer Bachelors in Education programs leading to teacher certification. Input was also sought from administrators in Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

The attached written supervision plan includes verification of the education preparation provider's roles and responsibilities for the program supervisor and verification that onsite mentorship and induction be provided by the LEA.

We believe that this supervision plan is key to supporting student teachers' success in completing the final capstone requirements and to be retained in the profession.

Thank you for your consideration of this request to approve the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan. The University of Arizona is committed to developing high quality, first year ready teachers to help meet the needs of our schools and provide a quality education for all our children in the State of Arizona.

Sincerely,



Renée T. Clift
Associate Dean and Professor

February 14, 2017

Arizona State Board of Education
1700 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Arizona State Board of Education Members:

Grand Canyon University is pleased to submit the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan as per R7-2-614(K) for Board approval. This plan was developed in collaboration with the five state-approved Educator Preparation Providers in Arizona that offer Bachelors in Education programs leading to teacher certification. Input was also sought from administrators in Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

The attached written supervision plan includes verification of the education preparation provider's roles and responsibilities for the program supervisor and verification that onsite mentorship and induction be provided by the LEA.

We believe that this supervision plan is key to supporting student teachers' success in completing the final capstone requirements and to be retained in the profession.

Thank you for your consideration of this request to approve the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan. GCU is committed to developing high quality, first year ready teachers to help meet the needs of our schools and provide a quality education for all our children in the State of Arizona.

Sincerely,



Dr. Kimberly LaPrade
Dean, College of Education

ASU Mary Lou Fulton
Teachers College
Arizona State University

February 16, 2017

Arizona State Board of Education
1700 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Arizona State Board of Education Members:

Arizona State University is pleased to submit the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan as per R7-2-614(K) for Board approval. This plan was developed in collaboration with five state-approved Educator Preparation Providers in Arizona that offer Bachelors in Education programs leading to teacher certification. Input was also sought from administrators in Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

The attached written supervision plan includes verification of the education preparation provider's roles and responsibilities for the program supervisor and verification that onsite mentorship and induction be provided by the LEA.

Thank you for your consideration of this request to approve the Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan. ASU is committed to developing high quality, first year ready teachers to help meet the needs of our schools and provide a quality education for all our children in the State of Arizona.

Sincerely,

Nancy J. Perry

Nancy J Perry, Associate Dean
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
Arizona State University

Student Teaching Intern Written Supervision Plan

This collaborative training agreement is between:

Name of Local Education Agency (LEA): [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone Number: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name of Principal/Superintendent/Designated Administrator: [Click here to enter text.](#)

AND:

Name of Board Approved Educator Preparation Program: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone Number: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Name of Program Director: [Click here to enter text.](#)

FOR:

Name of Student Teaching Intern: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Address of Student Teaching Intern: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Phone Number of Student Teaching Intern: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Email Address of Student Teaching Intern: [Click here to enter text.](#)

This Written Supervision Plan is between the Local Educational Agency (LEA) and the Educator Preparation Program (Program) and is in accordance with A.A.C. R7-2-614 Other Teaching Certificate approved by the Arizona Board of Education. The establishment of the plan is for the purpose of defining the nature and scope of a planned organized Student Teaching Intern (Intern) experience designed to facilitate the development of the Student Teaching Intern skills and competencies in the provision of high quality teaching consistent with applicable legal, ethical and professional standards. This plan will also specify the duties and responsibilities of the Supervising Practitioner identified by the LEA and the Supervisor assigned by the Intern's Program.

Establishing the Student Teaching Intern Placement:

1. The Designated Administrator (i.e., superintendent, principal or head) of the LEA agree that all aspects of this student teaching intern experience will be carried out in accordance with all requirements of the A.A.C. R7-2-614 Other Teaching Certificates, and all other applicable statutes and rules.
2. The LEA will establish a Supervising Practitioner for this internship experience subject to approval by the Program.
3. The LEA will communicate directly with the Director of the Educator Preparation Program or Designee regarding the experience that will be provided for the Student Teaching Intern.

4. Through a mutually agreed upon decision between the LEA and the Educator Preparation Program, the Student Teaching Intern who does not fulfill the requirements of the internship may be eligible to complete the student teaching capstone experience through traditional student teaching experience as defined by the respective Educator Preparation Program and by A.A.C R7-2-604.
5. The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) will indicate the professional development required of the Supervising Practitioner of the Student Teaching Intern. This professional development may be offered in partnership with the LEA and or other appropriate entities qualified to provide professional development.
6. Compensation for the Supervising Practitioner for the additional responsibilities related to the supervision of a Student Teaching Intern should be covered by the LEA and must be prearranged in writing with the duties and expectations clearly outlined in the agreement.

Responsibilities of the Educator Preparation Program Supervisor (Program Supervisor):

1. The Student Teaching Intern will complete an orientation facilitated by the EPP, upon obtaining the Student Teaching Intern Certificate.
2. The Student Teaching Intern will be assessed formally by the Program Supervisor using the established processes determined by the program for student teaching experiences.
3. Program Supervisors will collaborate with the LEA Supervising Practitioner and the Student Teaching Intern, and provide a report of these evaluations to the LEA Supervising Practitioner and the Student Teaching Intern.
4. Program Supervisors will review logs and other forms to ensure that adequate supervision and mentorship is being provided to the Student Teaching Intern.
5. The Student Teaching Intern will be deemed to have completed the experience upon meeting the Educator Preparation Program catalog and syllabus requirements for student teaching experiences.
6. Site and program expectations will be established in conjunction with the LEA Supervising Practitioner and the Program Supervisor.
7. Normally, the Student Teaching Intern should not be responsible for extra duties (e.g., coaching, substituting, monitoring, extensive committee responsibilities and other additional assignments).
8. The Program Supervisor will complete in-class observation/evaluation meetings consistent with program expectations with the Student Teaching Intern and Supervising Practitioner.
9. The Program Supervisor and the Supervising Practitioner will participate in an agreed upon number of supervision and evaluation meetings with the Student Teaching Intern.
10. The Program Supervisor will complete required forms established by the Program.
11. The Program Supervisor will provide information regarding professional development training experiences and ensure that the Student Teaching Intern has the opportunity to participate in these experiences.
12. Upon meeting programmatic requirements, the responsibility of the Program Supervisor ceases.

Qualifications of the Local Education Agency (LEA) Supervising Practitioner:

1. The Supervising Practitioner will be located in the same school building as the Student Teaching Intern.
2. The Supervising Practitioner shall meet the Standards for Arizona Teachers and have the experience with a variety of teaching strategies.
3. The Supervising Practitioner shall have a minimum of three years of teaching experience and must be appropriately certified, and have the content knowledge and training, in the areas of emphasis in which the Student Teaching Intern is being placed.
4. The Supervising Practitioner shall have completed the EPP required training in supervision within the last three years, and provide a copy of the certificate of completion.

Responsibilities of the Local Education Agency (LEA) Supervising Practitioner:

1. As per A.A.C R7-2-614, the LEA Supervising Practitioner will provide onsite mentorship and support to the Student Teaching Intern.
2. The Supervising Practitioner will collaborate with the Program Supervisor and Student Teaching Intern, and provide regular feedback of the Student Teaching Intern's instruction, professional performance, and abilities, as well as help the Student Teaching Intern reflect upon strengths and areas that need improvement.
3. The Supervising Practitioner will have a minimum of one meeting per week with the Student Teaching Intern at a prearranged time for a minimum of 60 minutes or the equivalent of a class period to provide formative feedback, reflect on the week and plan. Additional hours of mentorship will be provided when necessary to insure the adequate quality of the internship experience.. These meetings will be documented by the Supervising Practitioner and the Student and reviewed by the Program Supervisor to ensure minimum requirements are met.
4. The Supervising Practitioner or designee will conduct informal class observations as frequently as possible but at minimum at least once every two weeks during the internship experience and provide feedback within 48 hours. Observations forms and notes will be reviewed by the Program Supervisor to ensure minimum requirements are met.
5. Along with the Program Supervisor, the Supervising Practitioner will participate in a agreed upon number of supervision and evaluation meetings with the Student Teaching Intern. During the weeks these meetings occur, they can take the place of the weekly supervision meeting as described in #4.
6. The Supervising Practitioner will complete required forms established by the Program.
7. The Supervising Practitioner along with the assistance of the Designated Administrator will provide information regarding professional development training experiences, additional coaching and observation opportunities as needed, and ensure that the Student Teaching Intern has the opportunity to participate in these experiences.
8. The Supervising Practitioner agrees to participate in one or more training experiences provided by the Program.

This plan will be signed by all parties concerned including the Designated Administrator, Supervising Practitioner, and Program Director or identified parties responsible for executing this agreement. Amendments to this plan will be made upon approval of all parties that have signed and agreed to this plan. A copy of the plan will be provided to the Student Teaching Intern.

Name of Designated Administrator

Signature

Date

Name of Program Director

Signature

Date

Name of Supervising Practitioner

Signature

Date

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding discipline guidelines on certification enforcement actions

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Consistent with A.R.S. §15-203(20), the State Board of Education may impose disciplinary action upon a certified individual, including a letter of censure, suspension, suspension with conditions or revocation of a certificate upon a finding of immoral or unprofessional conduct.

Board staff has reviewed and compiled a list of recent disciplinary actions imposed by the Board at previous meetings. The purpose of this list is to inform the Board as it sets a range of suggested disciplinary action.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board create a range of suggested discipline action for immoral or unprofessional conduct by certificated individuals.

Contact Information:

Dr. Karol Schmidt, Executive Director, State Board of Education

INAPPROPRIATE COMMUNICATIONS – SEXUAL w/ STUDENT

Settlement Agreement	PPAC (before policy change)	Board action
3 month suspension	approved	approved
1 year suspension	approved	approved
1 year suspension with conditions	N/A	rejected*
2 year suspension with conditions	N/A	approved
3 year suspension with conditions	N/A	approved

Contested Action	PPAC	Board action
	revocation	approved
	suspension through expiration	approved

Board suggested guidelines:

INAPPROPRIATE COMMUNICATIONS – NONSEXUAL w/ STUDENT

Settlement Agreement	PPAC (before policy change)	Board action
1 year suspension with conditions	approved	approved

Contested Action	PPAC	Board action

Board suggested guidelines:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue:	Presentation, discussion and possible action to initiate rulemaking procedures for the proposed amendments to Board rule R7-2-619 regarding renewal requirements
---------------	--

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

A.R.S. § 15-203(A)(14) authorizes the State Board to supervise and control the certification of educators. The proposed amendments to R7-2-619 conform Board rule regarding Renewal Requirements to SB1057 which includes a provision for retired educators to renew their certificates after expiration. In addition, the amendments include a provision that continuing education credits regarding the human trafficking of children may be used for the renewal of Arizona certificates, endorsements or approved areas. Finally, the amendments conform to SB1042 which states that standard certificates that are renewed shall be valid for twelve years instead of eight years.

At the January 25, 2017 meeting of the Certification Advisory Committee (CAC), the Committee reviewed and provided feedback on a first draft of the amendments to Board rule R7-2-619 regarding Renewal Requirements. Board staff drafted revisions based on their recommendations and sought technical review from the Department of Education (ADE). At the February 6, 2017 meeting of the CAC, the Committee offered additional revisions and recommended the Board open rulemaking on the proposed amendments to R7-2-619 regarding Renewal Requirements.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board initiate rulemaking procedures for the proposed amendments to Board rule R7-2-619 regarding Renewal Requirements.

Contact Information:

Dr. Karol Schmidt, Executive Director, State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

R7-2-619. Renewal Requirements

A. A certificate may be renewed within six months of its expiration date except that an individual holding multiple valid certificates may renew all certificates at one time in order to align the expiration dates of each certificate. Certificates being aligned shall be renewed at the same time as the certificate that will expire first. Individuals seeking to align certificates shall meet the renewal requirements for each certificate being aligned. Certificates that are renewed or aligned pursuant to this Section shall be valid for **eight twelve** years.

B. A certificate may be renewed within one year after it expires. Individuals whose certificates have been expired for more than one year shall reapply for certification under the requirements in effect at the time of reapplication. Nothing in this Section shall imply that an individual may be employed in a position that requires certification after the expiration of the relevant certificate.

C. Renewal of certificates requires the completion of continuing education credits after the most recent issuance or renewal of the certificate, except that continuing education credits completed during the valid term of the certificate that expires first meets the requirement of certificates being aligned. One hour of continuing education credit shall be equivalent to one clock hour of a professional development activity. Continuing education credits must relate to Arizona academic or professional educator standards or apply toward the attainment of an additional Arizona certificate, endorsement, or approved area, and may include training regarding suicide awareness and prevention; child abuse, **human trafficking of children** and the sexual abuse of children, including warning signs that a child may be a victim of child abuse, **human trafficking**, or sexual abuses; screening, intervention, accommodation, use of technology and advocacy for students with reading impairments, including dyslexia; or other training programs explicitly permitted by state law. Professional development that may be counted toward the required hours of continuing education credit shall consist of any of the following activities:

1. Courses related to education or a subject area taught in Arizona schools, taken from an accredited institution. Each semester hour of courses shall be equivalent to 15 clock hours of professional development. The required documentation shall be an official transcript.

2. Professional activities such as conferences and workshops related to the profession of teaching or the field of public education. A maximum of 30 clock hours per year may be earned by attendance at professional conferences and workshops. The required documentation shall be a conference agenda and a statement or certificate from the sponsoring organization noting the clock hours earned.

3. District-sponsored or school-sponsored in-services or activities which are specifically designed for professional development. The required documentation shall be written verification from the sponsoring district or school stating the dates of participation and the number of clock hours earned.

4. Internships in business settings. The internship shall be based on an agreement between a business and a district or school with the stated objective of aligning teaching curriculum with workplace skills. A maximum of 80 clock hours may be

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

earned through business internships. The required documentation shall be written verification by the sponsoring business and district or school stating the dates of participation and number of clock hours earned.

5. Educational research. The research shall be sponsored by a research facility or an accredited institution or funded by a grant. The required documentation shall be the published report of the research or verification by the sponsoring agency; and a statement of the dates of participation and the number of clock hours earned.

6. Serving in a leadership role of a professional organization that provides training, activities, or projects related to the profession of teaching or the field of public education. A maximum of 30 clock hours per year may be earned by serving in a leadership role of a professional organization. The required documentation shall be written verification by the governing body of the professional organization of the dates of service and clock hours earned.

7. Serving on a visitation team for a school accreditation agency. A maximum of 60 clock hours per year may be earned by serving on a visitation team. The required documentation shall be written verification from the accreditation agency of the dates of service and clock hours earned.

8. Completion of the process for certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. The required documentation shall be written verification from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and a statement from the employing district or school verifying the dates and the clock hours earned during the certification process.

D. An individual holding a Standard teaching certificate, an administrative certificate, a Guidance Counselor certificate, or a School Psychologist certificate, may renew the certificate for eight years upon completion of fifteen hours of continuing education credits each year of the certificate term.

E. An individual who is employed by a school or school district at the time of renewal shall submit the required documentation of professional development to the district superintendent, director of personnel, or other designated administrator for verification. A certified individual who is not employed by a school or school district at the time of renewal shall submit the required documentation of professional development to a county school superintendent, the dean of a college of education, or the Department for verification. The school or district official, county school superintendent, or the dean of a college of education shall verify on forms provided by the Department the number of hours of professional development completed by the individual during the valid period of the certificate being renewed.

F. The Department shall issue a Standard teaching certificate of the same type.

G. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section, an individual with a valid fingerprint clearance card who has had a certificate or certificates expire for two years or more may renew the expired certificate(s) and any endorsement(s) or approved area(s) if the individual had ten or more years of verified full-time experience in this state in the area the individual is seeking renewed certification and was in good

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

standing without any other additional requirements. Standard certificate(s) issued to that individual pursuant to this subsection shall be identical to the expired certificate(s).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Discussion and possible action to direct staff to procure video recording equipment

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

State law requires that the State Board of Education record its minutes in writing or by audio or video recorder. A.R.S. § 38-431.01(B). Presently, as Board members know, the Board records its minutes by posting audio recordings of its meetings on its website, with a Summary of Action that indicates the time (to the hour and minute) at which each agenda item was considered. It is proposed that the Board direct its staff to investigate the cost of acquiring, installing, operating and maintaining video recording equipment to fulfill the requirement to record its minutes, and that its staff to report at a subsequent meeting regarding the results of its investigations.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the Board direct staff to investigate the cost of procuring video recording equipment to fulfill the requirement to record its minutes.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for David A. Coffman
Case No. C-2016-600

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

David A. Coffman holds a Reciprocal Provisional Secondary (6-12) certificate which is valid until June 1, 2019.

The investigative unit received a report from NASDTEC that Mr. Coffman had his Idaho teaching certificate revoked on or about September 23, 2016, due to numerous incidents of inappropriate behavior with female students.

Mr. Coffman was contacted by the investigative unit, resigned from North Pointe School, and surrendered his Arizona teaching certificate on January 19, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by David A. Coffman, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Zachary T. Goertz
Case No. C-2016-588

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Zachary T. Goertz holds a Provisional Secondary Education (6-12) certificate, valid until May 25, 2019, and a Substitute certificate valid until September 19, 2022.

The investigative unit received a report from the Vail Unified School District that Mr. Goertz was partaking in inappropriate electronic communications with female students.

Mr. Goertz was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered his Arizona teaching certificates on January 20, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Zachary T. Goertz, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Terry J. Lindsey
Case No. C-2015-135

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Terry J. Lindsey holds a Standard Cross Categorical Special Education certificate which is valid until September 15, 2021.

The investigative unit received a report from the Pendergast Elementary School District that Mr. Lindsey allowed a student to view pornography on his personal electronic tablet while in class.

Mr. Lindsey was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered his Arizona teaching certificate on January 7, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Terry J. Linsey, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Crystal Riley
Case No. C-2016-131

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Crystal Riley holds a Substitute certificate which is valid until February 18, 2022.

The investigative unit received a report from DPS that stated Ms. Riley was arrested on or about October 17, 2015, for Felony Criminal Damage.

Ms. Riley was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered her Arizona teaching certificate by email on July 25, 2016.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Crystal Riley, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Ariana M. Speranza
Case No. C-2016-353

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Ariana M. Speranza holds a Provisional Secondary Education (6-12) certificate which is valid until July 1, 2018.

The investigative unit received a report from the Tucson Unified School District that Ms. Speranza had engaged in sexual conduct with a minor student.

Ms. Speranza was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered her Arizona teaching certificate on January 9, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Ariana M. Speranza, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Amy Young
Case No. C-2016-235

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Amy Young holds a Standard Special Education ED (K-12) certificate, a Standard Special Education ID (K-12) certificate and a Standard Elementary Education (1-8) certificate, all of which are valid until September 11, 2021.

The investigative unit received a report from the Crane Elementary School District that Ms. Young had an altercation with a Special Education student, resulting in an improper restraint of the student.

Ms. Young was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered her Arizona teaching certificate on February 5, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Amy Young, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Certificate Surrender for Juan Zazueta
Case No. C-2016-260

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Juan Zazueta holds a Standard Secondary Education (6-12) certificate which is valid until March 2, 2017.

The investigative unit received a report from the Phoenix Union High School District that Mr. Zazueta had an inappropriate relationship with a minor student.

Mr. Zazueta was contacted by the investigative unit and surrendered his Arizona teaching certificate on January 9, 2017.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of any and all certificates held by Juan Zazueta, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams

Director of Special Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Permanent Revocation of Certificate(s) for Gregory Scott Tibbetts, Case No. C-2016-282, Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550.

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Gregory Scott Tibbetts was arrested for sexually assaulting a minor student over a two year period. He was charged with providing alcohol and pornographic material to the same minor student in the Michigan court system.

Mr. Tibbetts' Michigan teaching credentials were revoked in July of 2014.

These convictions constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550 and warrant the immediate and permanent revocation of his Arizona teaching certificate(s).

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550, the State Board of Education permanently revoke any and all certificates held by Gregory Scott Tibbetts, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Consideration of Permanent Revocation of Certificate(s) for Jason Scott Webb
Case No. C-2016-042, Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550.

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Jason Scott Webb guilty to Solicitation of a Child by Computer to Commit an Unlawful Sex Act in the North Carolina court system.

Mr. Webb's North Carolina teaching credentials were revoked in January 2016.

These convictions constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550 and warrant the immediate and permanent revocation of his Arizona teaching certificate(s).

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550, the State Board of Education permanently revoke any and all certificates held by Jason Scott Webb, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve the Revocation of certificates held by Christopher A. Heavin, Case No. C-2016-047

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Mr. Heavin holds a valid Standard Secondary Education 6-12 certificate which expires on May 2, 2019.

From January 5, 2015 through July 15, 2015, Respondent was employed as a teacher at PAS Charter, Inc.-Metro Location ("PAS"), a charter school located in Phoenix, Arizona.

Student A was a 16-year-old female student at PAS in February and March of 2015.

In at least February and March of 2015, Mr. Heavin and Student A exchanged numerous electronic messages wherein Mr. Heavin repeatedly sent Student A inappropriate communications, including profanity and comments of a sexually suggestive nature.

On or about February 3, 2016, PAS reported the inappropriate electronic communications to the Arizona Department of Education.

Recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (PPAC)

On January 10, 2017, the PPAC recommended, by a vote of 5 to 0, that the Board approve the revocation of Mr. Heavin's teaching credentials.

Recommendation to the Board

That the State Board of Education accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and the Recommendation of the PPAC to approve the revocation of any and all of Christopher A. Heavin's teaching certificates and that all states and territories be so notified.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve the Revocation of certificates held by Susan Yonker, Case No. C-2016-593

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Ms. Yonker holds a valid Standard Secondary Education 6-12 certificate which expires on April 9, 2020.

At all times relevant to this Complaint, Ms. Yonker was a teacher at Willis Junior High School ("Willis") in the Chandler Unified School District ("CUSD") located in Chandler, Arizona.

Student A was a 13-year-old female student at Willis during the Fall semester of 2015.

In the Fall semester of 2015, Ms. Yonker and Student A exchanged numerous inappropriate electronic messages, many of which included profanity, sexual topics, derogatory statements about co-workers and students and inappropriate comments about personal relationships.

Recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (PPAC)

On January 10, 2017, the PPAC recommended, by a vote of 3 to 2, that the Board approve the revocation of any and all of Ms. Yonker's teaching certificates.

Recommendation to the Board

That the State Board of Education accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and the Recommendation of the PPAC to approve the revocation of any and all of Susan Yonker's teaching certificates and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

*Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation for Certificate Suspension of Cassandra Dodson, Case No. C-2016-643.

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Ms. Dodson holds a valid Provisional Career and Technical Education (“CTE”) certificate which expires on August 4, 2017.

On April 15, 2012, Ms. Dodson was arrested in Craig, Colorado, by the Craig Police Department (“CPD”) after causing a disturbance at a hotel. Incident to her arrest by the CPD, Ms. Dodson was fingerprinted and charged with the following crimes:

- a. Charge 1: 3rd Degree Assault-Simple
- b. Charge 2: Domestic Violence
- c. Charge 3: 3rd Degree Assault-Simple
- d. Charge 4: Obstructing a Peace Officer
- e. Charge 5: Driving Under Influence-Liquor
- f. Charge 6: Criminal Attempt

Ms. Dodson was subsequently convicted of Harassment as a result of her actions on April 15, 2012.

On July 15, 2016, Ms. Dodson completed, signed and dated an application for certification. On that form, she checked “no” to answer the question “Have you ever been arrested for any offense for which you were fingerprinted?” Ms. Dodson then submitted the application on July 22, 2016 to the Certification Unit. She was issued a CTE certificate.

On September 26, 2016, Ms. Dodson was notified by mail that her fingerprint clearance card had been denied based on criminal history in another state.

Ms. Dodson’s fingerprint clearance card has been reinstated.

Recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (“PPAC”)

The PPAC, at its January 10, 2017 meeting, recommended, by a vote of 4 to 1, that the State Board of Education suspend any and all certificates held by Cassandra Dodson through August 4, 2017, the expiration date of her Provisional CTE certificate.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education adopt the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and the Recommendation of the PPAC and suspend any and all certificates held by Cassandra Dodson through August 4, 2017, and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve Application for Certification for Danielle Sierra, C-2016-447R

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Ms. Sierra is applying for a Substitute certificate. She submitted her application on or about August 24, 2016.

On February 4, 2012, Ms. Sierra was arrested for DUI by the Pima County Sheriff's Department. At the time of her arrest, her three children, all under the age of sixteen, were present in the vehicle. As a result, Ms. Sierra was also charged with three counts of Child Abuse.

On April 5, 2013, Ms. Sierra was arrested based on a warrant for failure to appear related to the charges stemming from the February 4, 2012 arrest.

On August 19, 2013, Ms. Sierra was convicted of one count of Endangerment and one count of Driving Under the Influence based upon the February 4, 2012 arrest, and convicted of one count of Custodial Interference based upon the April 5, 2013 arrest. As a result, Ms. Sierra was placed on probation for a period of two years beginning August 19, 2013.

On June 10, 2015, Ms. Sierra was granted an early termination of her probation. All three of the August 19, 2013 convictions are classified as misdemeanors.

It was determined that at the time of the February 4, 2012 arrest, Ms. Sierra did not consume alcohol, however, she did have over the counter medication and prescribed medication in her system.

Recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee ("PPAC")

The PPAC, at its January 10, 2017 meeting, recommended by a vote of 6 to 0, that the Board grant Ms. Sierra's application for certification despite evidence showing that the applicant engaged in unprofessional conduct.

Recommendation to the Board

That the State Board of Education accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and approve the application of Daniella Sierra.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects, State Board of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve the Negotiated Settlement Agreement for John M. Boggess. C-2016-558

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

John M. Boggess holds a Standard Secondary Education (6-12) certificate and a Guidance Counselor (PreK-12) certificate, both of which expire on July 11, 2017.

On August 1, 2016, Mr. Boggess was suspected of consuming alcohol while at work. His administrator from Dobson High School, in the Mesa Unified School District ("MUSD"), took Mr. Boggess to Concentra Medical Center for testing. Once a breathalyzer test was performed, it was determined that Mr. Boggess' blood alcohol content was a 0.243 at 7:52 p.m.

On August 2, 2016, Mr. Boggess was reassigned to home with pay pending further investigation and he subsequently resigned from his position in MUSD effective September 30, 2016.

Settlement Agreement and Conditions

Mr. Boggess has agreed to (1) the withdrawal of any open and pending applications for educator certification and (2) a one-year suspension with conditions. The conditions are as follows:

- Shall participate in counseling, therapy, or a treatment program which addresses substance abuse issues. Any such counseling, therapy, or treatment program must first be approved by the Board's staff.
- Shall furnish a letter of proof of successful completion to the Board certifying successful completion of counseling, therapy, or treatment addressing the issued that led to the conduct.
- All conditions are at the expense of Mr. Boggess.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the Negotiated Settlement Agreement with conditions for John M. Boggess and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve the Negotiated Settlement Agreement for Renee Hollander, C-2016-137

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

During the period from June 1, 2014 through the week ending December 27, 2014, Respondent filed 30 weekly claims for Unemployment Insurance (“UI”) benefits with the Arizona Department of Economic Security (“ADES”). Respondent worked for, and earned wages from, Burkes Outlet Store (“Burkes”) in Laughlin, Nevada, each of those 30 weeks. However, she failed to report those earnings when she filed each of those 30 weekly claims.

As a result of her failure to report her wages from Burkes each of those 30 weeks, Respondent was overpaid UI benefits (i.e., received UI benefits to which she was not entitled) in a total amount of \$5,851. In September 2015, Respondent remitted a cashier’s check in the amount of \$6,728.65 to ADES to repay the \$5,851 in overpaid UI benefits plus a penalty amount of 15% (\$877.65) because the overpayment was determined to be the result of fraud by Respondent.

In January 2016, a Direct Complaint was filed against Respondent in Maricopa County Superior Court charging Respondent with 31 felony counts as a result of her failure to report her earnings from Burkes and the resulting overpayment of UI benefits. Respondent subsequently entered a plea agreement in that case, and on June 17, 2016, Respondent pled guilty to one amended count of False Statement (Unemployment Compensation), a Class 1 Misdemeanor. Pursuant to the plea agreement, the other 30 felony counts that had been filed against Respondent were dismissed.

Settlement Agreement

Ms. Hollander has agreed to a one-year suspension of any and all of her teaching certificates.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the Negotiated Settlement Agreement for Renee Hollander and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Issue: Presentation, discussion and possible action regarding the Recommendation to Approve the Negotiated Settlement Agreement for Lauren Sieberg C-2016-629

Action/Discussion Item

Information Item

Background and Discussion

Lauren Sieberg holds a Standard Elementary Education (K-8) certificate which expires on May 18, 2017.

On October 12, 2016, Ms. Sieberg was suspected of consuming alcohol while at work. Her administrator from Copperwood Elementary School, in the Peoria Unified School District ("PUSD"), took Ms. Sieberg to a medical center for testing. Once a breathalyzer test was performed, it was determined that Ms. Sieberg's blood alcohol content was a 0.296 at 3:08 p.m.

To date, Ms. Sieburg is still an employee of PUSD. She is on an approved leave of absence from the district.

Settlement Agreement and Conditions

Ms. Sieberg has agreed to a one-year suspension with conditions. The conditions are as follows:

- Shall participate in counseling, therapy, or a treatment program which addresses substance abuse issues. Any such counseling, therapy, or treatment program must first be approved by the Board's staff.
- Shall furnish a letter of proof of successful completion to the Board certifying successful completion of counseling, therapy, or treatment addressing the issued that led to the conduct.
- All conditions are at the expense of Ms. Sieberg.

Recommendation to the Board

It is recommended that the State Board of Education accept the Negotiated Settlement Agreement with conditions for Lauren Sieberg and that all states and territories be so notified.

Contact Information:

Alicia Williams
Director of Special Projects
State Board of Education