

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting on August 26, 2013 at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson Street, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

President Tyree
Ms. Klein
Superintendent Huppenthal
Ms. Hamilton
Mr. Jacks
Vice President Miller (via phone)
Mr. Molera
Mr. Moore
Dr. Rottweiler

Members Absent:

Dr. Hart
Mr. Molera
Ms. Ortiz-Parsons

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, MOMENT OF SILENCE,
AND ROLL CALL

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

1. Appointments to nominating committee for 2014 Board Officers
President Tyree announced that he, Mr. Molera, Ms. Hamilton will serve on the nominating committee and will bring a list of candidates for 2014 Board officers to the December meeting. Nothing further to report.

B. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Huppenthal spoke about the Excellence in Civic Engagement award given to 20 schools recognized for distinction and merit. The principals of this award are high quality instruction dealing with the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the democratic process, as well as providing extracurricular and service learning activities in the community. Our schools teach our students more than just college and career ready as shown through the Excellence in Civic Engagement awards. These schools are teaching students to become good citizens and are embracing what it means to be an American.

Superintendent Huppenthal spoke about the Common Core Standards and how Arizona and the Department of Education has taken ownership of

these standards and feel confident that the standards that were adopted by the Board in July, 2010 are very solid standards going forward.

C. Board Member Reports

Ms. Klein spoke to the Board about her attendance to the Time Summit on Higher Education in New York City last week. In attendance were over 60 reform-minded leaders along with national leaders who have dedicated themselves to education reform. We have to have a higher degree in customization and be better at keeping students in college that make it to higher education. We have talked about having a joint meeting with the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education and is looking forward to that meeting.

Mr. Moore reminded the Board members about WestEd's Annual Dinner Meeting in October and welcomed their attendance if any member would like to attend.

D. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Yanez spoke to the Board and reminded the members to inform him of their attendance at the WestEd meeting so the State Board can post a quorum notice if necessary.

Since the Board's Retreat meeting in August, ongoing conversations have been held about the process for identifying and improving embedded CTE credits. I have had conversations with the Department and with President Tyree about making sure this process is completed in a timely manner. It has come to our attention that the process that was in place and approved approximately a year and a half ago has stalled due to some resource issues in the department. That processes essential require the CTE and academic division to work with the field and identify which courses qualify for credit. Since that process has stalled, Deputy Director Thompson and Mr. Yanez have approached the Science Foundation to see if they can assist in this process as well as with Darcy Renfro at the Stem Center and they have agreed to facilitate that process. Leadership in the Department of Education and the standards experts in the Department are involved to make sure that the Board can be confident that the courses have the rigor to qualify for those credits.

Lastly, Mr. Yanez asked the Board to hold the minutes from August 12, 2013 until the October meeting.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Consideration to approve Arizona State Board of Education minutes for August 12, 2013 and August 26, 2013.

- B. Consideration to approve the Arizona Charter School Program Awards, Round II 2014-2016 Contract Abstract
- C. Consideration to appoint Ms. Sasha Glassman to the Certification Advisory Committee (CAC).
- D. Consideration to approve funds for Interagency Service Agreement No. CSA-ISA-01-2014, regarding research and evaluation personnel for Arizona State Board for Charter Schools
- E. Receipt of AIMS Augmentation Report, pursuant to R7-2-302.06
- F. Consideration to accept voluntary surrender of the certificates held by the following individuals:
 - 1. Jasmeet Kaur Verma
 - 2. John D. Shull
 - 3. Jessica Annette Emmons
- G. Consideration to permanently revoke the teaching certificates held by Robert E. Warren, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-550
- H. Consideration to authorize Gadsden Elementary School District's request to increase the grade levels served from K-8 to K-12.

Member Klein asked to remove 2B from the Consent Agenda. Superintendent Huppenthal made a motion to approve the consent agenda with exception of Item 2A, minutes from August 26, 2013 meeting and Item 2B. Dr. Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Member Klein addressed the Board regarding Item 2B. She stated she is looking for more content regarding how this grant process fits into the overall agenda and asked Dr. Butterfield to explain to the Board these grant applications. Dr. Butterfield stated this is a Federal grant and there is a specific process in reviewing the application. This was an appeal by this particular school because they were not given this award in Round One. Dr. Mark Francis spoke about the appeal process and explained the process regarding this particular item.

Member Miller made a motion to approve Item 2B, the Arizona Charter School Program Awards, Round II 2014-2016 Contract Abstract. Superintendent Huppenthal seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Karen Givart addressed the Board regarding Common Core stating this is a non-constitutional federal intrusion on our system and needs to be stopped.

Gretchen Jacobs spoke to the Board regarding available training for teaching reading to special needs children with dyslexia.

4. GENERAL SESSION

A. Presentation and discussion regarding preliminary findings from pilot year 1 of ADE's Principal and Teacher Evaluation Model (WestEd/REL)

Dr. Butterfield and Todd Peterson presented a preliminary finding report to the Board regarding the 1st Year Pilot Implementation of the Arizona Department of Education Model Educator Evaluation Process. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) partnered with WestEd's West Comprehensive Center (WCC) and its Regional Educational Laboratory West (REL West) on a study of ADE's teacher evaluation model, which aligns to the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness. The study's preliminary findings focus on implementation successes and challenges of 5 pilot district and charter Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and includes qualitative and quantitative analyses. Five Pilot LEAs are Williams Unified School District, Bisbee Unified School District, Maricopa Unified School District, Stanfield Elementary School District, Accelerated Elementary and Secondary Charter School.

The ADE teacher evaluation model consists of three components:

- 33% tied to student academic progress;
- 17% tied to surveys (teacher, parents student) and a peer review process;
- 50% tied to observation of educator performance

In interviews, principals called the new system less biased than previous systems & generally believed that it resulted in higher quality feedback for teachers. Despite many focus group teachers reported frustrations with ratings lower than expected. 52% of surveyed teachers agreed that the new teacher evaluation process is fair. 45% of surveyed teachers felt new process is an improvement over their prior teacher evaluations. 63% of surveyed teachers agreed that "the criteria on which I was evaluated were made clear to me". 55% agreed that their training was adequate for them to effectively participate. 83% of responding teachers reported 2-3 formal classroom observations but informal observations varied:

One informal observation: 30%

2-3 informal observations: 36%

4+ informal observations: 34%

71% of respondents reported 2-3 pre-conferences, 63% reported having 2-3 post-conferences
These conferences generally spanned less than an hour:

< 15 mins (20%)

15-30 mins (45%)

31-45 mins (25%)

All participants cited labor intensiveness, time burdens involved with the new, more thorough observations (e.g., new forms, multiple domains, more evidence). Time estimates from principals in one focus group stated the following:

Approximately 3 hours per observation cycle

Round of observations for 20 teachers takes about one month

Teachscape technology helped efficiency, but process is still lengthy.

Positive aspects were accurate, consistent, reasonable, helpful, specific, evidence-based, objective (less biased) Negative aspects were time consuming, inflexible, lack of relevant content expertise among observers, too easy to prepare for/script/manipulate (need for additional informal observations)

Peer review, student surveys & parent surveys were a major concern in focus groups/interviews at all pilot LEAs citing the following:

Common student/parent survey concerns

Logistical difficulties with administration (computer/Internet access)

Reliability/validity of results: low response rates, overly subjective, problems “assigning” students/teachers, age/maturity of students

Common peer review concerns

Confidentiality (some printed forms)

Some questions were difficult to answer knowledgeably (e.g., professional organizations), little useful feedback

Some reviewers assigned by principals, others picked by teachers

Collegiality issues/tensions/discomfort with process

Surveyed teachers were generally optimistic that student test data can provide an accurate assessment of their teaching performance. Proportions of teachers responding that the following can assess their performance with moderate/high accuracy:

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) established through consultation with principal: 64%

Standardized school-wide test scores: 60%

Standardized test scores from their classroom(s) of students this year: 57%

To many principals, Danielson Framework provided clear definition of effective teaching & what to look for. Principals thought conversations with teachers were more focused & in-depth (thanks to the Framework) & collaborative, particularly after pre-conferences. Most focus group teachers reported that the new process had not changed conversations with their administrators. Some participants felt overwhelmed, noting stress & agitation among teachers at the site, particularly after summative ratings were shared.

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has made process and implementation changes for Year 2 of the project based upon the findings extracted from the preliminary report, including:

- Streamlined Rating Tables that measure student academic progress
- Enhanced procedural directions and guidance for survey deployment
- Updated instruments to clarify language and to reflect latest legislation/requirements
- Developed “Principal Resource Guide” and other supporting guidance documents to assist with implementation

- Created comprehensive handbook on Student Learning Objectives process
- Continue to analyze cut scores and point allocations based on quantitative analysis
- Correlation with summative teacher performance classifications with the school's/LEA's A-F labels and AIMS data;
- Implementation impact of including SLOs for all teachers in relation to equity, relevance and impact tied to Student Academic Progress data, growth;
- Extent that evaluation outcomes are driving professional learning opportunities;
- Is the ADE model changing teacher practice? Did school culture/climate perception change from Year 1?
- Support and resources necessary for principals to be effective instructional leaders;
- Have implementation challenges been minimized after Year 1 modifications - did processes go smoother in Year 2?

In addition to the 5 pilot LEAs that are implementing the state's model, the study also has encompassed implementation successes and challenges of 5 additional "partner" LEAs that are using other evaluation systems. More extensive reporting on the pilot's first year will be made available from ADE and REL West in the coming months.

Superintendent Huppenthal asked about the LEA letter grades with the pilot schools compared to the following year. Dr. Carrie Giovannone 4 out of the 5 schools improved their letter grade but there are a lot of components outside of this presentation that make up the letter grade.

Member Hamilton talked about observations in the classroom. Member Miller talked about computerization versus actual classroom observation. He talked about consistency for improvement versus a fair based process and how the process should be passed on improvement not fairness. President Tyree stated the system is to improve instruction and one of the ways to validate if teachers are succeeding is to improve instruction and student improvement. He asked if you will be able to see this in the process, be able to collect data to see if the evaluations correlate to what is actually happening in the classroom. Dr. Butterfield stated yes and there will be better, cleaner data to present to the Board in Year 2.

Presentation only. No action required.

- B. Presentation, discussion and consideration of request for rehearing or review of the State Board's decision to revoke the certification held by James M. Houston pursuant to A.A.C. R7-2-709(D).

Mr. Easaw spoke to the Board regarding this action. Dr. Houston was present by phone. On October 12, 2010, the Professional Practices Advisory Committee held a hearing on a complaint filed by the State Board of Education seeking a revocation of Dr. James M. Houston's Substitute certificate, issued on February 13, 1986, and expires on July 1, 2099. Though Dr. Houston was not present at the hearing, the PPAC made attempts to reach him by telephone. The PPAC found that the conduct of Dr. Houston constitutes conduct which would discredit the teaching profession pursuant to Arizona Administrative Code R7-2-1308(B)(15). By a vote of 5 to 0, the PPAC recommended that the State Board revoke any and all certifications held by Dr. Houston. At its meeting on March 25, 2013, the State Board voted unanimously to accept the

recommendation of the PPAC and revoked the certification held by James M. Houston. Dr. Houston has filed three documents: 1) A motion for a rehearing of the State Board's decision to revoke his certification, and 2) A request for reconsideration or review of the State Board's decision to revoke his certification. 3) A motion for the disqualification or recusal for Member Moore and Member Molera from this particular decision.

Mr. Houston addressed the Board. He stated he does not believe the record is complete and that items that were given to the Board appear to be missing. He stated his procedural due rights must be respected and feels they have not been. He requested to place this item on the October agenda due to the fact that he believes part of the record is missing. There are 14 exhibits that appear to be missing and are necessary to make the record complete. Mr. Houston stated revocation is too harsh. He stated since 2005 he has been a substitute teacher in the county he resides. He has had over 270 substitute teaching assignments which equates to approximately 1600 hours in the classroom.

Mr. Rottweiler stated the applicant is requesting a continuous and by his statement he is asking us to continue that appeal and the Board should take action on that. Mr. Yanez confirmed with Mr. Easaw that the members have received the entire record and all the items that were submitted by Mr. Houston. The record is complete and closed. Member Rottweiler stated he has been through the record at least twice and asked Mr. Houston what pieces are missing. Mr. Houston stated he is not sure because the information he received is void of any of the exhibits he submitted or referenced in his request. He is not sure what the entirety of the record looks like that the members received and he would like time to review that record. He stated he is not trying to delay or impede justice but doesn't know what the record looks like. Mr. Easaw clarified that the motions before the Board are the motions in their entirety which was received from Mr. Houston.

Pursuant to R7-2-709, Member Klein made a motion to deny Mr. Houston's request for a rehearing along with a motion for a request for reconsideration. Member Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. Member Moore did not recuse himself from the vote. Member Miller did not vote on the matter as his called was dropped and he was disconnected from the teleconference.

C. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the proposed settlement agreement in the matter of Lindsey Ireland.

Mr. Easaw spoke to the Board regarding this matter. Ms. Ireland was not present. Lindsay D. Ireland holds a Provisional Career and Technical Education (Business and Marketing) certificate valid November 4, 2010 through November 4, 2013 and a Standard Secondary Education (7-12) certificate valid March 12, 2009 through February 2, 2015. On October 5, 2011, Tucson Unified School District ("District") notified the Investigative Unit of the State Board of Education ("Board") of an allegation that Ms. Ireland reported to work while under the influence of drugs. Lab results revealed the presence of marijuana, cocaine, benzodiazepines, and alprazolam in her system. On January 3, 2013, the Investigative Unit notified Ms. Ireland of the intent of the State

Board of Education to file a complaint seeking disciplinary action against her teaching certificates. After discussing the matter with Ms. Ireland, a settlement agreement was proposed.

The Professional Practices Advisory Committee (“PPAC”) reviewed the settlement agreement on May 14, 2013. The terms of the settlement agreement include the following:

- A suspension of certification through September 30, 2014.
- Successful completion of counseling, therapy, or a treatment program which addresses substance abuse issues.

The PPAC voted 5 to 0 to approve the settlement agreement for suspension with conditions against any and all teaching certificates held by Ms. Ireland and that it be maintained as part of her permanent record. On June 24, 2013, the State Board considered a motion to adopt the PPAC’s findings of facts, conclusions of law, and recommendation to issue a suspension, with conditions, of Ms. Ireland’s teaching certificates through September 30, 2014. No action was taken by the Board. The matter was remanded to the Investigative Unit for additional information regarding Ms. Ireland’s efforts at rehabilitation and a determination of whether she had a criminal record. On August 26, 2013, the Investigative Unit presented the requested information which addressed Ms. Ireland’s efforts at rehabilitation, and noted Ms. Ireland does not have a criminal record. The State Board considered the additional information, but expressed a concern as to what might happen if Ms. Ireland “fell off the wagon” during the period of suspension. After a discussion, the State Board remanded the matter to the Investigative Unit to revise the Settlement Agreement to address the issuance of a sanction in the event that Ms. Ireland should revert to illegal drug usage during the period of suspension. Ms. Ireland has signed the Settlement Agreement.

Member Moore made a motion to approve the proposed settlement agreement and issue a suspension, with conditions, through September 30, 2014, of the teaching certificates held by Lindsay D. Ireland. Member Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

- D. Presentation, discussion and consideration to grant a rehearing or review of the Board’s prior decision in the matter of David Aleman, pursuant to R7-2-709.

Mr. Easaw spoke to the Board regarding this matter. Mr. Aleman was present during the meeting. On November 9, 2007, the Investigative Unit for the State Board of Education (the “Board”) received a report of unprofessional conduct on the part of David Aleman from the Cartwright Elementary School District (“CESD”). The report alleged that Aleman, a teacher at Dessert Sands Middle School, had been selling drugs on school grounds. The Board filed a complaint against David Aleman’s teaching certificates. On August 17, 2010, the Professional Practices Advisory Committee (the “PPAC”) held a hearing on the complaint. Mr. Aleman admitted to facilitating the transfer of marijuana, one time, to two other teachers in the CESD. He said that the marijuana was delivered to his vehicle, which was parked on the street, off of district property, during a district training session. After the training session, he transferred the marijuana at another location in the vicinity, but off district property. At the hearing, one of the PPAC members asked why Mr. Aleman did not have any character witnesses to present. It was

explained that in a complaint hearing, the State does not advise the respondent to present witnesses or letters of reference. If the respondent is represented by counsel, these issues are usually considered. Mr. Aleman was not represented by counsel at the hearing. The PPAC decided to move forward rather than continue the hearing.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the PPAC found Mr. Aleman's actions constituted unprofessional conduct. The PPAC recommended, by a vote of 3 to 2, that the Board revoke any and all teaching certificates held by David Aleman. At its October 25, 2010 meeting, the Board, by a vote of 6 to 0, adopted the majority recommendation of the PPAC to revoke Mr. Aleman's certification. Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes § 41-1065, Mr. Aleman timely filed a request for rehearing and review of the decision by the Board to revoke his certification. As a basis for the rehearing, Mr. Aleman provided that he was not fully aware of his right to present character witnesses on his behalf. Mr. Aleman timely filed a notice for a rehearing or a review of the Board's decision. Mr. Aleman spoke to the Board and asked to be judged on the person he is today not the person he was in the past.

Member Klein made a motion pursuant to R7-2-703 (B) 3 a motion to grant Mr. Aleman's request for a rehearing. Member Moore seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Presentation, discussion and consideration to modify the definition of Alternative Schools.

Dr. Carrie Giovannone addressed the Board regarding this matter. Dr. Giovannone talked about the current requirements which state the following:

1. The educational program and related student services of the school must match the mission or charter of the school.
2. The school must intend to serve students exclusively in one or more of the following categories:
 - Students with behavioral issues (documented history of disruptive behavior)
 - Students identified as dropouts
 - Students in poor academic standing who are either severely behind on academic credits (more than one year) or have a demonstrated pattern of failing grades
 - Pregnant and/or parenting students
 - Adjudicated youth
3. Any school offering secondary instruction for academic credit used to fulfill the Arizona State Board of Education graduation requirements (in part or in full) must offer a diploma of high school graduation.
4. Schools must have current year AIMS test scores to apply for and receive alternative school status.

The recommended changes are as follows:

1. The educational program and related student services of the school must match the mission or charter of the school.
2. The school must intend to serve students ~~exclusively~~ in one or more of the following categories:
 - Students with behavioral issues (documented history of disruptive behavior)
 - Students identified as dropouts or at risk of dropping out
 - Students in poor academic standing who are ~~either severely behind on academic credits (more than one year) or have a demonstrated pattern of failing grades~~ more than one year behind on academic credits or grade level performance
 - Pregnant and/or parenting students
 - Students who are full-time caregivers
 - Students over the age of 18
 - Adjudicated youth
3. Any school offering secondary instruction for academic credit used to fulfill the Arizona State Board of Education graduation requirements (in part or in full) must offer a diploma of high school graduation.
4. Schools must have current year AIMS test scores to apply for and receive alternative school status.

Current process to request alternative school status:

1. Submit to ADE Research and Evaluation a Letter of Intent requesting Alternative School Status.
2. Their mission and goals on the School Report Card need to clearly reflect an alternative school status.

Recommendation to acquire Alternative School Status:

1. Fill out online application.
2. Attach a copy of their mission and goals to the online form which needs to clearly reflect students represented in the Alternative School definition.
3. Hitting 'Submit' on the application will send an email notification which includes the data entered and attachments to the Achieve@azed.gov inbox and a confirmation email is sent to the applicant.
4. Their goals and their mission need to be reflected on their current School Report Card.

Call to the Public regarding this matter, Dr. Amy Schlessman spoke to the Board. She thanked Dr. Giovannone for asking for and listening to the comments from the field. She asked that the Board not vote on this matter today because she would like more research regarding increasing the percentage each year. She would like to research what other states are doing. President Tyree stated he would like to wait until the October meeting to receive additional information. Mr. Miller stated he isn't sure that is necessary and if we want more information we should bring it back next month but not stop the process.

This item will be placed on hold and come back to this in October.

- F. Presentation, discussion and consideration to adopt passing scores for the Arizona Education Proficiency Assessment for principals.

This item will be presented by Mr. Peterson. R7-2-606.E The Arizona Administrator Proficiency Assessment shall assess professional knowledge as described in R7-2-603 as a requirement for certification of administrators, supervisors, principals, and superintendents. In September, 2011 this Board adopted the new Evaluation System. The test development process that ADE and the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson designed for the AEPA involved numerous steps to ensure that the tests are customized for the Arizona educational context, aligned with Arizona educational standards, and judged to be appropriate and important for assessing the knowledge and skills required of entry-level educators by the State of Arizona. During the development of the principal exam, the test developer consulted Arizona documents, collaborated with Arizona educators, validated each principal test objective in multiple ways and engaged Arizona administrators in providing professional judgments concerning the passing standards for the principal exam.

Key components of the process that the ADE and Evaluation Systems employed to develop the principal exam are summarized below.

- Establishment of Arizona Content and Bias Review Committee
- Definition and Review of Test Content
- The Content Validation Survey
- Distribution of Final Test Objectives
- Preparation of Test Item
- Bias and Content Review of Test Items
- Pilot Testing
- Preparation of Study Guides
- Preparation and Administration of the principal exam
- Determination of Passing Scores

Superintendent Huppenthal asked if there was correlation between student growth percentiles and teacher evaluation. Mr. Peterson stated that data is not yet available but soon will be.

Superintendent Huppenthal moved to adopt passing scores for the Arizona Administrator Proficiency Assessment as presented. Member Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- G. Presentation, discussion and consideration to initiate rulemaking procedures for proposed rule R7-2-1002, regarding School District Procurement Bid Threshold. This item is being presented by Mr. Yanez.

A.R.S. § 15-213(A) requires the State Board of Education to adopt rules governing the procurement practices for school districts and charter schools. In part, these rules are required to specify the total cost of a procurement that is subject to invitations for bids. In 2013, the legislature amended A.R.S. § 41-2535, which states that the total cost of a procurement that is not subject to invitations for bids shall not exceed \$100,000. This rule was last amended by the Board in April 2010, corresponding with the legislature's last change to the amount of the bid threshold. The purpose of this rule is to align with what was recently passed in legislation.

Member Miller made a motion to initiate rule making procedures as presented. Member Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- H. Presentation, discussion and consideration to close the rulemaking record and adopt proposed rules R7-2-307 and R7-2-308 regarding high school equivalency testing. This item will be presented by Ms. Thompson.

Laws 2013, 1st Regular Session, Chapter 11, also known as HB 2071, modified references to high school equivalency tests to remove a proprietary name from adult education statutes. This proposed rule change makes similar conforming modifications to Board rule to remove the proprietary name. Pursuant to the Board's rulemaking procedures, a public hearing on these proposed rules changes was held on September 18, 2013 with no public comment at that hearing.

Superintendent Huppenthal made a motion to close rulemaking record and adopt proposed rules as presented. Member Moore seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- I. Presentation, discussion and consideration to adopt proposed revisions to the Arizona Early Childhood Education Standards.

This item was presented by Ms. Hrabluk. She spoke to the Board and stated that last month the final draft of the updated Early Learning Standards to the Board. These standards are to provide a tool to assist families and early learning professionals in designing standards for high quality preschools. The proposed visions make the following changes to realign the standards with the Common Core for Kindergarten, the Head State Outcomes, and the Infant & Toddler Development Guidelines and reorganize and make conforming changes. These standards have been heavily vetting in the community. Superintendent Huppenthal asked about the process. There were 20 – 25 vetting in the State. It included 125 different people that attendant those. The standards were also online so participation was available for those who could not attendant. There were extensive public hearings in every part of the State. People have been very interested and wanting to be a part of the process. Mr. Klein asked how these alignments relate to First Thing First and if First Things First are requiring these standards. Ms. Hrabluk stated the early learning standards are a part of the quality rating standards that First Things First has established. The standards are all voluntary and have 900 different programs in their quality rating programs.

Superintendent Huppenthal made a motion to accept the Early Learning Childhood Standards. Mr. Rottweiler seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Klein asked that the Board following up on the comments made by Gretchen Jacobs regarding dyslexia.

2. STUDY SESSION

Presentation and discussion regarding English Language Learners and the Structured English Immersion (SEI) instructional model. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3) and (4), the Board may vote to convene in executive session for consultation and/or legal advice.

This will be presented by Ms. Hrabluk and Kelly Koenig. Last month Dr. Giovannone shared this information with the Board. 83,000 students participate in the English Language Learners program and more than 80% are in the K5 section. 76% of ELLs are instructed in SEI classrooms, 23% of ELLs are instructed in the mainstream on an Individual Language Learner Plan (ILLP), 1% of ELLs are in a bilingual program. English is fundamental to content area mastery. Language ability based grouping facilitates rapid language learning. Time on task increases academic learning. Discrete language skills approach facilitates English language learning. ELLs are taught by highly qualified teachers. The four fundamental elements are as follows:

- 4 hours of English Language Development - as defined in SEI models
- Lessons taught using the ELP standards
- ELL students grouped by language proficiency levels
- Highly Qualified Teacher

Ms. Klein asked if there was any differences in the 4hour block vs students that are doing 1 hour. There is evidence that the majority of districts are holding to the one hour block. The fidelity to the one hour segment allows flexibility. That is a teacher's choice or a district choice. The four hour block can be broken up but at the end of the day, what is important is that the English Language Learner has received four hours of instruction. Teachers are focused on the English Language Standards. Half-day kindergarten must be modified to have a proportionate period of ELD. This works out to 2/3 of instructional time (usually 2 hours of ELD.) If a middle or high school student at the intermediate proficiency level tests proficient in reading or writing or both, after the first year they can reduce ELD time to 3 or 2 hours based on testing proficient on the sub-test.

Schools with more than 20 ELLs in a three grade span must provide instruction in an SEI classroom. Students are grouped according to proficiency levels when possible.

The benefits of ability-based groups are as follows:

Targeted instruction, Lesson is linguistically appropriate for ALL students, Accurate monitoring of student production, Minimizes students developing large language "gaps."

Schools with fewer than 20 ELLs in a three-grade span may provide instruction through the use of an Individual Language Learner Plan (ILLP) The student is placed in the mainstream classroom with an individual plan designed to integrate ELP standards into the mainstream curriculum

The Phoenix Union alternate model addresses the use of social studies or science textual

materials for the 60-minute Reading portion of the 4-hour ELD requirement. Provisions include:
English language learners must have a composite score of Intermediate on AZELLA.
There must be a specific ELP language objective during instruction
Content-based texts are grade and proficiency-appropriate levels
Teachers will be Highly Qualified in English/Language Arts

Glendale Union High School District “On-Track to Graduate” Alternate Model is as follows:

Students that meet ALL the criteria below may be exempted from one or two hours of ELD

Student has been enrolled in Arizona schools for at least two years

Student is a junior or senior

Student is an ELL at the Intermediate level on AZELLA (composite score)

Student has achieved a score of “approaches,” “Meets,” or “Exceeds” on AIMS subtests of

Reading and Writing. A student who scores “Falls Far Below” on either AIMS subtest of

Reading or Writing shall be enrolled in four hours of ELD classes in the following school year.

The student’s composite score on the AZELLA indicates a history of improvement from prior composite scores.

Student’s transcript evidences that student has earned a grade of #3” (“C” equivalent) in core content classes. The student is understood to be on track to graduate.

The top “50” Districts or Charters represent 83% of our ELL population. Of the “top 50” LEAS monitored in the last four years 84% are compliant with the SEI Model at this time.

Presentation Only. No action required.

Superintendent Huppenthal made a motion to adjourn meeting and go into Executive Session to obtain legal advice. Member Miller seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 12:33pm.

ADJOURN