

**Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, March 26, 2012**

The Arizona State Board of Education held a regular meeting at the Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson Street, Room 417, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

Members Present:

Ms. Amy Hamilton
Ms. Eileen Klein
Mr. Greg Miller
Mr. Jaime Molera
Mr. Jacob Moore
Ms. Diane Ortiz-Parsons
Mr. Thomas Tyree

Members Absent:

Dr. Vicki Balentine
Superintendent Huppenthal
Dr. James Rottweiler

PERSON
RESPONSIBLE

ROLL CALL

Mr. Yanez

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Molera

1. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Mr. Molera

President Molera had nothing to report.

B. Superintendent's Report

Supt. Huppenthal

Superintendent Huppenthal was not present, but a written report was provided to the members that included the following:

Superintendent Huppenthal went before the Legislature to request funding and outline the critical need to address the deficiencies in ADE's current data systems. Better data leads to better decisions at every level of the educational process. High quality data systems are foundational to the education reforms that Arizona has committed to enacting. Without the necessary funding to accomplish the needed reforms, it will be very difficult to move the reforms forward.

In its current form, the Student Accountability Information System's (SAIS) calculations cannot be audited or verified by ADE. This uncertainty in the data system leads to increased agency and school administrative costs. Fixing and updating SAIS and other related systems will allow LEAs to focus their resources in the classroom.

Last year the Governor's office and the Legislature entrusted ADE with additional funding to begin providing better data services to LEAs. ADE has accomplished those objectives outlined for its initial triage of SAIS. These were to stabilize the existing system with new hardware, maintaining SAIS's online availability. These changes have dramatically improved the ability of ADE and LEA's to access the SAIS system and better data. There is still much more to be done before the system will allow for performance based school funding reforms.

Investing in improving and upgrading the data systems at ADE will lead to greater cost savings, less administrative bloat and better educational decisions at the state and local levels.

C. Board Member Reports

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons attended the National Association of State Boards of Education 2012 Legislative Conference. She shared with the members a copy of a PowerPoint presentation from the conference.

D. Director's Report

Mr. Yanez

1. Update regarding State Board appointments
2. Other items, as necessary

9:02am - Mr. Yanez announced that the Governor appointed members to the Board. Ms. Hamilton was reappointed for a second four year term. Mr. Roger Jacks, superintendent from the Kingman Unified School District, was appointed as the new high school district superintendent, replacing Dr. Balentine. Mr. Jacks will be present at the Board meeting in April.

Mr. Yanez asked the Board members to begin looking at their calendars for a date in the first or second week of June to have the Board's annual retreat, at which the Board will conduct planning for 2013.

Finally, Mr. Yanez stated that staff requested Item 4G be tabled until April. Mr. Molera agreed that the item would be tabled.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to approve Arizona State Board of Education minutes for February 27, 2012

Mr. Yanez

B. Consideration to approve Contract Abstracts

Ms. Summers

1. Cochise College Adult Education
2. Arizona Charter School Program awards
3. National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education

C. Consideration to approve additional monies for teacher compensation for Fiscal Year 2012-2013, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 15-952 and 15-537

Dr. Butterfield

D. Consideration to approve Grand Canyon University's Bachelor of Science Early Childhood Education Program

Dr. Butterfield

E. Consideration to grant one year extension to approved professional preparation programs to accommodate modified evaluation procedures

Dr. Butterfield

F. Consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and grant the application for certification for John Banta

Mr. Easaw

G. Consideration to approve the expansion of the Arizona Online Instruction program offered by the Wickenburg Unified School District to include grades K-5.

Mr. Yanez

H. Consideration to accept the recommendations of the Career Ladder Advisory Committee and approve the Career Ladder programs of the following school districts for Fiscal Year 2012-2013:

Dr. Butterfield

1. Flowing Wells Unified School District
2. Pendergast Elementary School District
3. Payson Unified School District
4. East Valley Institute of Technology
5. Patagonia Union High School District
6. Flagstaff Unified School District
7. Sunnyside Unified School District
8. Chandler Unified School District
9. Peoria Unified School District
10. Cave Creek Unified School District
11. Ganado Unified School District
12. Show Low Unified School District
13. Santa Cruz Valley Union High School District
14. Amphitheater Unified School District
15. Litchfield Elementary School District
16. Tolleson Elementary School District

*9:05am - Ms. Ortiz-Parsons moved to approve the consent agenda.
Second by Vice President Tyree
The motion passed unanimously.*

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No requests to speak.

4. GENERAL SESSION

A. Presentation and discussion regarding the Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System. The Board may take action to approve the expenditure of funds, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-249.

Mr. Masterson

10:07am - Mr. Masterson, ADE Chief Information Officer, shared information regarding the status of the ADE IT Modernization Effort.

The Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) is an ADE system designed to serve as the fundamental integration toolset for statewide school finance processes and services to LEAs. The IT team has put 112 bug fixes into production this fiscal year. The latest release included upgrades to the LEA calendar and addressed issues with AZELLA SAIS identification and SPED integrity failures. The team has determined that there is a need to focus on stabilizing the environments and clearing out the Quality Assurance backlog before additional work can be done. Doing so will mitigate the risk of introducing defects into production.

Arizona Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (AZ-SLDS) is a system that provides student-level data to school districts and charter schools that will empower educators with the ability to make data-driven decisions to improve student achievement. Initial beta dashboards were released to internal ADE staff for feedback on January 31, 2012. The IT team is planning a second internal release. When the dashboards are ready, ADE internal staff will receive an updated application link for review and feedback. Following this “soft launch,”

strategy and execution plans will be developed for demonstration to the Data Governance Commission and the Board. Based on that feedback, additional planning will be necessary before there can be a full public launch.

The ADE System Modernization program only includes dashboards development with existing ADE statewide longitudinal data warehouses.

Great Plains is a Microsoft Financial Systems Management product. The design review phase was completed on schedule on March 2, 2012. IT was able to complete the solution design document in early February. On February 7, 2012 the proposed design was put into development.

Identity Management System (IMS) formally known as Identity Access Management (IAM) encapsulates people, processes and products to identify and manage the data used in an information system to authenticate users and grant or deny access rights to data and system resources. The goal of IAM is to provide appropriate access to enterprise resources for Arizona universities, school districts, students and parents. IAM comprises four main components: authentication, authorization, user management and central user repository. Its goal is to provide the right access to the right people in order to protect information sources (FERPA).

Forefront Identity Management (FIM) uses a phased approach to providing access controls for the statewide implementation of AELAS. It improves and simplifies security by providing federation capability to multiple systems, thus providing users single logon capability as well as improves compliance with FERPA. The IMS project has been delayed for one month in order to reevaluate priorities and scope of work. New timelines for deliverables have been established.

The Arizona Education Learning and Accountability System (AELAS) Business Case is the statewide education management information system that will provide Arizona districts, schools, children and parents services that will enable our educators to focus limited resources to improve student achievement and reduce overall infrastructure costs. Services to be provided potentially include Student Information Systems (SIS), Assessment Systems, Human Resources and Financial Systems, etc. The business case will conduct market research and a feasibility study for the new statewide data system. ADE leadership as well as key external stakeholders have been tasked to promote program participation in the comprehensive outreach plan.

A survey was developed and distributed to selected sample LEAs to provide market information on currently-used technology solutions. Results of the survey will be used to develop next steps of the outreach campaign (focus groups, steering committees, etc). The Request for Information for the private cloud technology was released in February. Members of the team have been temporarily assigned to a project with MCESA; however, it is anticipated that there will be substantial overlap between projects. This overlap will allow the team to continue progress after the initial outreach campaign is completed.

The IT Programs Support Office (IT-PSO) will provide the high-level administrative support for the ADE IT modernization efforts. The PSO oversees the ADE IT finance program, IT communications program, IT staff augmentation program and IT program/project controls program. The core function of the IT-PSO is to ensure that all departmental budget and financial activity is managed and applied to appropriate funding sources. Other functions include the creation of strategic and project controls policy, process and procedure documentation; staff augmentation management oversight; and project administration policy, process and procedure documentation.

A contract staff member dedicated to budget and finance has been secured. In addition to a well-defined budget and reporting process, staff has been able to begin a project-by-project spending forecast. IT is working with the Arizona Department of Administration to streamline contract worker process and comply with proposed

statewide changes. The marketing and communications team has begun a realignment of IT's public to provide the public with more information in an intuitive, user-friendly format.

Enterprise Architecture (EA) is a set of practices and processes that aligns IT with business vision and goals. This is done by analyzing existing ADE business structure and processes, the IT practices and processes that support them and creating a roadmap of process, policy and IT changes that will help the organization to efficiently and effectively fulfill its mission. The funded portion of the EA initiative deals with determining ADE's current state and creating the roadmap.

The project lead came on board February 1, 2012. The consultant is a former Pearson Education executive with a background in innovation, assessment and learning platforms. A preliminary alignment has been completed of all 150+ applications to business units and the Four Pillars of Arizona's Education Reform Plan. Architecture Principles have been defined. These form the foundation for all processes and practices. Fundamental subprojects have been identified and resourced. The initial focus will be on business system data flow and ADE top-level business processes.

The Student-Teacher Connection will use Race to the Top (RTTT) grant funding in the amount of \$2.5 million. IT will use the award money to build a data system with which parents, teachers and administrators can more effectively monitor student and school performance. An additional portion of the grant funding will be devoted to use by local school districts and charter schools. The RTTT funding will play an important role in the implementation of new, more stringent state education standards, as well as the training of teachers to meet these standards. In addition to setting a higher bar for student achievement, the state has established aggressive new education goals in areas like third-grade literacy, high school graduation rates and baccalaureate-degree output by Arizona's institutions of higher education. A portion of the RTTT dollars also will be devoted to the advancement of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education, which is considered key to Arizona's future, high-skill economy.

The Board approved the acceptance of grant funds on January 23, 2012. The course mapping tool will be purchased from the grant funds. As such, the \$199,500 previously allocated to purchasing the tool has been returned to the unencumbered AELAS funds for future reallocation.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-249.01, the purpose of the Data Governance Commission (DGC) is to (1) identify, examine, and evaluate the needs of public institutions who provide instruction to pupils in preschool, kindergarten, grades one through twelve and postsecondary programs in Arizona; (2) provide recommendations on technology spending; and (3) provide analyses and recommendations.

At its February 17, 2012 meeting, the DGC voted to support IT continuing to pursue CEDS/Ed-Fi as data standards for AELAS. The DGC also recommended approval of an additional \$245,000 for the IT budget; \$225,000 for SLDS Dashboards, and \$20,000 for Application Lifecycle Management.

At the March 16, 2012 meeting, IT asked the DGC to recommend approval of \$500,000 for SAIS RFP requirements gathering, \$130,000 for Great Plains, \$54,250 for Application Lifecycle Management and \$227,000 for the Program Support Office.

Almost \$2 million has been spent on reengineering SAIS. IT now has the ability to move on to the next step, which is to gain functional requirements for an RFP to be done.

Ms. Klein asked for a gap analysis to help the Board understand where remediation on SAIS was needed.

Mr. Masterson replied that a gap analysis has not been done because IT will not know what the final product is

going to look like until functional users tell IT what is needed. Once feedback is gathered from the field, IT will be able to tell what SAIS does and what it should be. Mr. Masterson added that SAIS currently has the student master, which needs to be taken out and put in a separate stand-alone system because student IDs should not have duplicates. IT wants to build a solid student master, which ties into the teacher. As the student-course-teacher connection is created, it is important to know who is interacting with whom, and it is very difficult to figure that out right now. That is the major gap.

Another major gap is the payment system. Currently the system has 1% - 5% errors every year; 1% is \$40 million a year. Payments are either higher or lower than they should be. The state needs accountability. The future payment system will be Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) compliant for full audit-ability throughout the system.

LEAs across the state spend a total of around \$25-\$30 million a year on just matching students to student records. It will be a huge cost savings to be able to provide a data system that people can trust. Then more audits can be done and ADE can help districts be more accountable. 80% of SAIS is school finance and it is IT's job to support school finance. There needs to be a system that does school finance. There are systems everywhere that have this capability. ADE's system is in the 1970s.

SAIS reengineering is complete and cost \$1,497,726. From now until October, IT will be gathering feedback regarding user functional requirements. This piece is estimated to cost \$500,000. An RFP will then be created between October 2012 and March 2013. Then, from March 2013 to December 2014 the new system will be developed, which is estimated to cost around \$10,000,000. The new SAIS deployment is scheduled for January 2015.

This all depends on funding. The Board is being asked to approve \$500,000 to cover the user function requirements, after which, IT will be ready to do the RFP. It could also be that after IT completes the user functional requirements in October, they look at the system and technical requirements before doing the RFP. IT may do an RFI to help identify the costs. Knowing the system and technical requirements makes it clearer what a vendor will deliver, which will help avoid change requests. The goal is to buy off the shelf as much as possible so the system is flexible and not so customized.

Arizona Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (AZ-SLDS) presented some very difficult challenges. Microsoft has people working 24/7 trying to solve how to get this released through ADE's infrastructure. There is a dashboard that is working, but it is too slow. The pilot districts will see the dashboards before they are released to the public. Districts will be able to see what AIMS scores they say they have, what scores ADE says they have, and end of year scores. AZ-SLDS allows real time notification of how kids are doing. Parents will be able to see how their kids are doing in reading before third grade; ADE will be able to see how the state is doing in assessments and on report cards. The goal is real time visibility.

There is \$2,639,169 available in the remaining authorized budget. \$2,803,852 has been spent already. The total resource request is \$1,156,250 million.

10:29am - Mr. Miller moved to grant the ADE's request for the expenditure of funds, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-249.

Second by Ms. Ortiz-parsons

The motion passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Yanez
Ms. Cannata

Item held

C. Presentation and discussion regarding intervention and remedial strategies for Move on When Reading, pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-701

Ms. Hrabluk

9:05am - Mr. Yanez stated that this item has been before the Board on two previous occasions and that A.R.S. § 15-704, Arizona Reads, has been in place for eight years and refers to the types of reading strategies that need to be in place for K-3. LEAs should already be implementing the requirements under A.R.S. § 15-704.

Mr. Yanez added that the Move on When Reading (MOWR) law, A.R.S. § 15-701, is very specific in terms of what it charges the Board to approve. Ms. Hrabluk's presentation proposes remediation strategies for students held back in third grade. However, Ms. Hrabluk is well versed in literacy and literacy instruction and can speak to some of the strategies in place for kindergarten, first and second grade.

President Molera commented that the Board needs to look at underlying policy implications, and that it is incumbent upon the Board to offer recommendations that will make the legislation more effective.

Ms. Hrabluk, Associate Superintendent for High Academic Standards, began her presentation, the purpose of which was to review best practices for reading intervention as it pertains to the MOWR legislation. Research indicates that 90% - 95% of children are capable of learning to read.

A.R.S. § 15-701 requires:

- The State Board to develop intervention and remedial strategies for pupils who are not promoted from the third grade.
- A school district governing board or the governing board of a charter school to offer at least one of the intervention and remedial strategies developed by the Board.
- The parent or guardian of the pupil who is not promoted and the pupil's teacher and principal to choose the most appropriate intervention and remedial strategies that will be provided to the pupil.

The four options for intervention are:

1. assign the pupil to a different teacher;
2. summer school reading intervention;
3. intensive reading instruction in the following year when the student is retained; and
4. online reading instruction.

The Response to Intervention (RTI) model serves as the foundation for these four options. The RTI model is multi-tiered and includes grade level instruction with additional intervention. LEAs will move forward in planning to the best of their abilities, given their current fiscal constraints. These strategies will emphasize evidence-based reading instruction to the fullest extent possible.

The strategies are based on what is known about how all humans learn language. The six key elements of evidence-based reading instruction and intervention are phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and written response. LEAs should consider how these components fit into their intervention plan.

Effective reading interventions provide training in four essential instructional elements:

1. Alphabetic principle, layering sound to letters
2. Guiding the student through to independent reading of progressively more difficult texts

3. Writing exercises
4. Engaging students in practicing comprehension strategies while reading text

Intervention is deeply embedded in the problem solving model, which involves identification and analysis of the problem using assessments; planning; implementing the plan; and then evaluation, using progress monitoring assessment.

Option 1: Critical components of assigning the student to a different teacher

The teacher should demonstrate:

- Evidence of quality skills as a reading teacher;
- Cross K-3 grade level experience/knowledge in standards expectations; and
- Effectiveness in administering reading assessments, analyzing the data and using the results to drive instruction.

President Molera described a situation where an effective teacher may have a student that is very far below the standard, and then the student makes significant gains over the course of the remediation year, but is still not at grade level. This type of situation needs to be addressed in the legislation.

President Molera made another point regarding merging the intervention strategies with, for example, the new teacher and principal evaluations. He asked how teacher and principal evaluations are going to be folded into whether or not a teacher is assigned a remediated student, and if there is evidence showing that a teacher is or is not effective, how those kinds of connections are made. This is one of the areas the Board needs to look at, and ADE needs to develop guidelines.

Ms. Hrabluk said that the ADE literacy team is working with the Title 2 team, who are doing principal and teacher evaluation systems, and they are working with regional centers to develop systems.

Option 2: Critical components of summer school reading intervention

A summer school reading intervention program should include:

- 4-6 weeks of a condensed instructional model
- Comprehensive assessment system
 - Assess for reading level upon entry, and to monitor progress
 - Identify students that are one and two grade levels behind
- Differentiated instruction for students determined to be one or two grade levels behind
 - At a minimum, increased instructional time for students determined to be one year behind vs. two years behind. Ideally, RTI Tier II and III, respectively.
- Assess at conclusion to determine grade assignment for following academic year
 - Districts must use an assessment that will measure student's reading skills relative to 3rd grade literacy standards

Vice President Tyree asked if it is possible for a retained student who goes through a summer school reading intervention program to show sufficient progress to be promoted.

Ms. Hrabluk replied that it is possible. Students are retained if they earn a "falls far below" on AIMS reading, which can happen for a variety of reasons. Closely monitoring throughout the summer intervention program is critical, and intensity makes a difference.

Option 3: Critical components of intensive reading instruction during the remediation year

For reading intervention during the academic year, these would be the necessary components to ensure we are

using time wisely and instructing at the point of need:

- Comprehensive assessment system
 - Screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring assessments
- Core instruction—standard 3rd grade reading curriculum. This is also known as Tier 1 instruction. For a student who falls far behind, this would include differentiated instruction and small group instruction, but they must receive grade-level instruction.
 - Standards based
 - Alphabetic principle, reading connected text, comprehension, writing.
- Intervention—supplemental instruction, 45-75 minutes/day recommended. This would be Tier 2 or Tier 3, depending on the level of intensity needed. This time is in addition to the 60-90 minutes/day spent on core instruction.
 - Skills-based, dependent on student’s specific deficiencies identified in assessment.
 - Phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing

Option 4: Critical components of online reading instruction

Online reading instruction is becoming more popular, but there is less research and evidence to indicate what works best. What is critical is monitoring the online reading intervention. LEAs must make the decision of whether they are using online instruction as a supplement for only one of the key elements. If online instruction is used for intensive reading instruction, all six components must be integrated. Online reading instruction can be embedded into a reading program, but should be closely monitored by the teacher.

Online reading instruction programs should include the following:

- Focus on the six key elements of reading
- Sequential, systematic, explicit instruction
- Adaptive instruction, review, expansion/integration
- Corrective feedback
- Alignment to teacher instruction
- Engaged time that will vary by program
- Scientifically research based online programs are:
 - Supplemental – one or more key element of reading instruction
 - Intensive – all the key elements of reading instruction

At a minimum, all intervention programs must contain the following elements to be successful:

- Comprehensive assessments that check how a student is progressing and how effective intervention has been.
- Evidence-based instructional materials that match the needs of learners.
- Explicit, systematic instruction
- Data driven instructional/intervention model
- Time
- Exit plan

ADE’s High Academic Standards Division is available to provide technical assistance to LEAs in devising the best program that fits their needs. All LEAs should employ some iteration of the three-tier model.

ADE offers the following best practices to guide LEAs in their development of remediation programs aligned with the recommended strategies.

Coordination and integration of core instruction and intervention is essential.

Tier 1:

- Grade level content
- ELA standards
- Differentiated instruction in large group setting
- Assist student in reading independently at grade level
- Assess student 3 times per year at grade level.

Tier 2:

- Skill based (targeted skills)
- diagnostic assessments and biweekly monitoring
- Small group (3-6)
- Students no more than one year behind
- 8-10 weeks minimum, additionally as needed

Tier 3:

- Intensive instruction, covering all of the components of reading
- Skill based
- Weekly assessment monitoring
- Small group (2-3 or 1 on 1)
- Students 2 or more years behind
- Full school year

Tier 1 intervention is 90 minutes per day of uninterrupted grade level core instruction. Tier 2 intervention is 45 to 50 minutes per day of supplemental intervention. Tier 3 is 60 to 75 minutes per day of intensive intervention. The total time for intervention instruction is 90 minutes of Tier 1 plus 45 to 50 minutes of Tier 2, which is 135 to 140 minutes per day; or 90 minutes of Tier 1 plus 60 to 75 minutes of Tier 3, which is 150 to 165 minutes per day.

It is important at all levels to recognize the need to incorporate parents as partners in teaching children to read and providing additional support. LEAs are responsible for keeping parents informed. Parents should:

- Be well informed of their child's reading progress in K-3
 - Acknowledge yearly notification from the school of reading deficiency in grades K-3
 - Follow up with school to determine additional reading support family can provide
- Be well informed regarding 3rd grade retention law
 - If child will be retained, work with principal and teacher to choose appropriate intervention strategies
 - Work with school to determine additional reading support family can provide
- Recognize the importance of reading proficiently by 3rd grade

President Molera asked if schools are notifying families, starting in kindergarten, when their child falls far below the standards.

Ms. Hrabluk replied that schools are required to do so.

President Molera commented that this is third grade centric, and asked how grades K-2 are handled and if there is a way to enforce schools notifying parents when their child is far behind in K-2.

Ms. Hrabluk replied that ADE's operations manual for K-3 contains specific information on how to move forward with effective parent engagement.

Research done by Henderson and Mapp (2002) shows that:

- Students whose families are involved in their learning earn better grades and have higher graduation rates
- Children do best when parents can take on various roles in their learning including participating in key decisions about school programs, helping at home, providing guidance
- Students with engaged parents have more positive attitudes, attend more regularly and have fewer behavior issues
- Middle and high school students with engaged families make better transitions, maintain quality of work and are less likely to drop out

Other research suggests the following is effective in engaging parents:

- Establish positive communication systems
- Identify priorities and action plans collaboratively
- Use data to set priorities and focus strategies
- Provide relevant on-site professional development – including training parents with specific skills they can use at home, and telling them how it compliments what teacher are doing in the classroom.
- Build one-to-one relationships between families and educators that are linked to learning
- Set, communicate and support high and rigorous expectations
- Connect students to the community

With regards to engaging parents, Ms. Hrabluk concluded that parents need to know two things to help build self efficacy:

- They need to know they have an influence
- They need to know they have the skill set to support their child

When parents and teachers set rigorous standards together and set progress monitoring standards together, it is much more successful than when a school does it alone. What is important is a strong K-3 reading program to prevent the need for intervention.

ADE's operations manual is organized in a way to provide LEAs with the legislation and research in each of nine areas:

1. Move on When Reading
2. Leadership
3. Assessment
4. Goals, Objectives and Priorities
5. Standards
6. Grade Level Instruction
7. Differentiated Instruction and Intervention
8. Instructional Time
9. Professional Development

Vice President Tyree asked if ADE and the Board could look at Head Start programs or preschool and track what those students are doing.

Ms. Hrabluk replied that ADE does collaborate with First Things First and the Head Start Program, and ADE is using a singular assessment system for the preschools associated with Head Start and First Things First. ADE's early childhood section is also working closely with preschools.

Mr. Moore wondered how the system integrates with existing programs for identifying and providing

instruction to children with learning disabilities and whether it provides for additional resources or support for special education.

Ms. Hrabluk explained that the original research on RTI and intensive intervention programs came out of the national special education office and it has diffused across to general education programs. LEAs implementing this plan are using a variety of funding streams, and can use up to 15% of their IDEA funds for prevention. LEAs are also able to use Title 1 funding. They can support reading specialists and reading coaches with Title 2 money. Some LEAs are using M&O funds and also Indian gaming funds.

Ms. Hamilton commented that attention must be paid to first and second grade teachers. Tier 2 or 3 instruction should not be just a repetition of core instruction. Teachers need the support to offer Tier 2 and 3.

Ms. Hamilton added that letters started going home last year for kids who are behind in reading. K-2 teachers know MOWR is taking place and are looking at students who are already behind to prevent third grade retention. Teachers want to avoid over-identification and over-retention and do not want to place kids in special education before their time, so they try to wait and see and check developmental levels. While that is a concern, the Board needs to consider that, with K-2 intervention, decisions need to be made, making it difficult to wait and see. Teachers need a way to start identifying students early to get them help without fear of over-identification in special education. There are also some philosophical differences about whether retention is effective or not.

Ms. Hrabluk stated that more than 50 years of research shows that retention does not work if all the student gets is more of what failed them in their first four years of study. On the other hand, there is growing research that says intensive intervention can make a difference. Ms. Hrabluk reminded the Board that research shows that 90-95% of kids are perfectly positioned to learn to read. LEAs need time and space to provide necessary interventions and make decisions without fear.

Ms. Klein expressed disappointment that the remediation strategies do not address K-2 and suggested individual reading plans that would engage parents earlier. Regarding Option 1, assigning the student to a different teacher, the qualifications for the different teacher are things every teacher should already be – a quality teacher with experience and knowledge of the expectations of the standards, and the ability to use data. Ms. Klein suggested that what is missing is a teacher who is good at remediation.

Mr. Miller commented that the best practices as outlined are already implicit for K-2. Without a comprehensive reading program in K-2, there are problems in third grade. MOWR seems like a reminder to LEAs that they better have comprehensive reading programs in K-2 or they will not be able to pass their students on from third grade.

Mr. Molera stated that one problem in K-3 is being able to interpret assessment data and then develop the required remediation.

Ms. Hamilton agreed that has been the case in the past, but teachers have been learning more about how to use data to determine what children need. The problem is that a teacher with 29 kids in her class, who may need to do Tier 3 intervention for 3 of her students, also needs to find something for her other kids to do for 60 minutes. One thing lacking is another person in the room, or some sort of site-based reading intervention to help Tier 3 kids. Tier 3 programs usually involve testing with built in entry and exit levels. Teachers are learning to use data, and embedded into Tier 3, and usually Tier 2, are assessments to help guide teachers.

Teachers do informal reading plans, but in high needs schools, there may need to be 30 reading plans that have to be flexible. Some of those practices for K-2 are just basic good teaching. If a teacher is not looking at

students' individual needs and differentiating instruction, then they may not be doing the best teaching. Teaching today involves intervention, differentiated instruction and flexible grouping. It is implied and should be expected in K-2. If those who do not work in the field do not understand this, then there is a communication issue.

Ms. Klein commented that the NAEP results in reading indicate that comprehensive reading programs in K-2 do not exist consistently around the state. The more the Board can do to help provide guidance on strategies and interventions for less privileged schools, the better. The Board does not have to mandate how it is done in K-2 or even K-3, but ADE has a role in providing the best guidance and information, especially for districts that need the help. The governor provided \$50 million for this in her budget. The Legislature, however, prefers to do a grant program. The problem with grants is that the districts that are good at applying for them might be the ones that are already advanced in these areas. The concern is consistency.

Mr. Molera reiterated the importance of integrating teacher and principal evaluations with MOWR and school accountability systems.

9:48am - Mr. Miller moved to approve the proposed remediation strategies, pursuant to A.R.S. 15-701, as presented.

Seconded by Mr. Moore.

President Molera offered a friendly amendment to include ADE's recommendations with those developed by the Board in order to strengthen A.R.S. § 15-701.

Second by Mr. Miller and Mr. Moore

The amendment passed unanimously

Ms. Klein requested a further amendment regarding Option 1 and assigning the student to a different teacher; that ADE prioritizes the qualification that the different teacher be skilled in remediation.

Second by Vice President Tyree

The amendment passed unanimously

The motion, as amended, passed unanimously

D. Presentation and discussion regarding logistics and policy implications for the transition to the assessments developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)

Ms. Alley

9:51am - Ms. Alley, ADE Associate Superintendent for Standards and Assessment, brought forward issues the Board is facing as a consequence of the transition to the assessment tools developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), a consortium of 24 states. Arizona has been a governing member of the PARCC consortium since its inception in September. There have been some decisions made by the consortium that impact Arizona.

The primary issue is transitioning the high school competency exam. PARCC has decided to make it an end-of-course assessment in grades 9-11, which is very different from Arizona's AIMS system which is administered at the end of grade 10. ADE and the Board need to consider the impact this has on high school students that have a competency exam based on AIMS 10th grade.

There are two different assessment systems that will be developed by PARCC. They are going to adopt an

integrated math sequence and a traditional math sequence. A traditional math sequence is Algebra I – Geometry – Algebra II. In Arizona, the majority of schools have the traditional course sequence, but a few LEAs have adopted an integrated approach.

The decision needs to be made of whether to mandate one approach or approve two approaches. Approving both sequences raises the questions of how to compare scores from students covering different material each year, and what is going to be used as the high school competency exam for Arizona: 9th grade English language arts (ELA) or Algebra 1; Algebra 1 and Geometry; grade 9 and 10 ELA; or whether the grade 11 assessment demonstrates college and career readiness.

Next year's freshman will take AIMS in 2014, but will take the grade 11 ELA and Algebra II assessment as 11th graders. The question is how long to maintain AIMS for retesting if it is left for the graduating class of 2016. The graduating class of 2017 will take the grade 10 and grade 11 PARCC assessment. The Board and ADE need to decide if they should also take AIMS in 2015, since they will not have the ninth grade assessment. The graduating class of 2018 will be the first to have the full sequence of PARCC assessments.

Ms. Alley stated that she met with her state advisory group and they suggest that ADE ties the end-of-course testing to course grade, and make the grade the graduation competency expectation. That is one option, but there are many others. Decisions need to be made soon because high school math departments are already asking if ADE is going to adopt one or both math sequences.

President Molera stated that the Board needs to hear what the recommendations are from ADE, including financial estimates.

Mr. Yanez suggested a study session for the Board before ADE comes back with recommendations for Board approval or consideration.

President Molera asked for an outline to be developed of the issues that need to be considered.

Vice President Tyree asked whether alternative end-of-course testing will be accepted once the PARCC assessment is in place.

Ms. Alley replied that will be determined by what assessment is used for the accountability system. The question is whether the alternative test fulfills the requirements for state and federal reporting. That is an accountability issue and a policy decision.

E. Presentation and discussion regarding recommendations from the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee. Discussion may include, but is not limited to, alternative schools, small schools, ELL reclassifications, AIMS A students and growth model points.

Dr. Giovannone

10:30am - Mr. Miller, as the chair of the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee, gave a brief introduction. The Subcommittee is comprised of Mr. Miller, Ms. Hamilton, Dr. Balentine and Vice President Tyree, and they held public meetings on March 14th and 21st. At the March 14th meeting, they approved for the full Board's consideration, proposed technical changes to the existing A-F accountability as required by A.R.S. § 15-241 as presented by ADE. The Subcommittee provided stakeholders an opportunity to provide input to the Subcommittee and ADE, which the stakeholders did. At the meeting on March 21st, the Subcommittee approved a few more considerations and provided some feedback to ADE on areas for reconsideration.

Dr. Giovannone, ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent for Research and Evaluation, began her presentation, which included an overview of adjustments made to the current A-F letter grade model, a review of proposed technical adjustments to the A-F traditional model, proposed parallel A-F models and the proposed 100 point scale.

The traditional model from 2011 included two sides, growth scores and composite scores. The growth side includes percentages of growth for all students and growth for the lowest performing students. The composite side includes the percentage of students passing AIMS, percentage of ELL students reclassified, and for high schools, the graduation and dropout rates. High schools could earn up to 209 points and elementary schools could earn up to 203 points. Since this system has been put in place, ADE has heard from the field regarding various elements needing to be adjusted or brought to the attention of the Board.

The model is set up so that a school can earn up to 100 points in the growth portion. In reality a percentile is from 1 to 99. The recommendation for an additional growth point is to start the measure at one. This recommendation was approved by the Subcommittee.

With regards to the ELL reclassification criteria, the 2011 criteria was that only groups of 16 or more students were included, and the students were those identified as continuing ELLs and continuously enrolled in the ELL program for 150 days. ADE recommends lowering the n count to 10 ELL students school-wide, incorporate a 95% tested on the AZELLA end-of-year test, and a 30% reclassification of full academic year (FAY) ELL students. This recommendation was approved by the Subcommittee.

With regards to AIMS A results, students that were eligible to take AIMS A have not previously been included. ADE is recommending including in the school-wide calculation of the percentage of students passing in the current academic year students who demonstrate proficiency on AIMS A. There will be a 1% cap on the number of AIMS A scores that count towards proficiency, which will be enforced at the local level when letter grades are calculated. This recommendation was approved by the Subcommittee.

Testing 95% of students is no longer a federal requirement. But A.R.S. § 15-755 requires schools to test all students. ADE is recommending incorporating testing 95% of students on AIMS. The Subcommittee approved a cap on eligible points as follows:

- If a school tests 95% of their students or higher, they are eligible to earn an A, or the full 200 points.
- If a school tests 85-94% of their students, they can only earn a B, or a maximum of 139 points.
- If a school tests 75-84% of their students, they can only earn a C, or a maximum of 119 points.
- If a school tests less than 75% of their students, they can only earn a D, or a maximum of 99 points.

Dr. Giovannone then presented the recommendations for A-F Letter Grade Parallel Models, beginning with the recommended model for K-2 schools. AIMS is not administered in K-2, but the nationally norm-referenced Stanford 10 test is administered to all second graders. ADE recommends using an on-target score in place of growth scores since there are no AIMS scores for K-2. The on-target score is a measure that indicates the degree to which students in grade 2 are on-track for proficiency on AIMS Reading and Mathematics in grade 3. On-track benchmarks are a scale score of 577 on the Stanford 10 Mathematics assessment and a scale score of 580 on the Stanford 10 Reading assessment. For each K-2 school, the percentage of students at or above the benchmarks is calculated.

On the composite side for K-2 schools is the percentage of second grade students who are at or above the 5th stanine on the Stanford 10 and the percentage of ELL students who are reclassified. ADE recommends that growth for the lowest performing students not be included due to lack of prior year data.

President Molera asked if, based on the previous discussion about Move on When Reading, the students from a K-2 school earning a letter grade of A will be sure to pass third grade. In other words, President Molera asked if this new K-2 model will help identify schools whose students will move on from grade three or not.

Dr. Giovannone replied that this issue would have to be analyzed further, because there are a number of ways for schools to receive an A. The proposed K-2 model is able to predict if students are on track for passing AIMS in third grade.

Mr. Miller added that the K-2 model is being created because A.R.S. § 15-241 requires a letter grade be given to all schools.

11:00am - Mr. Miller moved to approve the proposed modifications to the AZ LEARNS school accountability formula related to the following:

- *An additional point to the growth side of the model;*
- *Adjustments to the n count related to ELL reclassification rates;*
- *Inclusion of the percent tested criteria;*
- *Parallel accountability model for K-2 schools; and*
- *Inclusion of students that are administered the AIMS A.*

Second by Vice President Tyree

The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Giovannone presented the model for small schools. ADE recommends defining small schools as schools with 100 or fewer students enrolled on the first day of the elementary AIMS testing window in the current school year, the purpose of which is to capture the majority of students across all grades that are tested as late in the school year as possible. On the growth side, the percentage of growth for all students will be a pooled three year median, and the percentage of growth for the lowest performing students will also be a pooled three year median. On the composite side, ADE recommends a pooled three year average on AIMS and AIMS A for grades 3-8 and 10, and for grades 11 and 12, the better of the fall or spring AIMS scores, as well as the percent of ELL students reclassified and high school graduation and dropout rates.

Alternative schools are those that apply to ADE for alternative school status. Their educational programs and support services must match their stated missions. These schools must serve students with behavioral issues, who are identified as dropouts, who are in poor academic standing who are either severely behind on academic credits or have demonstrated a pattern of failing grades, who are pregnant and/or are parents, or students who are adjudicated youth.

For the percentage of growth for all students, ADE recommends using a pooled three year median growth percentile for grades 3-8 and 10. For high school, ADE also recommends an improvement score that gives credit to a school's work with high school students to reach proficiency by twelfth grade. Students in grades 10-12 must have test scores in the two most recent test administrations from the same school, either across school years (spring and fall) or within the same school year (fall and spring). ADE recommends not including the lowest performing students in the alternative schools model.

On the composite side, ADE recommends using the AIMS and AIMS A scores for grades 3-8 and 10, and for grades 11 and 12, the better of fall or spring AIMS scores from the current school year, as well as the percent of ELL students reclassified and high school graduation and dropout rates. The graduation rate would be one half standard deviation above the alternative schools' statewide average graduation rate. Academic persistence would also be included. Academic persistence is a proxy for an effective alternative school and an indicator of school quality. It incentivizes alternative schools to keep students engaged in a school setting across years. A

school would have to meet a 70% threshold. An academically persistent student is one who returns to the same school, enrolls in another alternative school or returns to a traditional school.

President Molera stated there were requests to speak from the public.

Mary Berg is the Vice President of Academic Support Services at The Leona Group, LLC. Ms. Berg commented on the proposed model for alternative schools. Cut scores should be reconsidered because the distribution of letter grades for alternative schools is troubling. Only 2% of alternative schools earn the extra credit points for ELL reclassification, which does not seem fair and consistent. The Leona Group schools have consistently missed AYP because of their graduation rate, but they decided five years ago to never turn a student away due to graduation rate issues. With regards to proficiency rates, she would like growth for all students to be recognized, not just those who reach proficiency.

Ildi Laczko-Kerr is the Vice President of Academics at the Arizona Charter Schools Association. Ms. Laczko-Kerr urged the Board and ADE to consider all possible options before making a final decision.

Dr. Amy Schlessman is the president of the board of directors for the Arizona Alternative Education Consortium (AAEC). She stated that the members of the Consortium are concerned that the proposed alternative schools framework still may not be the best at showing the alternative schools that do a good job at what they're doing. The AAEC approved a framework at their meeting in January, a copy of which was given to the AZ LEARNS Subcommittee.

Dr. Schlessman also stated that there have been several steps made in the right direction in the framework proposed by ADE. The work on the improvement rating includes all aims testers, which is good. When students come to an alternative school, a third of them fall far below to begin with, so even though improvement is a major step in the right direction, to add that to the growth score, we would also like everyone to reconsider if a school is also doing its job getting a student from falls far below to approaching. That has to be done first in order to get to meets or exceeds on AIMS. The Subcommittee recommends that growth is weighted more than performance. That is a step in the right direction. Dr. Balentine suggested that the additional points be weighted heavier, and that is worth considering also.

Jim Taylor is the vice president of the AAEC and the district director for the Yavapai Accommodation School District in Yavapai County. Mr. Taylor urged the Board to look at the proposed alternative schools model a little more before making a decision.

Margaret Raush-Meier is the director of Concordia Charter School, Inc. Ms. Raush-Meier provided background information about herself and her two charter schools, which are small schools. She stated that the demographics of her students are not convenient to assess compared to the traditional model. She asked if she could provide feedback in writing regarding the proposed model for small schools, to which President Molera replied would be fine and offered to speak with Ms. Raush-Meier individually after the meeting.

Dr. Giovannone concluded her presentation with information regarding the weighting system. ADE recommended a 30/70 weight for the alternative school model - 30% for the composite side and 70% for the growth side, which was approved by the Subcommittee. There were two things that were recommended: the 30/70 weighting system and adding additional points. The 30/70 weighting counteracts the additional points. This needs consideration from board.

Dr. Giovannone presented her last item, which was the recommendation to use only a composite score, a 100 point scale, for first and second year small and alternative schools.

F. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and approve the proposed settlement agreement to issue a Letter of Censure against the teaching certificate held by Ian Muir

Mr. Easaw

Mr. Easaw, Chief Investigator for the Board's Investigative Unit, stated that Mr. Muir lives in Ohio and was not present. The Professional Practices Advisory Committee is confident that the incident was an isolated event and they do not expect there to be any further difficulty on the part of Mr. Muir. Mr. Muir's teaching record with both Dysart and Avondale indicate this was a one-time incident.

Ms. Klein asked why Arizona is continuing to grant Mr. Muir a license if he lives in Ohio.

Mr. Easaw replied that Mr. Muir may return and his certificate is valid through 2015.

Ms. Klein suggested that Mr. Muir may re-apply upon his return to Arizona.

President Molera asked Mr. Yanez if the Board could recommend Mr. Muir's certificate be suspended until it expires in 2015.

Mr. Yanez replied the Board could do that, but when the Board considers disciplinary action, the law specifies that it must be for acts of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Yanez deferred to legal counsel, but added that when the Board considers what type of disciplinary action is appropriate, it needs to fall within the parameters of what the Board has defined as immoral or unprofessional conduct under Board rule.

Ms. Klein stated that licensure is a privilege, not a right and recommended the Board suspend Mr. Muir's certificate for unprofessional conduct.

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons asked Ms. Klein if that was in the form of a motion, to which Ms. Klein responded it was.

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons seconded the motion.

Mr. Yanez stated that the appropriate action would be to not approve the settlement agreement, in which case the Board could negotiate a new settlement agreement with Mr. Muir. If a new agreement is not reached, there will be a hearing at which the PPAC will recommend disciplinary action to the Board.

11:44am - Ms. Klein withdrew the motion and moved to reject the proposed settlement agreement and remand the case back to the PPAC.

Second by Ms. Ortiz-Parsons

President Molera commented on the need for zero tolerance of bullying.

The motion passed unanimously.

G. Presentation, discussion and consideration to accept the findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee to revoke all teaching certificates held by Buffy Murinko

Mr. Easaw

Item held

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

Mr. Molera

5. ADJOURN AS THE ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND RECONVENE AS THE ARIZONA STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION

11:45am - Mr. Miller moved to adjourn as the Arizona State Board of Education and reconvene as the Arizona State Board for Vocational and Technological Education.

Second

The motion passed.

A. Presentation, discussion and consideration to approve funding from the Arizona Agricultural Youth Organization Special Plate Fund

Mr. Hamilton

11:49am - Mr. Hamilton informed the Board that the Arizona Future Farmers of America (FFA) Association invested heavily in allowing this to happen. The Arizona Department of Transportation has some of the investment that could be paid back at this point. The ADE CTE unit would like the authority to collect some of that money.

Mr. Miller moved to approve funding related to the Arizona Agricultural Youth Organization Special Plate Fund, as presented.

Second by Ms. Ortiz-Parsons

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Presentation and discussion regarding procedures for the review and identification of Career and Technical Education courses and programs that may satisfy minimum course of study requirements for mathematics. The Board may take action to approve the proposed procedures

Mr. Hamilton

11:46am - Mr. Hamilton, ADE Deputy Associate Superintendent of Career and Technical Education (CTE), stated that the CTE unit reviewed procedures and worked with stakeholders to identify mathematics crosswalk credit. The seven-step process involves the work of interdisciplinary teams of mathematics and CTE content experts conducting an intensive, collaborative review and articulation of matching the Arizona 2010 Mathematics Standards and Mathematical Practices with CTE Technical Skill Standards. The available data is difficult to use, so the CTE unit is in the process of building a database that will make the data more available and more accessible.

President Molera expressed the Board's appreciation for the work done and acknowledged the importance and significance in moving this project forward.

11:48am - Mr. Miller moved to approve the proposed procedures related to the review and identification of Career and Technical Education courses and programs that satisfy minimum course of study requirements for mathematics.

Second by Mr. Moore

The motion passed unanimously.

6. ADJOURN

Mr. Miller asked if there were FERPA problems associated with Senate Bill 1176, regarding notification on injuries at school.

Ms. Anderson replied that there were issues with FERPA and this bill.

President Molera stated he would discuss the issue with Ms. Cannata, the Board's legislative lobbyist.

Mr. Yanez stated he would provide a written update to the Board.

11:52am - Mr. Miller moved to adjourn.

Second by Mr. Moore

The motion passed unanimously.