

Minutes
State Board of Education
Monday, October 19, 2009

The Arizona State Board of Education held a special meeting at the, Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting was called to order at 9:13AM.

Members Present:

Mr. Jacob Moore, President
Superintendent Tom Horne
Dr. John Haeger
Mr. Larry Lucero
Ms. Anita Mendoza
Mr. Jaime Molera
Dr. Karen Nicodemus

Members Absent:

Dr. Vicki Balentine, Vice President
Ms. Cecilia Owen

1. ROLL CALL

Mr. Moore introduced Ms. Diane Ortiz-Parsons and welcomed her to the State Board of Education. Ms. Ortiz-Parsons stated she was glad to be a member of the Board and shared her educational background experience.

Mr. Moore stated there would be two presentations for item 2 and asked Ms. Pollock if there was information the Board should have before moving to Executive Session. Ms. Pollock stated it would be best if the Board held questions and comments until after receiving legal advice in Executive Session.

2. Update regarding *Hobday, et. al. v. Horne, et. al* and *Craven et. al. v. Horne, et. al.* The Board may convene in executive session, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 A(3) and (4), to receive legal advice and/or consult with and instruct counsel on Board's position on matters relating to *Hobday, et. al. v. Horne, et. al* and *Craven et. al. v. Horne, et. al.* The Board may, in general session, take action to authorize Board counsel to act on the Board's behalf in these matters in accordance with instruction given in executive session.

Mr. Moore introduced Mr. Jay Kaprosy representing the Arizona Charter Schools Association.

Mr. Kaprosy stated his presentation would be to provide some of the data that brought the lawsuit forward and provided the members with a handout that reflected the Arizona public school district and charter schools 2007-2008 total revenue per pupil. Mr. Kaprosy said statistics reflect some of the disparities in place for charter schools and school districts that are in very similar situations due to the limited access resources beyond the basic state funding. Mr. Kaprosy stated the differences in funding are not a charter school vs. district issue it is a school finance disparity that has occurred in the last 29 years. Mr. Kaprosy stated that in 1980 a model program was created by the state for equalized funding in education and if that system would have stayed

intact and in place there would be not concerns but over a period of time school finance has evolved away from the equalization model and now there is almost \$2 billion worth of funds that are in the systems but are not equally accessible by all school districts or charter schools. Many of the issues have been amended on to the system throughout the years such as desegregation, adjacent ways, small school adjustment, dropout prevention and others. Mr. Kaprosy provided the Board is a handout that listed all of the unavailable revenues to charter schools and many school districts and stated the graphs and information presented are the basic numbers that have driven the need to file the lawsuit. Mr. Kaprosy said the goal of the lawsuits is to move toward a system of improved student equity and the association hopes that this action will spur action in the best interest of students. Mr. Kaprosy stated the association also hopes that the legislation move quickly and effectively before there are further generations of students whom are impacted by the student inequity that has been allowed. Mr. Kaprosy said one of the facts is that the difference over the educational career between the lowest 10% of students and the funding that is available to the highest 10% of students is approximately \$7.5 billion these are very significant resources that are directed towards the highest per pupil funded students in the state and that the lowest funding per pupil funded students in the state do not have access to due to the flawed system that does not provide the kind of equal access that is necessary.

Supt. Horne said his impression was that the districts that receive \$13,928 are the small rural school districts and asked Mr. Kaprosy if this was the association's impression as well. Mr. Kaprosy stated it was not due to the number of school districts that are in the realm that are not in the high 10%.

Mr. Moore thanked Mr. Kaprosy for his presentation and clarified that the purpose of meeting is to provide the Attorney General's office direction from the Board as to whether to defend the lawsuit. The purpose of the presentations is to provide balanced information with the understanding that during Executive Session Mr. Chad Sampson from the Attorney General's office will also provide the Board with an overview from the state's perspective and an understanding of the lawsuit. Mr. Moore introduced Mr. Tom Elliott, Assistant Supt. of Business Services at the Paradise Valley District and is also the President Elect for the Arizona Association School Business Officials.

Mr. Elliott his presentation would provide a comparison between district schools and charter schools and identify the places where they differ. A comparison of the Group A for elementary schools and high schools was made. All students fall under the Group A category and the basic amount of funds for a student (FY 2009-2010) is \$3,308.57 and after weights are applied the total amount is \$3,831.32 per student at the elementary level and \$4,195.27 at the high school level. The totals for Group A include the 1.25% for teacher compensation. Mr. Elliott stated there are adjustments made based on district size. Ms. Mendoza asked if the funds received from the Group A weight were the only funds available for special needs students if such districts were not receiving federal funds such as from IDEA. Mr. Elliott said if districts or charter schools that are not receiving money from IDEA and do not have Group B type students their funds would only come from the Group A formula. Mr. Elliot explained the total dollar amounts for the Group B add-on funds for kindergarten, K-3, English Learners, and Disabled Students. Mr. Elliott stated that the school district capital outlay revenue limit (CORL) has been the same

since FY 1998-1999 for all areas. The school district 2008-2009 CORL and soft capital amounts are as follows:

- CORL K-8 = \$225.76
- CORL 9-12 = \$267.94
- CORL textbooks 9-12 = \$69.88
- Soft Capital = \$225.00

The CORL amounts are funds districts receive but charters do not.

Mr. Molera asked if the CORL could be used as M&O, Mr. Elliot said that was correct the entire CORL could be shifted to M&O.

Charter schools do not receive additional assistance in CORL, soft capital, pupil transportation, or funds for the school facilities board. The amounts that charters do receive as additional assistance are:

- \$1,588.44 for K-8
- \$1,851.30 for 9-12

Mr. Elliot provided an outline of the 2009-2010 state funding for districts and charters with 600+students. The amounts outlined did not include overrides or bonds only the Group A and B formula amounts. Other major revenue sources are classroom site fund – Prop 301 and instructional improvement funds – Indian gaming. District based level add-ons include the teacher experience index and career ladder.

*Ms. Ortiz-Parsons moved to go into Executive Session
Motion second by Mr. Lucero
Motion passes*

*Mr. Lucero moved to reconvene
Motion second by Mr. Molera
Motion passes*

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons was not in the room and did not vote

Ms. Pollock on behalf of the Attorney General's Office requested a motion as to how to proceed in the Craven and Hobday lawsuits.

*Mr. Molera move to direct legal counsel to proceed as discussed in Executive Session
Motion second by Mr. Lucero*

Mr. Moore asked for individual votes.

| <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|------------|-------------|
| Dr. Haeger | Ms. Mendoza |

Dr. Nicodemus

Mr. Molera

Supt. Horne

Mr. Lucero

Mr. Moore

Motion passes

Ms. Ortiz-Parsons was not in the room and did not vote

3. Presentation and discussion regarding the current professional preparation program approval process for teacher certification. Discussion may include, but is not limited to, intern certificate requirements and options relating to alternative teacher certification.

Mr. Moore stated the item presentation was to make any necessary changes to the current alternative teacher certification rule and as it relates to the Race to the Top application keeping in mind the December 15th deadline.

Dr. Karen Butter, Associated Superintendent for the Academic Achievement stated Ms. Jan Amator and Patty Hardy would also be available for questions about the presentation.

Dr. Haeger left at 10:26

The draft requirements specific to great teachers and leaders was presented and baseline data on great teachers and principals. Also provided was the status of highly qualified teachers tied to equitable distribution and Dr. Butterfield stated the figures presented were for 2007-2008 and also noted the chart reflected the number of core academic courses taught by either highly qualified teachers and the courses taught by non-highly qualified teachers and regarding to the all schools at the elementary level there is close to 7% gap. There are more non-highly qualified teachers at high poverty schools. Dr. Butterfield said that the numbers presented were based on free and reduced lunch numbers only. The work of NCLB and RTTT monies is to close the achievement gap and assure all students are taught by highly qualified and highly effective teachers. At the secondary level there was also a close to 4.6% level gap between low poverty and high poverty distribution of highly qualified teachers.

The current Board rule for professional preparation institutions may include but is not limited to:

- Universities and colleges
- School districts
- Professional organizations
- Private businesses
- Charter schools
- Regional training centers

Examples of other organizations are county ESA's, AZ Charter Schools Association, etc.

Mr. Molera asked if the application process required a higher education experience. Dr. Butterfield stated it is up to the group overseeing the process. Dr. Butterfield stated the main goal is to make sure the teacher has quality background. Supt. Horne stated the capstone experience does not necessarily need to be a student teaching experience through a higher learning institution. Mr. Yanez stated there are two different models. One is through a higher learning institution. The second is a mentoring type of model and this is the traditional type of model.

A list of the current alternative programs was provided and the number of participants for each fiscal year starting in 2005-2006 through 2009-2010. The following are the programs listed:

- Teach for America

- Phoenix Teaching Fellows
- Transition to Teaching-Interns
- Transition to Teaching-Paraprofessionals

Dr. Nicodemus asked if the information presented included rationale for the decrease in participants. Ms. Amator stated the programs that reflect a decrease are in the area of Phoenix but the other programs have increased and this could in part be because the need for intern teachers decreased when contracts were not renewed. It is anticipated that as the economy turns the numbers will again increase. Ms. Amator also stated that the transition to teaching also took a drop in 2007-2008 because the old grant stopped and the new grant began and that grant concentrates mainly on the grow your own concept.

Dr. Butterfield stated the issuances of emergency and intern certificates reflect the significant drop of emergency and intern certificates. This decrease is due to the requirement from the federal government that emergency certificates are not allowed for Title I schools. The summary of alternative pathways listed the potential strengths in place particularly tied to RTTT and these are that there are several pathways in place currently, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of intern certificates issued and no in-state, non-traditional preparation programs have come forward to seek State Board approval. There is a Board rule to support alternative pathways. Dr. Butterfield stated it will be critical for work done towards RTTT to continue building state-wide capacity, to scale up and sustain programs that increase the pipeline of teachers and close any existing gaps.

Mr. Moore introduced Ms. Becky Hill who represents ABCTE. Ms. Hill stated they have met with ADE after the September 29th Stated Board meeting. Ms. Hill thanked Ms. Amator and staff for taking the time to respond to the many questions. Ms. Hill stated the application process ADE has in place has some areas of flexibility but ABCTE feels the flexibility is hard to see and understand and that is somewhat based on staff discretion. Further clarification needs to be provided for the requirements of credit hours if that is the case. Ms. Hill said the time frames need to be reviewed. The three-step process is complex and once one deadline is missed companies need to wait 6 months to start the process again. Ms. Hill suggested staying with the concept of a schedule but adding one or two evaluation periods.

Mr. Horne left at 10:59

Ms. Hill stated the evaluation committee could use a broader representation whom may have a more non-traditional perspective of what teacher preparation programs might look like. Ms. Hill said that another issue relates to flexibility is turning the information to the evaluation committee and not knowing what their perspective and their understanding of the flexibility of the rule. Ms. Hill stated that the practicum component rule might also need to be revised since alternative certification generally refers to a format with preparation leading up to certification and one of the ways ABCTE and other entities are alternatives is in the design of the practicum. ABCTE has left the practicum component up to the employer in most states. After changes are made to the ABCTE program candidates will continue to be under the program umbrella and ABCTE will need to be administratively responsible that that will be new. Ms. Hill stated that the rule may be flexible but not alternative.

Ms. Mendoza asked if a similar process could be created to include the follow-up requirements and make the system more user-friendly. Ms. Amator said the practicum and SEI has been discussed and agrees that a new application has to be created. Ms. Mendoza stated new diversity or increased representation in the committee would be beneficial.

Mr. Moore thanked the department for the information provided. Mr. Molera suggested working with Mr. Yanez to provide the next steps for the process and bring the recommendations to the Board. Mr. Molera said the RTTT presentation will be presented at the State Board regular meeting on Monday, October 26, 2009. Mr. Moore stated this matter is critical to the RTTT process and asked if further information could be provided at the next Board meeting.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Lucero moved to adjourn

Motion second by Ms. Mendoza

Motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 11:18