

ARIZONA FRAMEWORK FOR MEASURING EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

*Effective Beginning the **2014-2015** School Year*



The Arizona State Board of Education

Adopted April 25, 2011 and Amended May 19, 2014

ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

2010-2011 TASK FORCE ON TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATIONS

The 2010-2011 Task Force on Teacher and Principal Evaluations conducted its work in service of the students in Arizona's public schools. The Task Force members hold that the goal of both teacher and principal evaluations is to enhance performance so that students receive a higher quality education. Further, the work here submitted reflects the belief that evaluations are most effective as one part of a systemic approach to improving educator performance and student achievement.

VISION

"To improve student achievement, Arizona supports effective teachers and principals by developing a model framework that can be incorporated into all Arizona LEA [district and charter] evaluation instruments and ensures that student academic progress is a significant component in the teacher and principal evaluation process."

GOALS

- To enhance and improve student learning;
- To use the evaluation process and achievement data to drive professional development to enhance teaching, leadership, and student performance.
- To increase data-informed decision making for students and teacher and principal evaluations fostering school cultures where student learning and progress is a continual part of redefining goals for all.
- To use the evaluation process and data to improve teacher and principal performance;
- To incorporate multiple measurements of achievement;
- To communicate clearly defined expectations;
- To allow districts and charters to use local instruments to fulfill the requirements of the framework;
- To reflect fairness, flexibility, and a research-based approach;
- To create a culture where data drives instructional decisions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES § 15-203(A)(38)	1
BACKGROUND	1
ESSENTIAL STANDARDS RELATING TO THE APPROPRIATE USE OF TESTS AND OTHER TYPES OF ACHIEVEMENT DATA.....	1
DEFINITIONS	3
FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	6
FRAMEWORK FOR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	15
SUMMARY.....	20
ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISTRICTS AND CHARTERS	21
APPENDICES	22
APPENDIX A	23
APPENDIX B.....	24
APPENDIX C.....	25
APPENDIX D	26
APPENDIX E.....	28
APPENDIX F	30
APPENDIX G	31
APPENDIX H	32
APPENDIX I.....	33
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	34
2010-2011 TASK FORCE MEMBERS.....	35

ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES § 15-203(A)(38)

ARS §15-203(A)(38), first adopted in 2010 and subsequently amended, requires the State Board of Education to - “*adopt and maintain a model framework for a teacher and principal evaluation instrument that includes quantitative data on student academic progress that accounts for between thirty-three percent and fifty per cent of the evaluation outcomes.*” The statute requires the Board to include four performance classifications in the framework, and adopt best practices for professional development and evaluator training. The statute mandates that by school year 2013-14 school districts and charter schools in a public meeting adopt the definitions of the State Board performance classifications, and implement the classifications into their evaluation instruments.

BACKGROUND

Outstanding teachers and principals make a difference. Great classroom teaching and principal leadership are the strongest predictors of student development and achievement. Based on this reality, in 2010 Arizona legislators initially passed a law intended to change the culture of education in Arizona, and improve how many districts and charters evaluate their teachers and principals. Specifically, this law requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop a framework for teacher and principal evaluations that includes quantitative data on student academic progress that accounts for between 33% and 50% of each evaluation outcome. Districts and charters will be required to use an instrument that meets the requirements established by the framework to annually evaluate individual teachers and principals beginning in the 2013 – 2014 school year.

The Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness detailed in this document complies with all legal requirements while also providing districts and charters with as much flexibility as possible to develop evaluation systems that meet their individual needs.

For many districts and charters, implementing a new or revised teacher and principal evaluation instrument/system that incorporates the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness by the 2012 – 2013 school year will present significant challenges. The SBE understands these challenges and acknowledges that it may take time for districts and charters to develop and implement truly robust systems. To assist schools during this transition the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) will provide a repository of evaluation instruments that comply with the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness. The intent of this repository is not to require the use of any specific evaluation instrument or system, but rather to provide districts and charters with additional guidance on how they might develop their own.

ESSENTIAL STANDARDS RELATING TO THE APPROPRIATE USE OF TESTS AND OTHER TYPES OF ACHIEVEMENT DATA

In reviewing this Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, one should be reminded of the thoughtful decision making processes that will be required to ensure that evaluation systems are fair and accurate. In developing these systems it is imperative that districts and charters

recognize that high stakes decisions about educator effectiveness should only be made using multiple measures that are both valid and reliable. To this end, this framework identifies several sources of data that may be used; however, districts and charters should recognize that the majority of teachers do not have a complete compliment of valid and reliable student achievement data. This is particularly true for teachers in special needs areas and for those in grades and subjects where statewide assessments are not required. As districts and charters begin the work of developing their own evaluation systems priority should be given to the creation of valid and reliable assessments in these high need areas.

DEFINITIONS

Academic Growth

The change in student achievement students experience between two or more points in time.

Academic Progress

A measurement of student academic performance. These measurements shall include the amount of academic growth students experience between two or more points in time, and may also include measures of academic performance, including, but not limited to, state administered assessments, district/school formative and summative assessments, and school achievement profiles.

Classroom-Level Data

Data that are limited to student academic performance within an individual classroom or course. These may include scores on state administered assessments, district/school assessments, benchmark assessments, standardized assessments, other assessments, and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Classroom-level data is not intended to include individual teacher made quizzes or tests for a specific classroom.

Classroom Observations

Used to measure observable classroom processes including specific teacher practices, aspects of instruction, and interactions between teachers and students. Classroom observations can measure broad, overarching aspects of teaching or subject-specific or context-specific aspects of practice.¹

Formative Assessment

Assessments used by teachers and students as part of instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students' achievement of core content.

Framework

A general set of guidelines that comprise the basic elements that shall be included in all teacher and principal evaluation instruments utilized by Arizona LEAs.

Group A Teachers

Teachers with available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona's academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas.

Group B Teachers

Teachers with limited or no available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona's academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas.

Multiple Measures of Student Learning

The various types of assessments of student learning, including for example, value-added or growth measures, curriculum-based tests, pre/post-tests, capstone projects, oral presentations, performances, or artistic or other projects.¹

Multiple Measures of Teacher Performance

The various types of assessments of teachers' performance, including, for example, classroom observations, student test score data, self assessments, or student or parent surveys.¹

New Teacher

A teacher new to the profession with less than three years of experience.

Newly Reassigned Teacher

A teacher who has been newly assigned to a grade, a content area or a school.

Nontested Grades and Subjects

Refers to the grades and subjects that are not required to be tested under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or Arizona law.¹

Other Assessments

The development and/or adaptation of other measures of academic growth for non-tested grades and subjects used across schools or districts. These measures may include early reading measures; standardized end-of-course assessments; formative assessments; benchmark, interim, or unit assessments; and standardized measures of English language proficiency. Other assessments may be developed at either the state education agency or local education agency level. Teacher-developed assessments of student learning or growth also may fall into this category when those assessments meet expectations for rigor and comparability across classrooms in a district or across classrooms statewide.¹

Parent Surveys

Questionnaires that usually ask parents to rate teachers on an extent-scale regarding various aspects of teachers' practice as well as the extent to which they are satisfied with the teachers' instruction.¹

Pre- and Post-Tests

Typically, locally developed student achievement tests that measure the content of the curriculum of a particular course. They are taken at the beginning of a time period (usually a semester or year) and then toward the end of that period to obtain a measure of academic growth. Many pre- and posttest models also include mid-year assessments and formative assessments for teachers to adjust instruction throughout the course or year.¹

Reliability

The ability of an instrument to measure teacher performance consistently across different rates and different contexts.¹

School-Level Data

Data that are limited to student academic performance within an individual school. These may include scores on state administered assessments, district/school assessments, other standardized assessments, and school achievement profiles.

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

A classroom-level standards-based measure relevant to the content area taught during the current school year that: 1) is specific and measureable; 2) is based on available prior student learning data; and 3) assesses academic growth and/or achievement.

Student Surveys

Questionnaires that typically ask students to rate teachers on an extent-scale regarding various aspects of teachers' practice as well as how much students say they learned or the extent to which they were engaged.¹

Summative Assessment

Assessments used to determine whether students have met instructional goals or student learning outcomes at the end of a course or program.

Teacher

An individual who provides instruction to Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes; or who teaches in an environment other than a classroom setting and who maintains daily student attendance records. Recognizing that many classes do not meet every week day school is in session, "daily student attendance" means a teacher takes attendance each time the class meets.

Team

Any group of teachers that teach the same subject, students or grade levels.

Validity

The extent to which a test's content is representative of the actual skills learned and whether the test can allow accurate conclusions concerning achievement.

Veteran Teacher

A teacher with three or more years of experience.

¹ National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality: Supporting State Efforts to Design and Implement Teacher Evaluation Systems (Dec. 2010)

FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Arizona's Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness is designed to provide districts and charters with as much flexibility as possible to create and implement evaluation systems for teachers of Kindergarten through grade 12 that fit their individual needs. While not required by the Board, districts and charters may include the evaluation of Pre-Kindergarten teachers in the evaluation systems they adopt.

Due to the disparity in available valid and reliable student achievement data between teachers in various content areas, the framework is divided into two components: Group A and Group B. Districts and charters shall apply the Group A framework to all teachers with available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona's academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas. The Group B framework shall be applied to all teachers with limited or no available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona's academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas.

Because districts and charters throughout Arizona have vastly different assessment data available across multiple content areas it is not possible to impose strict rules on which teachers should use each framework. For example, while some districts and charters may have developed several sources of classroom-level student achievement data for their music teachers, others have not. Districts and charters are strongly encouraged to examine their existing assessment systems and to develop new sources of valid and reliable classroom-level student achievement data where currently none, or very little, exist.

The table that follows outlines the evaluation framework for both Group A and Group B. It also includes the types of student achievement data that may be used. As districts and charters use this framework to develop their own evaluation instruments they shall adhere to the following requirements:

Group A:

Academic Progress

- Classroom-level data elements shall account for at least 33% of the **total** evaluation outcomes. Districts and charters may increase the weight of these elements as they deem appropriate; however, the total weight of these data shall not exceed 50% of the **total** evaluation outcome. If available and appropriate to a teacher's content area, data from state administered assessments shall be used as at least one of the classroom-level data elements. Districts and charters may determine which additional classroom-level data will be used and in what proportions.
- The use of school-level data elements is optional for teachers using the Group A framework. If school-level data are used the total weight of these data shall account for no more than 17% of the **total** evaluation outcomes. Additionally, the sum of school-level data and classroom-level data shall not exceed 50% of the **total** evaluation outcome.

- Districts and charters shall ensure that the total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) includes a calculation of the amount of Academic Growth students experience between two or more points in time. The Academic Growth calculation shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the Academic Growth calculation. The State Board of Education will define that significant factor prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year after two years' consecutive growth data from the new assessment are available.
- Districts and charters shall ensure that multiple data elements are used to calculate the portion of each teacher's evaluation dedicated to student academic progress.

Teaching Performance and Professional Practice

- The "Teaching Performance and Professional Practice" component of the evaluation shall be based upon classroom observations as required by ARS §15-537. District and charter evaluation instruments shall include rubrics for this portion of the evaluation that are aligned to the Professional Teaching Standards approved by the State Board of Education in Board Rule R7-2-602, available at: http://azsos.gov/public_services/Title_07/7-02.htm#Article_6. The "Teaching Performance and Professional Practice" component of the evaluation shall account for between 50% and 67% of the **total** evaluation outcomes.

Group B:

Academic Progress

- By definition, teachers using the Group B framework have either limited or no valid and reliable classroom-level student academic progress data that are aligned to Arizona's academic content standards and appropriate to individual teachers' content areas.
 - In cases where limited valid and reliable classroom-level data exist districts and charters shall incorporate these data into the final evaluation outcome; however, these data shall be augmented with the use of additional school-level data. School-level data may include aggregate school, grade, or team-level data. The sum of available classroom-level data and school-level data shall account for between 33% and 50% of the **total** evaluation outcomes.
 - In cases where no valid and reliable classroom-level data exist school-level data shall account for at least 33% of the **total** evaluation outcomes. School-level data may include aggregate school, grade, or team-level data. Districts and charters may increase the weight of these elements as they deem appropriate; however, the total weight of these data shall not exceed 50% of the **total** evaluation outcome.
- Districts and charters shall ensure that the total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) includes a calculation of the amount of Academic Growth students experience between two or more points in time. The Academic Growth calculation shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.

- Districts and charters shall ensure that multiple data elements are used to calculate the portion of each teacher’s evaluation dedicated to student academic progress.

Teaching Performance and Professional Practice

- The “Teaching Performance and Professional Practice” component of the evaluation shall be based upon classroom observations as required by ARS §15-537. District and charter evaluation instruments shall include rubrics for this portion of the evaluation that are aligned to the Professional Teaching Standards approved by the State Board of Education in Board Rule R7-2-602, available at: http://azsos.gov/public_services/Title_07/7-02.htm#Article_6. The “Teaching Performance and Professional Practice” component of the evaluation shall account for between 50% and 67% of the **total** evaluation outcomes.

Teacher Performance Classifications:

As prescribed in A.R.S. § 15-203, beginning in school year 2013-2014 all school districts and charter schools shall classify each teacher in one of the following four performance classifications:

- **Highly Effective:** A *highly effective* teacher consistently exceeds expectations. This teacher’s students generally made exceptional levels of academic progress. The highly effective teacher demonstrates mastery of the state board of education adopted professional teaching standards, as determined by classroom observations required by ARS §15-537.
- **Effective:** An *effective* teacher consistently meets expectations. This teacher’s students generally made satisfactory levels of academic progress. The effective teacher demonstrates competency in the state board of education adopted professional teaching standards, as determined by classroom observations as required by ARS §15-537.
- **Developing:** A *developing* teacher fails to consistently meet expectations and requires a change in performance. This teacher’s students generally made unsatisfactory levels of academic progress. The developing teacher demonstrates an insufficient level of competency in the state board of education adopted professional teaching standards, as determined by classroom observations required by ARS §15-537. The developing classification is not intended to be assigned to a veteran teacher for more than two consecutive years. This classification may be assigned to new or newly-reassigned teachers for more than two consecutive years.
- **Ineffective:** An *ineffective* teacher consistently fails to meet expectations and requires a change in performance. This teacher’s students generally made unacceptable levels of academic progress. The ineffective teacher demonstrates minimal competency in the state board of education adopted professional teaching standards, as determined by classroom observations required by ARS §15-537.

FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

	Classroom-level Data	School-level Data	Teaching Performance
<p style="text-align: center;">GROUP “A”</p> <p>(Teachers with available classroom-level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona’s academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers’ content areas.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Administered Assessments • AP, IB, Cambridge, ACT, Quality Core • District/Charter-Wide Assessments • District / School-level Benchmark Assessments, aligned with Arizona State Standards • Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) • Other valid and reliable classroom- level data <p><u>Required</u> Classroom-level elements shall account for at least 33% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</p> <p><i>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the Academic Growth calculation. The State Board of Education will define that significant factor prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year after two years’ consecutive growth data from the new assessment are available.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Administered Assessments (aggregate school, department, grade, or team level results) • AP, IB, Cambridge, ACT, Quality Core (aggregate school, department or grade level results) • Survey data • School Achievement Profiles • Other valid and reliable school-level data, e.g., grade level goals <p><u>Optional</u> School-level elements shall account for no more than 17% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</p> <p><i>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.</i></p>	<p>Evaluation instruments shall provide for periodic classroom observations of all teachers. Districts and charters may develop their own rubrics for this portion of teacher evaluations; however, these rubrics shall be based upon national standards, as approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p><u>Required</u> Teaching Performance results shall account for between 50% and 67% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">GROUP “B”</p> <p>(Teachers with limited or no available classroom- level student achievement data that are valid and reliable, aligned to Arizona’s academic standards, and appropriate to individual teachers’ content areas.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District / School Level Benchmark Assessments, aligned with Arizona State Standards • District/Charter-wide Assessments, if available • Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) • Other valid and reliable classroom-level data <p><i>If available, these data shall be incorporated into the evaluation instrument. The sum of available classroom-level data and school-level data shall account for between 33% and 50% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Administered Assessments (aggregate School, department, grade, or Team-level results) • AP, IB, Cambridge, ACT, Quality Core (aggregate school, department or grade- level results) • Survey data • School Achievement Profiles • Other valid and reliable school-level data, e.g., grade level goals <p><u>Required</u> <i>The sum of available school-level data and classroom-level data shall account for between 33% and 50% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.</i></p>	<p>Evaluation instruments shall provide for periodic classroom observations of all teachers. Districts and charters shall develop their own rubrics for this portion of teacher evaluations; however, these rubrics shall be based upon national standards, as approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p><u>Required</u> <i>Teaching Performance results shall account for between 50% and 67% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</i></p>
---	--	---	--

SAMPLE WEIGHTING GROUP “A”


The charts represent three **options** for the weighting of evaluations for teachers **with** valid and reliable classroom-level academic progress data. The **options may include, but are not limited to:**

Sample 1: 33% Classroom-level data*
17% School-level data*
50% Teaching Performance


Sample 2: 50% Classroom-level data*
50% Teaching Performance

Sample 3: 33% Classroom-level data*
67% Teaching Performance


- * The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the **total** evaluation outcome.
- * Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the Academic Growth calculation. The State Board of Education will define that significant factor prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year after two years' consecutive growth data from the new assessment are available.



SAMPLE 1



SAMPLE 2



SAMPLE 3

SAMPLE WEIGHTING GROUP “B”


The charts represent three **options** for the weighting of evaluations for teachers **without** valid and reliable classroom-level academic progress data. The **options may include, but are not limited to:**

Sample 1: 33% School-level data*
17% Classroom-level data*
50% Teaching Performance


Sample 2: 50% School-level data*
50% Teaching Performance

Sample 3: 33% School-level data*
67% Teaching Performance


* The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the **total** evaluation outcome.



SAMPLE 1




SAMPLE 2



SAMPLE 3

Weighting Breakdown

Teacher Evaluations



Classroom-level Data: Possible Measures

- State Administered Assessments
- AP, IB, Cambridge, ACT, Quality Core
- District / Charter-Wide Assessments
- District / School-level Benchmark Assessments, aligned with Arizona State Standards
- Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)
- Other valid and reliable classroom-level data




School-level Data: Possible Measures

- State Administered Assessments (aggregate school, department, or grade-level results)
- AP, IB, Cambridge, ACT, Quality Core (aggregate, school, department or grade-level results)
- Survey data
- School Achievement Profiles
- Other valid and reliable school-level data, e.g., grade level goals

State Board Adopted Professional Teaching Standards (Teaching Performance)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Learner Development | 2. Learning Differences |
| 3. Learning Environments | 4. Content Knowledge |
| 5. Innovative Applications of Content | 6. Assessment |
| 7. Planning Instruction | 8. Instructional Strategies |
| 9. Reflection and Continual Growth | 10. Collaboration |



FRAMEWORK FOR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

FRAMEWORK FOR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Principals are the instructional leaders of our schools and ultimately responsible for student achievement in all content areas and grade-levels. For this reason the framework for principal evaluation instruments is most directly tied to school-level student achievement data.

The table that follows outlines the evaluation framework for principals. It also includes the types of student achievement data that may be used. As districts and charters use this framework to develop their own evaluation instruments they shall adhere to the following requirements:

- School-level data elements shall account for at least 33% of evaluation outcomes. Districts and charters may increase the weight of these elements as they deem appropriate; however, the total weight of these data shall not exceed 50% of the total evaluation outcome. Data from state administered assessments shall be included as at least one of the school-level data elements. Districts and charters may determine which additional school-level data will be used and in what proportions.
- Districts and charters may choose to incorporate other types of system/program-level data into principal evaluations that focus on student academic performance in specific programs, grade-levels, and subject areas. For example, districts and charters may determine that their principal evaluations will include academic progress data related to third grade reading proficiency rates. If other types of system/program-level data are used the total weight of these data shall account for no more than 17% of evaluation outcomes. Additionally, the sum of these data and school-level data shall not exceed 50% of the total evaluation outcome.
- Districts and charters shall ensure that multiple data elements are used to calculate the portion of each principal's evaluation dedicated to student academic progress.
- The "Leadership" component of the evaluation shall be based upon observation of a principal's performance. District and charter evaluation instruments shall include rubrics for this portion of the evaluation that are aligned to the Professional Administrative Standards approved by the State Board of Education in Board Rule R7-2-603 available at: http://azsos.gov/public_services/Title_07/7-02.htm#Article_6. The "Leadership" component of the evaluation shall account for between 50% and 67% of evaluation outcomes.

FRAMEWORK FOR PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

	School-level Data	System/Program-level Data	Instructional Leadership
ALL PRINCIPALS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Administered Assessments (aggregate school or grade level results) District/School Level Benchmark Assessments AP, IB Cambridge International, ACT Quality Core School Achievement Profiles Student academic progress goals Other valid and reliable data <p><u>Required</u> School-level elements shall account for at least 33% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</p> <p>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.</p> <p>Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the Academic Growth calculation. The State Board of Education will define that significant factor prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year after two years' consecutive growth data from the new assessment are available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey data Grade level data Subject area data Program data Student academic progress goals Other valid and reliable data <p><u>Optional</u> These elements shall account for no more than 17% of evaluation outcomes; however, the sum of these data and school-level data shall not exceed 50% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcome.</p> <p>The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the total evaluation outcome.</p>	<p>Evaluation instruments shall provide for periodic performance reviews of all principals. Districts and charters may develop their own rubrics for this portion of principal evaluations; however, these rubrics shall be based upon National standards, as approved by the State Board of Education.</p> <p><u>Required</u> Instructional Leadership results shall account for no more than 50 to 67% of the <u>total</u> evaluation outcomes.</p>

SAMPLE WEIGHTING PRINCIPAL EVALUATIONS


The charts represent three **options** for the weighting of evaluations for principals. The **options may include, but are not limited to:**

Sample 1: 33% School-level data*
17% System/School-level data*
50% Instructional Leadership


Sample 2: 50% School-level data*
50% Instructional Leadership

Sample 3: 33% School-level data*
67% Instructional Leadership


- * The total measure of Academic Progress (classroom-level and/or school-level) shall include a calculation of Academic Growth. Academic Growth (using classroom-level and/or school-level data) shall comprise at least 20% of the **total** evaluation outcome.
- * Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, state assessment data must be a significant factor in the Academic Growth calculation. The State Board of Education will define that significant factor prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year after two years' consecutive growth data from the new assessment are available.



SAMPLE 1




SAMPLE 2



SAMPLE 3

Framework Effective Beginning the 2014-15 School Year

Weighting Breakdown Principal Evaluations



School-level Data: Possible Measures

- State Administered Assessments (aggregate school or grade level results)
- District / School Level Benchmark Assessments
- AP, IB, Cambridge International, ACT Quality Core
- School Achievement Profiles
- Other valid and reliable data



System/School-level Data: Possible Measures

- Survey data
- Grade level data
- Subject area data
- Program data
- Other valid and reliable data

State Board Adopted Standards (Instructional Leadership)

Standard 1

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4


A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understand, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.



SUMMARY

As attention now turns to the implementation of this framework there will be a myriad of important matters for districts and charters to consider. In an effort to ensure the integrity of these evaluation systems there are a few central considerations that merit specific attention.

First, as previously mentioned, it is critical that high stakes decisions regarding educator effectiveness be made using multiple measures that are both valid and reliable. The Task Force understands that the necessary assessments and other student achievement data do not exist for all teachers to be included in the Group A evaluation framework. Therefore, districts and charters are strongly encouraged to begin the processes necessary to develop additional valid and reliable classroom-level data for all teachers. It should be the goal of every district and charter to create the necessary data sources so that all teachers can be evaluated using the Group A framework.

Second, to ensure the fairness and success of all evaluation systems, districts and charters should take the necessary steps to align professional development offerings to evaluation outcomes. The Task Force recommends that teachers and principals remain focused on Arizona's Professional Teaching and Administrative Standards. These will serve as key components in all evaluation systems. In addition, districts and charters should develop and/or participate in professional development that meets the standards from the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) to ensure that all professional learning for educators meets the highest standards of quality.

Finally, as implementation occurs during the next few years, the Task Force is strongly focused on reinforcing the need for a shared effort to support cultural change throughout the system. This change can only be accomplished if stakeholders at all levels work cooperatively to ensure that newly developed evaluation systems are fair, accurate and student-focused.

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISTRICTS AND CHARTERS

- When available, data from statewide assessments shall be used to inform the evaluation process.
- All assessment data used in educator evaluations shall be aligned with Arizona State Standards.
- Districts and charters shall include student achievement data for reading and/or math as appropriate; however, student achievement data should not be strictly limited to these content areas.
- Evaluation instruments should integrate student academic progress data with data derived through classroom observations – neither should stand alone.
- All evaluators should receive professional development in the form of Qualified Evaluator Training.
- Districts and charters should provide for the development of classroom-level achievement data for teachers in those content areas where these data are limited or do not currently exist so that all teachers use the Group A framework.
- Districts and charters should develop and provide professional development on the evaluation process and in those areas articulated in Arizona's Professional Teaching and Administrative Standards, as approved by the State Board of Education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA SOURCES

<u>ASSESSMENT DATA SOURCE</u>	<u>METHOD(S)</u>	<u>CRITERIA</u>
AIMS Spring '10 – '11 (select reading or math)	<p>Movement on the FAME scale</p> <p>MAP - School Achievement scale scores</p> <p>Percent correct for student below "Exceeds"</p>	<p>X percent of students will improve one FAME label; no more than X percent will drop from "Exceeds" to "Meets"</p> <p>X percent of students are predicted to pass AIMS in 2 years (criteria utilized in MAP)</p> <p>60% of ELL students will increase by X percentage points on the Reading test; X percent of non-ELL students will increase by X percentage points; the percent of students in the "Exceeds" category will remain the same (this is an example of differing subgroup performance and could be sued with other subgroups)</p>
District Criterion Assessments (given three times)	<p>Percent correct</p> <p>FAME Scale</p>	<p>X percent of students will increase from the first to the third benchmark by at least X percentage points. Using a vertically equated scale the growth in scale scores across each benchmark will increase a minimum of X scale points.</p> <p>The FAME equivalent score will improve one level or remains at "Meets" or "Exceeds"</p>
District Developed Pre-Post Tests	Percent of students who show growth (defined) from Pre to Post test	X percent of students will show X percent of growth from Pre to Post test
AZELLA	Percent of students testing English proficient	With the exception of pre-emergent and emergent students, 30%* of ELL students will test out of ELD (*A-F School Achievement standard)
End of Course Assessment (no pretest)	Percent of students who achieve an identified percentage of items	X percent of students will achieve 80% on the end of course exam
DIBELS		<p>X percent of students scoring in the 'Intensive' category on the beginning- period DIBELS assessment will move to 'Strategic or Benchmark' by the end- period assessment.</p> <p>X percent of students scoring 'Strategic/Benchmark' at the beginning-period will not drop into the 'Intensive' category by the end of the year.</p>

APPENDIX B

The table below can serve as a roadmap for district and charter movement from current to ideal practices in order to improve student achievement in Arizona.

Cross Analysis of Current and Ideal Practices for the Improvement of Instruction through the Implementation of Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator	
Current Practices	Ideal Practices
1.0 Limited or non-existent Post-Observation Feedback for Teachers and Principals.	1.0 Ongoing use of Quality Post-Observation Feedback, plus Use of Data and Assessment Analysis to drive Increased Student Academic Progress and Achievement.
2.0 None to one Summative Teacher and Principal Evaluation per year.	2.0 Multiple Formative and Summative Teacher and Principal evaluations per year.
3.0 Limited Evaluator Inter-Rater Reliability for Teacher and Principal Evaluations.	3.0 Qualified and Certified Evaluator Inter-Rater Reliability for Teachers and Principals.
4.0 Limited or no use of Student and Teacher National Standards for the design of Observation Rubrics.	4.0 Extensive use of National Student and Teacher Standards for the design of Observation Rubrics.
5.0 Little to no alignment of Teacher and Principal Observation Instruments to Student Academic Progress and Achievement (Product)	5.0 Alignment of Teacher and Principal Observation Instruments for Increasing Student Academic Progress and Achievement (Product)
6.0 Limited or no use of Performance Levels for Teacher and Principal Competencies.	6.0 Multi-Levels of Teacher and Principal Performance Competencies.
7.0 Compliance driven Annual Teacher and Principal Evaluations as a “Have To”.	7.0 “Want To” conduct Annual Evaluations of Teachers and Principal for the purpose of Increasing Student Academic Progress and Achievement.
8.0 Use of Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) ONLY for Under-Performing Teachers and Principals.	8.0 Use of an Annual Educator’s Goal(s) Plan for All Teachers and Principals resulting with Increased Student Academic Progress and Achievement. .
9.0 Only Teachers are accountable for the Improvement of Student Academic Progress and Achievement.	9.0 All Teachers and Principals are Accountable for Improvement of Student Academic Progress and Achievement.
10.0 Use of a “checklist” for Teacher and Principal Performance.	10.0 Rubrics based on National Teacher, Principal and Student Standards with Indicators, Descriptors and Performance Levels are utilized.
11.0 Limited use of Teacher and Principal Evaluation Data to determine professional growth program for Increasing Student Academic Progress and Achievement.	11.0 Use of School and District Teacher and Principal Evaluation Data to determine allocation of staff; professional development; and resources for building capacities for Increasing Student Academic Progress and Achievement.

APPENDIX C

COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS

To assist districts and charters as they work to revise their teacher and principal evaluation instruments to meet the requirements of the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, the Task Force recommends a focus on the following key components of effective educator evaluations for teachers and principals:

- *Arizona's Professional Teaching Standards* – The Arizona State Board of Education has adopted Professional Teaching Standards from the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Professional Teaching Standards that establish specific expectations for the skills and knowledge that all Arizona teachers should possess. These standards should serve as key components in any teacher evaluation system.
- *Arizona's Professional Administrative Standards* – The Arizona State Board of Education has adopted Professional Administrative Standards from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) that establish specific expectations for the skills and knowledge that all Arizona principals should possess. These standards should serve as key components in any administrative evaluation system.
- *National Staff Development Council Standards for Professional Development*—The Arizona State
- Department of Education has adopted Professional Development Standards from the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) that establish specific expectations to ensure that all professional learning for educators meets the highest standards of quality.
- *Evaluator training to ensure inter-rater reliability* – Critical to the fairness and success of all evaluation systems is the professional development of staff to ensure the reliability and validity of the evaluation process.

It is also important to reinforce that effective evaluations of all educators should:

- Recognize quality instruction and improve instruction;
- Incorporate multiple measures;
- Focus on student progress;
- Create a path toward a professional improvement plan;
- Be summative and formative; and
- Include and encourage collaboration with other teachers, educational staff and school personnel.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE PROCESS TO DEVELOP TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Sample School District Teacher and Principal Performance Evaluation System Design Team

Statement of Role of the Evaluation Instrument Design Team: To develop recommendations to the Administration under the auspices of the Governing Board regarding the inclusion of at least 33% of the teacher and principal evaluation instruments to include student academic progress. All recommendations will be thoughtfully considered and researched by the appropriate individuals before finalizing any policy or procedure.

Purpose: To improve achievement of students in Sample Public Schools by implementing a teacher and principal evaluation instrument which ensures that student academic progress is a significant component of the performance evaluations of teachers and principals.

Goals:

- To enhance and improve student learning;
- To use the evaluation process and data to improve teacher and principal performance;
- To incorporate multiple measurements of achievement;
- To communicate clearly defined expectations;
- To allow districts and charters to use local instruments to fulfill the requirements of the framework;
- To reflect fairness, flexibility, and a research-based approach;
- To create a culture where data drives instructional decisions.
- To use the evaluation process and achievement data to drive professional development to enhance student performance.
- To increase data-informed decision making for students and evaluations fostering school cultures where student learning and progress is a continual part of redefining goals for all.

Design Team Composition: Teacher Evaluation Instrument

Teachers in tested and non-tested areas (Sp. Ed., STEM areas, CORE etc.), Administrators, etc.

Design Team	Specific Objective	Deliverables/ Products	Deadline	Meeting Dates/Location
Evaluation Instrument Design Team Members: Facilitator:	To advise the district with specific recommendations for indicators of student academic progress for the purposes of teacher evaluation	Identify the best data available by grade/content areas for use with both tested and untested groups. List of specific objective indicators of student academic progress to include in the Evaluation Instrument in order to comply with the new state mandate.	Implementation 2012-2013 To Governing Board for approval <DATE>	<DATES>

Design Team Composition: Principal Evaluation Instrument
Principals (elementary, middle, high school, if appropriate)
Assistant Principals (middle and high school, if appropriate)

Design Team	Specific Objective	Deliverables/ Products	Deadline	Meeting Dates/Location
Principal/ Assistant Principal Members: Facilitator:	To advise the district with recommendations for specific objective indicators of student academic progress to be included on the principal and assistant principal evaluation instrument.	List of specific objective indicators of evidence of student academic progress for inclusion on the principal and assistant principal evaluation instrument.	<DATES>	<DATES>
Evaluation Instrument Revision Meeting Schedule	Key Discussion Topics/Questions			Deliverables/ Products
<DATES>	Background on Arizona State Board of Education Framework Review of Research Utilized for Framework What are the quantitative measures that we currently have in place? What are other assessment measures in place in classrooms? What does the data look like from these measures?			List of quantitative measures in place List of other assessment measures in place in various classrooms
	Review of current practice on collecting student achievement information (connection to last meeting) Brainstorming session to form possibilities for achievement data collection Review of current Evaluation Instrument (examine areas where indicators could be added/moved/deleted/rewritten)			
	Design Phase: Develop new indicators Examine rating scale and make recommendations			
	Review draft of 2012-2013 Evaluation Instrument Conduct teacher/principal survey Conduct school based discussions led by principals Review Evaluation Instrument and revise as needed			
	To Governing Board for Pilot Approval, <DATE>			
	Pilot Conducted Feedback to Design Team Final Revisions Governing Board Review and Approval, <DATE>			

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE DISTRICT OR CHARTER COMMUNICATION PLAN

The goals of the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Design Communication Plan are as follows:

1. Establish a regular and timely communication process as we revise the Evaluation Instrument to include at least a 33% focus on student academic progress.
2. Raise the awareness and understanding of student assessment and measures of student academic progress with all teachers and administrators.
3. Garner support for the new teacher and principal evaluation system. Establish understanding of new Arizona State Law requirements regarding teacher and principal evaluation.

Purpose: The revision of the Evaluation Instruments to meet the new requirements of Arizona State Law for teacher and principal evaluation provides districts and charters the opportunity to increase awareness of the importance of student assessment, to foster comprehensive analysis of the available quantifiable student achievement data and to tie this information to the development of a highly skilled teaching and administrative staff. The following communication framework is suggested:

Communication Methods	Purpose	Timeline	Dissemination	Audience
Updates/ Briefings	To demonstrate open communication regarding the development of the new components of the Evaluation Instruments.	Communication about the Design Team process and charge sent out in late April 2010 Progress information sent out by May 2010 TBA as the Design Team progresses	Electronic Communication/E mail	Teaching Staff, Principals, Senior Staff
Administrative Team Updates	Dissemination to a wide number of departments.	As per scheduled meetings at the request of senior staff.	Verbal with handouts as appropriate.	All school and department administration
Phone Calls	Handling individual concerns, etc.	Returned within 24 hours or less.	Individual	Individual
Emails/Outlook	General updates, Design Team communication, Handling individual concerns, sending meeting appointments	Returned within 24 hours or less.	Individual/ Design Team/Staff	Individual/ Design Team/Staff

Web Site	To disseminate information quickly to a broad audience		Currently internet, so, this will be general information	Unlimited
School Presentations/ Discussions	To provide clear and consistent information to all teachers	<DATES>	Presentation	All participants and interested others at each school
Teacher Survey/Principal Survey	To gather information from a wide audience	<DATES>	Electronic/ Survey Monkey	Teachers/Principals
Governing Board Communication	To communicate effectively with the superintendent and Governing Board	Upon request	Emailed	Superintendent/ Governing Board
Pilot Study Process	To gather information on possible implementation issues as the instrument is tested with a small group of teachers and school administrators	<DATES>	Presentation/One to one dialogue	Teachers/ Principals
New Evaluation Instrument Publication	To provide clear and consistent information to teachers, principals and teacher evaluators	<DATES>	Print/Electronic Publication	All teachers and teacher evaluators

Evaluation:

Establish a regular and timely communication process as we revise the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Instruments to include at least a 33% focus on student academic progress.

- Evidence of ease of transition;
- Evidence of teacher and principal understanding of the new requirements;
- Raise the awareness and understanding of student assessment and measures of student achievement with all teachers and administrators;
- Evidence of training conducted at school sites on student assessment and student achievement data;
- Garner support for the new evaluation system. Establish understanding of new Arizona State Law requirements regarding teacher and principal evaluation;
- Moderate concern or lack of concern about new requirements;
- Questions raised are detail and implementation oriented.

APPENDIX F

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

- Ensure Arizona's Professional Teaching Standards align to national expectations (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium - InTASC)
- Ensure Arizona's Professional Administrative Standards align to national expectations (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium - ISLLC)
- Provide for periodic reviews of this evaluation framework and implementation and make any modifications deemed necessary based upon the best available data

APPENDIX G

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

- Expand data and assessment resources to increase the number of teachers with associated student-level achievement data.
- Ensure review of Framework and implementation with districts and charters that are in Corrective Action or are identified as “persistently low achieving.”
- Develop and implement a communication plan that provides timely and consistent information to all stakeholders.
- Participate in the CCSSO States Consortium on Educator Effectiveness (SCEE) regarding this effort nationally.
- Focus training plans on developing capacity through County School Superintendents and/or Regional Support Centers.
- Provide a repository of Arizona school district and charter school evaluation instruments (observation rubrics, protocols, etc.) as well as qualified evaluator training utilizing best practices.
- Provide a repository (bank) of experts for consultation (available on request).
- Provide support for various users groups as instruments are developed.
- Provide a menu of reference materials on effective evaluation processes.
- Institute on-going professional development for teachers in the area of student assessment, analysis of student assessment/progress data, and instructional practices which link directly to increased student progress.
- Include in the state’s annual Federal reporting whether districts and charters have classroom-level achievement data on each teacher and whether those data are used in their teacher evaluation instruments. This information should be used to ensure that districts and charters are constantly developing reliable classroom-level achievement data for teachers in non-core academic areas.
- Develop an Advisory Committee to review the effectiveness of the teacher and principal evaluation framework that is approved by the State Board of Education. The findings and recommendations of this committee should be reported to the State Board of Education for its consideration.

APPENDIX H

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARIZONA COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

- Coordinate, with the Arizona Department of Education, the implementation and utilization of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems for each County Local Education Agency.
- Assist County Local Education Agency Alliances with the development and implementation of Student Assessment Systems for Tested and Non-Tested areas of instruction.
- Facilitate, with County Local Education Agencies, the development and implementation of Classroom Teacher Observation and Principal Performance Instruments based on National Teaching, Student, and Principal Standards.
- Coordinate, with County Local Education Agencies, Professional Staff Development Programs that will assist each to develop and implement Training Programs that will increase the professional capacity for Teachers and Principals resulting with increased student academic progress and achievement.
- Assist County Local Education Agencies, through highly effective training programs, that will ensure Inter-Rater Reliability for Formative and Summative Classroom and Principal Performance Observations.
- Develop a County Cadre of Professional Experts who can assist Local Education Agencies to implement its Teacher and Principal Performance Based Evaluation System.
- Assist County Local Education Agencies with developing “Sustainability of Valid Fiscal and Human Resources” required for ensuring continuation of its Performance Based Evaluation Systems.
- Coordinate, with County Local Education Service Agencies, proposed public policies that will enhance and sustain its Performance Based Evaluation System.
- Assist County Local Education Agencies to design develop and submit public and private funded grants that will provide fiscal resources to research and validate ongoing improvements of its Performance Based Evaluation System.
- Provide County Local Education Agencies a repository of research; samples; and data required to validate a successful Performance Based Evaluation System.
- Facilitate countywide seminars and conference for Local Education Service Agencies for ensuring effective development, implementation and evaluation of Performance Based Evaluation Systems as evidenced by statistically significant increases in student academic progress and achievement for all teachers.

APPENDIX I

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STATEWIDE EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS

- Assist with training on state and national teaching and leadership standards
- Assist with training in the observation and evaluation of classroom teaching
- Assist with training in understanding data and its use for continuous student and school improvement
- Support opportunities for the development of region/district cadres of inter-rater reliable trained evaluators
- Work collaboratively with the ADE to develop repositories of observation and evaluation instruments
- Develop repositories of experts for consultation
- Collaborate to ensure availability of training opportunities throughout the state

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 2010-2011 Members of the Task Force would like to thank the following individuals and groups who contributed significantly to the development of the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Effectiveness.

- Roberta Alley, Arizona Department of Education
- Jan Amator, Arizona Department of Education
- Jo Anderson, U.S. Department of Education
- Arizona School Administrators Teacher Effectiveness Data Standards Sub-Committee
- Audrey Beardsley, Arizona State University
- Denise Birdwell, ASA Teacher Effectiveness Data Standards Sub-Committee
- Tricia Coulter, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
- Rebecca Gau, Arizona Governor's Office of Education Innovation
- Laura Goe, National Center for Teacher Quality
- Todd Hellman, Battelle for Kids
- Lynn Holdheide, Vanderbilt University
- John Huppenthal, Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Paul Koehler, WestEd
- Sabrina Laine, National Center for Teacher Quality
- Roseanne Lopez, Amphitheater Public Schools
- Marie Mancuso, WestEd
- Carolyn McKinney, North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission
- John Papay, Harvard University
- Jennifer Pollock, Arizona Attorney General's Office
- Ed Sloate, ASA Teacher Effectiveness Data Standards Sub-Committee
- Christine Tande, Tandehill Human Capital
- Scott Thompson, District of Columbia Public Schools
- Vince Yanez, Arizona State Board of Education

2010-2011 TASK FORCE MEMBERS

VICKI BALENTINE, ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBER,
DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT, TASK FORCE CHAIR

TIM BOYD, STAND FOR CHILDREN, HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER

CHRISTI BURDETTE, CHARTER SCHOOL TEACHER

KAREN BUTTERFIELD, ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ADE)

DON COVEY, MARICOPA COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

GYPSY DENZINE, NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

DEB DUVAL, ARIZONA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS (ASA)

REBECCA GAU, ARIZONA CHARTER SCHOOL ASSOCIATION (ACSA)

AMY HAMILTON, ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBER,
DISTRICT TEACHER

DAVE HOWELL, ARIZONA BUSINESS AND EDUCATION COALITION (ABEC)

MARI KOERNER, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

RON MARX, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

WENDY MILLER, CHARTER PRINCIPAL

ANDREW MORRILL, ARIZONA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (AEA)

KARI NEUMANN, DISTRICT PRINCIPAL

KAREN OLSON, SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER

JANICE PALMER, ARIZONA SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION (ASBA)

KARLA PHILLIPS, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE