

DRAFT

**AMPHITHEATER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Tucson, Arizona**

MINUTES OF REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Place, Date and Time of Meeting

Wetmore Center, 701 West Wetmore Road, January 13, 2015 at 6:00 PM

Board Members Present

Deanna M. Day, Vice President
Dr. Kent Paul Barrabee, Member
Julie Cozad, Member
Jo Grant, Member
Scott A. Leska, Member

Central Administrators Present

Patrick Nelson, Superintendent
Monica Nelson, Associate Superintendent
Todd A. Jaeger, J.D., Associate to the Superintendent and General Counsel
Scott Little, Chief Financial Officer

OPENING OF MEETING

Call to Order and Signing of Visitors' Register

Ms. Day called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and invited members of the audience to sign the visitors' register.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Walker Elementary School

Ms. Day asked Mr. Nelson to introduce our guests for the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Nelson commented on the outstanding students with us tonight from Walker Elementary School and asked Mr. Michael McConnell, Walker Principal, to introduce them. Mr. McConnell spoke about the Walker Kindness Krew leading the pledge tonight. The Kindness Krew supports Ben's Bells Kind Kids program and will focus on community service projects this year. Their mission is to educate and motivate students about the power of intentional kindness, and to inspire them to make a lifelong commitment to use kindness to strengthen themselves and relationships with others and their communities. This year Walker started the Ben's Bells Kind Campus Challenge and have challenged other schools throughout the District and the State to perform 1,000 acts of kindness. The students handed Kindness Slips to the Board. Mr. McConnell introduced the members of the Kindness Krew: Joscelin Morales, Niobe Cruz, Johnny Verheyen, Marley Swonger, Ricarda Landis, Anna Boigon, Kylee Hernandez, Jessica Salazar and De'Angelo Trujillo. The students then led the pledge of allegiance. Ms. Grant thanked the students and presented each with a certificate of appreciation on behalf of the Board.

Recognition of Student Art

Walker Elementary School

Ms. Day asked Dr. Barrabee to introduce the Walker Student Art. Dr. Barrabee commended the outstanding work by the students and leadership by Art Teacher Jane Peterson. He was impressed by all the elements of Art that she instructed the students in at all grade levels. This month's work included: horizon lines, vanishing point, color wheels, variations in color tone, tin foil embossing, creation of Lego characters and Rizzi birds. Dr. Barrabee asked Anna Boigon, one of the students, to talk about her art that is on display. Anna said that

they studied the silver jewelry of Mexico. The tinfoil represents the Mexican jewelry. They created a sketch that they enjoyed, embossed it on a tin square to make it pop out, and then applied the color with markers.

Announcement of Date and Place of Next Regular Governing Board Meeting:

Ms. Day announced the next Special Meeting of the Governing Board on Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 5:00 PM, at the Wetmore Center, 701 W. Wetmore Road.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Day read the open call to the audience. Three speaker cards were submitted for general Public Comment. Requesting to speak was: Mr. Tom McFadden regarding AzMerit's effect on course grades, Ms. Rachel Diaz de Valdes regarding AzMerit and Mr. John Fife regarding elections. Mr. Fife stated that he would speak at the second Public Comment.

Mr. Mc Fadden was first to address the Board. Mr. McFadden stated that he was a parent representative of the Ironwood Ridge High School Site Council, and the parents have questions for the Board regarding Az MERIT. They attempted to get answers from Arizona Department of Education, but the Department of Education was not able to answer, and directed them to speak to their School Board. The main concern is how AzMERIT will or will not affect course grades based on an interview Ms. Nelson had with Hillary Davis of the Northwest Explorer on November 12, 2014. He provided a print out of questions for the Board Members. The handout contained the following:

Questions Regarding AzMERIT's Effect on Student's Course Grades

1. If the AZ Legislature does not require student's course grades to be affected by (or linked to) their performance on the AzMERIT Assessment, will Amphitheater School District make it a requirement?
2. If the District decides to have student's course grades affected by (or linked to) their performance on the AzMERIT Assessment, who's responsible for making that decision? How will that decision be made?
3. If student's course grades are linked to their performance of the AzMERIT Assessment, what percentage of their course grade will be affected? Who will determine this percentage?
4. If students are passing their courses but fail the AzMERIT Assessment, will they receive a failing grade, or be forced to retake the class?
5. If AzMERIT is an end of the year assessment, why is it being given to our student in March and April, when nearly 20% - 25% of their courses instructional time remains? This effectively means that students will be tested on material their teachers have not had the allotted school year time to teach them.

Mr. McFadden concluded by saying the public was just informed this past November that students will take the AzMERIT Assessment. According to the Arizona School Boards Association, the tests were just completed the first week of December. It's reasonable that parents, students, teachers and administrators have questions and concerns. We therefore ask you to do everything in your power to ensure that our children's course grades will in no way, shape or form be affected by their performance on the assessments until such time that we have answers to the above questions and concerns. We respectfully request that this issue be placed on the Agenda for February's District Board Meeting.

Dr. Barrabee asked that the Board receive a Friday Memo responding in whatever way is appropriate to the questions.

Ms. Day then called on Ms. Diaz de Valdes to address the Board. Ms. Diaz del Valdes wanted to continue what Mr. Mc Fadden had to say regarding community concerns about the AzMERIT test. Not only are parents concerned about how these tests will affect our students, but are also worried about how they are going to affect teacher evaluations, and frankly the ranking of the District. As one can imagine with so many questions unanswered that concerns and rumors fly. As an active member of Site Council, she doesn't know the answers to the vast majority of the questions being asked by parents. The AzMERIT test affecting teacher evaluations are not only a concern of the parents but for the community as a whole. They love and support our teachers as they know the District does. They don't want to see teachers held accountable for a test that is new to students, and for which they have neither had the time to prepare the lesson plans or their students for. Her understanding is that some students are taking the test as early as March of this year. This leaves a whole quarter of material that could be on the test that hasn't been presented. Conversely, if the test is given in March, what will be taught after that summative test? In the future if the teachers are held accountable, when will they begin to be held accountable and what would that look like? As the Board is well aware, Board Policy KD states, "The Superintendent has the responsibility of keeping the public informed as to the purpose, goals, methods and projects of the educational program. Accuracy, reliability, and leadership in this area will develop confidence and understanding, creating a better relationship between the District and the community." All school personnel are responsible for good public relations. She thinks that this is an excellent policy and looks forward to having all of their questions answered.

1. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

A. Administration of Oath of Office to Newly-Elected Governing Board Members

Board Book Information: *State law requires that officers and employees of the state, including its political subdivisions, take a loyalty oath of office. This requirement includes individuals appointed or elected to school district Governing Boards.*

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-231, the Oath of Office states: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution and the laws of the State of Arizona; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and defend them against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of the office of Governing Board Member for Amphitheater Unified School District No. 10, according to the best of my abilities, so help me God (or, so I do affirm).

Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-426, Board members are also required to execute the oath in writing before a Notary Public which shall then be forwarded to the Pima County School Superintendent. It should be noted that both Mrs. Grant and Mr. Leska have previously subscribed the oath of office in accordance with law, prior to January 1, 2015. Board members newly elected or appointed to a first term, or re-elected to a new term, are required to state and execute the oath of office. Board members continuing their existing term of office are not required to restate and re-execute the oath.

B. Nomination and Election of Governing Board President and Vice President

Board Book Information: *Arizona law, A.R.S. §15-521, requires that the Governing Board hold an organizational meeting between January 1 and January 15. The Board's meeting of this evening obviously meets this requirement. In addition, the same section of Title 15 requires that the Board elect a president from among its members. The President of the Board presides over all meetings of the Board, in accordance with Arizona law and District policies, and performs a number of other key duties on behalf of the Board.*

A.R.S. § 15-521(D) provides that the Board must prescribe rules for its own governance. Governing Board Policy BDA, one of the Governing Board rules of governance, requires the election of a Board Vice President, who presides over all meetings of the Board at which the President is not present.

The nomination of candidates for these two offices, under Roberts Rules of Order, may be done by “open nomination”. The President initiates this method by simply calling for nominations from the floor. The current Vice President takes all nominations for the office of President first. Board members may, alternatively, move the nomination of a candidate, requiring a second and a passing vote for the nominee to be placed on the slate of candidates. This, of course, adds an additional step to the election process and is not recommended for small bodies like the Board.

Nominees may decline their nomination prior to any vote. When it appears no further nominations are forthcoming, the Vice President may close the floor to further nominations, or it may be closed upon a passing motion to do the same.

The office of President should be determined first, with the selected candidate assuming responsibility for chairing the remainder of the meeting (including election of the new Vice President) immediately.

Under Roberts Rules, there are technically several ways of conducting the election of officers following the nomination process; those that are practicable and applicable to the election of Governing Board officers are described below. Secret balloting, notably permitted by Roberts Rule, is not permitted by the Arizona Open Meeting Law. Any one of the alternative methods below may be used – determined either by the current Vice President or by motion (the latter of which controls in the event of conflict). If a voting method is selected, the Vice President should explain how the matter will proceed prior to the vote being taken.

Acclamation. *If there is only one nominee for an office, the chair of the meeting can simply declare the individual is elected, rather than taking a vote.*

Voice or Other Voting. *Absent election by acclamation, a vote of the Board on nominees is required by voice, roll call, show of hands or rising (where Board members stand). Roberts provides that, unless a method of voting is selected upon motion, the chair will decide the method based upon the nature of the election, closeness of the expected vote, and the size of the group. The chair announces the result of a vote formally, for the record. Until that announcement, Roberts permits any Board member to change their vote. In the event of a tie between nominees, the chair may call for a new vote to determine the tie.*

Ms. Day called for the installation of the newly-elected Board Members. Mr. Nelson read the requirements for the Oath of Office for newly-elected Governing Board Members. Ms. Jo Grant was sworn in as a Governing Board Member by Mr. Todd Jaeger who administered the Oath of Office. Mr. Scott A. Leska was sworn in as a Governing Board Member by his wife Sarah, his children Jairus, Samantha and Baile and Deacon Scott who assisted in administering the Oath of Office.

Ms. Day then called for the next item of business 1. B. Nomination and Election of Governing Board President and Vice President. Mr. Nelson read the requirements for the nomination and election of officers and recommended that Ms. Day request nominations from the Board for the office of President. If there were multiple nominations, then a vote would be required. If there was only one nomination, in accordance with Robert Rules of Order, Ms. Day may simply declare the single nominee be elected by acclamation, unless there is an objection to that approach. Ms. Day asked the Board if there were nominations for the office of Board President. Ms. Grant nominated Ms. Day, Ms. Cozad seconded. Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Day closed the nominations and moved on to the election. Ms. Day was therefore elected to the office of Governing Board President by acclamation.

Ms. Day stated the next order of business to be the election of the Board Vice President and called for nominations. Dr. Barrabee nominated Ms. Grant. Ms. Day asked if there were any further nominations. Hearing no further nominations, Ms. Day closed the nominations and moved on to the election. With only one nomination, Ms. Day declared Ms. Grant elected to the office of Governing Board Vice President by acclamation.

Ms. Day asked if there were any personal comments. Ms. Grant stated it was an honor being a Governing Board Member and she looks forward to serving the District for the next 4 years. Ms. Day seconded those sentiments and added that having been in the District since she was 10 years old as a student, as a graduate, teacher, administrator and now Board Member, she knows how hard everyone works. The Board is here for the District and it is indeed an honor. The Board welcomes new Board Member Mr. Leska, and looks forward to very productive years ahead.

2. RECEPTION FOR NEWLY-ELECTED GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Jo Grant

Mr. Scott A. Leska

Ms. Day requested a short break for a reception in honor of Ms. Grant and Mr. Leska. The meeting reconvened at 6:42 PM.

3. INFORMATION

A. Update on AzMERIT

Board Book Information: *The Board has requested an information item to provide an update and additional information on AzMERIT. Staff will provide background and updates in an overview presentation. This item is presented for the Board's information and discussion only.*

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 3. A. presentation attachment] (Exhibit A)

Ms. Day asked Mr. Nelson to introduce Item 3. Mr. Nelson stated that there was a request to provide some additional information on AzMerit. Ms. Nelson will provide general information about what is known about AzMERIT and some of the earlier issues that were described by the speakers. Ms. Nelson said that she put together background information and an updated presentation knowing that there is still a lot that we don't know. While she is very appreciative of the questions that came up tonight, please understand that these are the very same kinds of things the District is investigating on a daily basis. Today at the Principal's meeting they went to the AzMERIT website, because it is the place where some of the most up-to-date information is. The day that the AzMERIT was announced, the District had a number of phone calls from the media and our responses had to be fairly vague. Frankly all that is known is what is on the website, and we directed the media to the website. Anyone working in education today feels that very same way, because it is new to all of us, it is unfolding as we go along.

One of the first things to discover was what the acronym stood for. It stands for Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Informed Teaching. It is the new State assessment that has been adopted by the State Board Of Education. Students in elementary schools and middle schools grades 3-8 and all students enrolled in 9-11 grade English, Algebra, Geometry and Algebra II are slated to take some version of AzMERIT. The high school courses are currently identified as end-of-course assessments with no direction from the State at this point as to how, if, or when they will be counted for how much or how little of a grade. They are considered end of course assessments designed to measure what the students have learned. The District raised the question with the State, very similar to a question asked tonight, and is waiting for an answer. The on-line testing window opens March 30th and the paper/pencil version April 13th - 24th. Does that mean the assessment is designed for the curriculum that has been taught to that point, about 75% of the curriculum, or the full content to the end of the year? What content will be covered on the test? In December the Board was provided initial

information on what we know and don't know, what we are trying to find out, what we hope and fear, and our timeline for things that we will be addressing. We have discovered that middle school students who are enrolled in Algebra, Geometry or Algebra II will take the end-of-course test as part of that course. And, they will take the 6th, 7th or 8th grade Math test as well. They will be taking two versions of the Math test: one based on their grade configuration and the second based on a high school credit course that they may be enrolled in. The AIMS Science test will still be in place for grades 4, 8 and in high school after the Biology test. We still have a group of students that have to pass the AIMS test. But students who graduate after December 2016 no longer have to take the AIMS test. That is general background information.

There are two testing windows: the online version which is available this time which opens March 30th and closes May 8th and the pencil and paper version which is an April 13th through April 24th window. The reason being, that the pencil and paper version has to be scored and done in a consolidated timeline. The question is, where does the assessment come from? Originally the State was looking at PARCC as an assessment. They withdrew from the PARCC Consortium. In June of 2014 the AZ Department of Education adopted a set of values related to the AZ College and Career Ready Standards and developed a Request for Proposal (RFP), issued in June 2014, to which six vendors responded. They identified an evaluation committee made up of seven members which reviewed all the RFPs and recommended to the State that the proposal submitted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) be approved. At their November 3, 2014 State Board of Education meeting they awarded the contract to AIR. AIR announced the development of AzMERIT. The AIMS scores provided information to us in terms of four different performance levels of "falls far below", "approaches", "meets" and "exceeds". The AzMERIT score levels are under discussion, so there is no word yet on how a student's raw score will be translated into any kind of achievement level. The question then is what it means to pass the AzMERIT. Because it is designed to align with Arizona's College and Career Ready standards, the expectation is that students who pass the assessment will have met the higher expectation and are expected to be on track for college and careers upon graduation. Part of what the national assessment allows is not only for parents to know how their child does in relation to their previous scores, but also how they do in relation to other children in the school and State. Scores are supposed to be comparable across the country and so our assessment, as best we understand it, will be comparable with states such as Utah, Florida and others that are part of the Smarter Balance Consortium. The Smarter Balance Consortium and the PARCC Consortium were the two original groups that were identified to develop an assessment.

As in the past, student test scores are stored on the Arizona Department of Education servers. A number of states have legislation in place to prevent corporations from mining information. The White House is proposing Federal legislation for a Student Data Privacy Act. What the State Department of Education does with the current pencil and paper version of the AIMS test is provide electronic and hard copies to districts which are then passed on to schools and parents.

Ms. Nelson highlighted the link on the Arizona Department of Education website AzMERIT assessment page where updated information is given. There are blueprints of course assessments as they become available, history and background of the standards as they are being developed, videos for parents and teachers, resources for teachers including sample items from the online version of AzMERIT and more. By 5:00 pm on January 5, 2015, the first day back after Christmas Break, the District had to notify the Arizona Department of Education about which version of AzMERIT our schools would take. A lot of information was needed. For example: in a K-8 school, could the younger students take the paper and pencil version while the older students took the online version because they have more computer experience. The State said no. The school has to choose one version of the assessment. Next principals had to determine if they had sufficient computers and headphones to be used for online testing. Then they had to determine if the computer labs were reserved for the assessment, what the impact would be on the regular curriculum that needed to use the labs. Measure of Academic Progress (MAPS) testing is also done three times a year, and it has to be determined if the AzMERIT online will interfere with the MAPS testing window. Also, we don't want to test students back to back. The biggest question and concern is to assure that students aren't judged based on their word processing skills, but on their understanding of the material. Our schools have been working at the elementary level especially to

expose the students to word processing skills such as keyboarding, drag and drop, highlight, cut and paste and various things that will likely be used in the online version of the assessment. The State expects to completely transition to online testing over the next 5 years. The decision made by the Principals and staff at all of our schools is that the online version will be taken by thirteen of our schools and the paper/pencil version will be taken by six of our schools. (See slides for a list of schools and test to be taken.)

An interesting scenario came up recently where, by misunderstanding or misinformation, parents thought they could opt out of the mandatory statewide assessment. That is not true. It is a mandatory, statewide requirement for assessment. Some people believed they could opt out based on the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, A.R.S. 15-502. The Arizona Attorney General has ruled twice that parents do not have the right to opt out of the mandatory statewide assessment, including a ruling that was issued just a few days ago. A.R.S. 15-502 provides that a parent can withdraw a child from a learning activity or prevent them from learning material if it “questions beliefs or practices in sex, morality, or religion”. The Attorney General’s opinion is that a statewide assessment of achievement is neither a learning activity nor learning material and, as a result, parents may not refuse to allow their children to participate in mandatory assessments.

Then we have to look at the consequences of not testing. The District has been testing for a long time. Back in 2001 the No Child Left Behind Act was passed and schools began to be required to test students to measure academic progress. This included gathering of data to look at various sub-groups; to look at ethnic representation, poverty and English second language learners, to determine achievement gaps that were happening with those groups of children. No Child Left Behind requires a 95% testing level. That is why we had a 2-week window for AIMS testing, although we tested for 4 days. The responsibility of the sites was to pick up those students who were absent to take the test, and to maintain the 95% or better testing rate. The second component addressed under this legislation is adequate yearly progress, and the schools are now measured against a set of standards that all determine adequate yearly progress. Ninety percent attendance is one of those standards. If a school is unable to maintain 90% attendance then the District has to show an improvement of 2% a year in order to meet that standard. If parents decided to pull their children out during testing, then we would not hit the attendance rate that is needed. Failure to meet these levels would impact our schools’ and Districts’ letter grades and would have potential to impact federal and state funding sources.

Ms. Day read the requirements for submitting a speaker card to address an Agenda Item. Mr. Arizeder Urreiztieta requested to speak regarding Agenda Item 3.A. AzMerit, specifically about privacy concerns. Mr. Urreiztieta thanked the Board for the opportunity and honor to speak, and as a product of Amphitheater schools, he was especially honored to see the Board working in such harmony and accord. Mr. Urreiztieta stated that he is the concerned parent of a 7th Grader at Cross Middle School. It looks as if Cross will be taking the paper/pencil version of AzMERIT. Be that as it may, the majority of schools in the District, as it looks now, will be taking the online version, and that is the topic of his comment. He is concerned about privacy and many people, including parents and teachers, would be interested to know how the District plans to protect and safeguard our children’s privacy, on private data as it is generated on the AzMERIT test. He is curious with whom will the data be shared as they heard information that there are possibly other entities that might want to make use of the data. He understands that the District probably plans to comply with Federal law, but as everyone knows often times Federal law is like Swiss cheese; it is full of holes. Mr. Urreiztieta stated he does not believe that there is anything that is preventing the District from using safer and stricter guidelines regarding information. He requested that the Board ask the Superintendent to furnish a list of all District approved parties who may have access to our children’s data. Similarly Mr. Urreiztieta requested, noting that he speaks for many parents, that a mechanism be implemented allowing parents to opt in or out when it comes to data sharing. He also requested that parents, community members and other stakeholder be given a say in the policies that are drafted and adopted regarding data safeguarding.

Ms. Nelson commented further about AzMERIT and data security. The District is not expecting any data results back until the fall. So there will be no data implications at all for grades at the end of this school year. There

will be no information from the State until probably the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. That may help alleviate concern about an immediate issue.

Mr. Leska asked for further questions/discussion of AzMERIT. The Middle School has two tests if they are in an upper division course, especially in Math. Mr. Leska asked if 11th Graders who are in Calculus would have both tests. Ms. Nelson addressed the question. There is only assessment of High School math for Algebra, Geometry and Algebra II. If a student is in the 11th Grade and is taking Pre-Calculus they will not take any math tests because they will have already passed those courses. Mr. Leska's second question was with the test being given before the end of the year, with the students being assessed on information being taught until the end of the school year, how can a student be assessed on knowledge they still haven't been presented? Mr. Nelson addressed the question. We still do not have an answer from the State Department of Education as to what content the students will be assessed on. Mr. Leska asked if the AzMERIT assessment will mirror the PARCC test questions. From his understanding, they are the same type of questions. Mr. Nelson addressed the question. AzMERIT most closely mirrors Smart Balance. Mr. Leska expressed concerns for younger students taking the assessment on computers. His son is 7 years old and had a lot of issues when it came to the keyboard. In class they used a website that timed memorization of addition. He would race through it to beat the time. He knew the correct answer, but rushing he would hit the wrong answer, it was too late, so the answers were wrong. For the littlest ones who don't have the cognitive and dexterity skills for keyboarding yet, they can possibly hurt their grade, as well as school and District standings. Ms. Nelson addressed the question. This concern has been discussed among elementary principals, and has been under discussion since the spring of 2014 when the District knew some form of new assessment was coming. Ms. Nelson recommended that this topic be discussed further after everyone has had the opportunity to go to the site and look at some of the 3rd Grade sample questions. One of the pieces of information the principals had to wrestle with was that everybody in the State who is taking it online is going to wrestle with the same issues. Rather than opting for the paper/pencil test, maybe our students should have the online experience now during the transition period, rather than having the students take it online for the first time when it is a requirement. The principals have started building time in centers for students to utilize online materials, keyboarding, drag and drop, etc. There is a lot of drag and drop in the 3rd Grade assessment. Everyone in the general population will take a version of AzMERIT. What schools are waiting for is accommodations that may need to be put into place. Ms. Nelson believes that one of the reasons this is being considered a baseline year is because we haven't yet seen, across the board, how children at the 3rd Grade level in the State and across the country, manipulate the information and whether or not it needs to be adjusted. It is certainly something that the State will have to monitor very carefully, as will the District. Mr. Leska's last question was regarding the issue Mr. McFadden and Ms. Valdez raised about teacher assessments being high stakes, not only for students, GPA, but also for teachers. It is a concern that an unproven test, even if it is next year, would be linked to any of that. Mr. Nelson stated that the District is concerned also.

Dr. Barrabee inquired if there had been any field testing of the assessment. Ms. Nelson stated that there has been no field testing of the AzMERIT assessment. However, it is closely aligned in format to the Smarter Balance assessment. AzMERIT is the test that is being developed uniquely for Arizona and Arizona educators are involved in the development, evaluation and revision of it. Dr. Barrabee expressed his disappointment that any governmental organization would impose something that hasn't been tested yet. Mr. Nelson said that over the last five or six years there have been a lot of untested things the District has had to struggle with and implement. When the two states who led the effort on Common Core implemented Common Core (which we call College and Career Ready Standards), the scores dropped significantly. Administration shares many of the concerns expressed here tonight. We have spent months worrying about this, trying to work through it and get answers. We will administer this as best we can. Dr. Barrabee shared that his commitment as a Board Member is to provide support for the Administration and teachers, and the teachers to support the students. This is not support; this is a burden and is not constructive.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Day asked if there were Board Member requests to have any items addressed separately. Mr. Leska requested that Items 4. I., Out of State Travel, and 4. J. Approval of Textbooks for Display, be set aside for questions. A motion was made by Ms. Cozad to approve Consent Agenda Items A-H. The motion was seconded by Ms. Grant and passed unanimously 5-0. Appointment of personnel is effective provided all district, state, and federal requirements are met.

A. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

Minutes from the December 17, 2014 meeting were approved as submitted.

[<http://www.amphi.com/departments-programs/governing-board-minutes/2014-2015/december-2014.aspx>]
(Exhibit B)

B. Approval of Appointment of Personnel

Certified and classified personnel were appointed, as listed in Exhibit 1.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. B.]

C. Approval of Personnel Changes

Certified and classified personnel were appointed as listed in Exhibit 2.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. C.]

D. Approval of Leave(s) of Absence

Leaves of Absence requests were approved for certified and classified personnel as listed in Exhibit 3.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. D.]

E. Approval of Separation(s) and Termination(s)

Certified and classified personnel separations were approved as listed in Exhibit 4.

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. E.]

F. Approval of Vouchers Totaling and Not Exceeding Approximately \$1,239,923.37 (Final Total)

A copy of vouchers for goods and services received by the Amphitheater Schools and recommended for payment has been provided to the Governing Board. The following vouchers were approved as presented and payment authorized:

FY 14-15

Voucher # 956 \$136,207.63	Voucher # 966 \$98,573.65	Voucher # 967 \$97,995.21
Voucher # 968 \$842,416.66	Voucher # 969 \$244,086.38	Voucher # 970 \$94,581.12
Voucher # 971 \$144,804.94	Voucher # 972 \$192,321.68	

G. Receipt of Monthly Status Report for the Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Board Book Information:

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/Public/PublicAgenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. G. attachment]
(Exhibit 5)

H. Approval of Parent Support Organization(s) for 2014-2015

The following Parent Support Organization(s) for 2014-2015 were approved:

NAEP Parent Committee

I. Out of State Travel

Out of state travel was approved for students and/or staff (source of funding indicated) from:

[<https://v3.boardbook.org/public/publicagenda.aspx?ak=1000433&mk=50132127>, Item 4. I.] (Exhibit 6)

J. Approval of Textbooks for Display

Board Book Information: *In accordance with Section 15-721 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, new textbooks must be placed on display for a period of 60 days prior to official adoption by the Governing Board.*

TEXTBOOK: AP Edition Campbell Biology In Focus

Publisher: Pearson Education, Inc.

Author: Lisa A. Urry, Michael Cain, Steven A. Wasserman, Peter V. Minorsky, Robert B. Jackson, and Jane B. Reece

Price: \$130.47

Ms. Day called on Mr. Leska for questions on Consent Agenda Item 4.I. Out of State Travel. Mr. Leska's questions were specifically regarding the EdLeader21 Professional Learning Days conference being attended by Ms. Nelson, Mr. Bejarano and Dr. Lopez. Mr. Leska asked how information will be brought back and disseminated to teachers for implementation, and why no teachers were attending the conference. Mr. Nelson explained that the District belongs to an organization called EdLeader 21 for administrators interested in moving their districts forward and increasing student achievement. The past several years the focus has been on training teachers on depth of knowledge. The next extension of that is what we call the 4 Cs. There are several districts that have enough experience that they have perfected some of the approaches not only to teaching, but to professional development, assessment of skills, etc. This particular conference is Administrator focused to provide information to bring back to train teachers and principals on best practices for integrating the 4Cs. It is a natural extension of where we are headed with methodologies and strategies to increase student achievement. Mr. Leska asked if the training was for teachers or principals. Mr. Nelson said it is for both. Mr. Leska asked if training was mandatory or optional. Mr. Nelson said that the way we approach professional development, when you say mandate, is we have to be specific about the target audience. We have been very successful with creating target audiences and creating the reason why it is an extension of their natural teaching. That is a much better approach than just a sweeping mandate.

Next, Item 4. J. Approval of Textbooks for Display, *AP Edition Campbell Biology in Focus* by Pearson, was discussed. Mr. Leska noted there was only one publisher and one book, and asked what the process was for the approval. Mr. Nelson explained the process. *AP Edition Campbell Biology in Focus* is used in AP Biology and was ready in September 2014. They delayed to see if they could use the new process which includes parents and students in the review process. They could not use the new textbook process due to the work already put into selecting the book. Mr. Nelson called on Mr. Bejarano to explain further. Mr. Bejarano explained that at our high schools we have curriculum that is particular to prescribed standards we must follow for programs such as Cambridge, International Baccalaureate and Advanced Placement. The *AP Edition Campbell Biology in Focus* textbook is specifically for Advanced Placement Biology courses. Advanced Placement is the umbrella organization of the College Board that provides guidance for these courses. They are college level courses that we offer. When students take Advanced Placement courses, they are essentially taking their first year of college course work. Teachers who are experts in the AP fields were given the responsibility to select the textbook. AP Biology went from specific content focus to a wider subject area. Instead of mastering concepts, it now goes deeper into other areas. Publishers start to match those criteria. The College Board reviews the books and provides a list of the books that meet the criteria. There were not many publishers on the list. Teachers attend national workshops, gather ideas and wait to see what is being published. The Campbell Biology textbook is the newest edition to the current book in use. AP teachers, Department Chairs and Principals found the best book that matches the AP criteria.

Ms. Day asked the Board if there were any further questions. There were none. Ms. Day called for a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items 4. I. and 4. J. Mr. Leska moved and Ms. Grant seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Dr. Barrabee complimented Administration for the time put into AzMERIT issues; he feels badly that they were burdened by yet another new requirement.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Day asked the Board if there were any requests for future agenda items. Mr. Leska requested further information on AzMERIT and its implications.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Day asked if there was any further comment. Mr. John Fife of AEA addressed the Board. He stated that the AEA congratulates Ms. Grant and Mr. Leska on their election to the Board and congratulates Ms. Day and Ms. Grant on their election as Board officers. AEA looks forward to working with the Board over the next several years.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Day asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Leska moved that the meeting be adjourned and Ms. Grant seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. Ms. Day declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen S. Gardiner

Board President

Date

Approved: TBD