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Foreword

ASBA recognizes the importance of organizational history, recording not only its milestones, but the internal and external factors that shape its decision making and growth. At this moment in time, 25 years after the first history of ASBA was published, we take time to contemplate who we have been and who we will be. This is a time of celebration of what have we done and what we can become in our service to Arizona’s school boards and the more than 1 million students they represent.

Dr. Timothy L. Ogle
Executive Director, Arizona School Boards Association
December 1, 2015
2015 ASBA Board of Directors

The Arizona School Boards Association Board of Directors is composed of five executive officers and 17 County Directors — one for each county in Arizona, with two for Pima and Maricopa Counties due to their higher populations. Officers are elected to one-year terms by the full membership at the ASBA Annual Meeting. County Directors are elected by membership within each county to two-year terms at the County Meetings. All members of the ASBA Board of Directors must be current school board members.

The chairs of the ASBA Hispanic-Native American Indian Caucus and the ASBA Black Caucus also serve on the board of directors, as does any Arizona school board member who serves on the board of directors of the National School Boards Association.
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Prologue (1949-1989)

Quality leadership and advocacy for children in public schools. Though the vision of the Arizona School Boards Association was not articulated as succinctly at its founding 65 years ago as it is today, the ultimate goal of the individuals who founded the association in 1948 and attended its first membership meeting in 1949 was the same. Over the decades, its staying power has been proven, over and over.

An association can provide a collective voice to discuss and solve “common” problems unique to those individuals who have volunteered to serve their local constituencies on matters related to children and public schools. The issues and challenges facing the members of the original association and subsequent cohorts are, at times, unique to their historical moment; at other times, they are strikingly familiar.

ASBA has grown considerably over the decades, but today, as it was more than six decades ago, the organization’s board of directors and staff are courageous, creative, mission-driven individuals who strive each day to promote and support elected local leadership of Arizona’s public schools and, while doing so, advocate for excellence and opportunity for all Arizona students, a group that now is more than 1 million strong.

THE BEGINNING

No history of the Arizona School Boards Association is complete without a recounting of a particular warm Saturday in May 1948, when representatives from all but four Arizona counties listened intently as the proposed constitution for the new organization was read. As recollected in “Celebrating 50 Years of Service,” which was published in 1989 to celebrate ASBA’s 40-year anniversary, “They scrutinized, revised and reworked words and ideas. They voted on each paragraph individually.”

Among those named in the meeting minutes as present that day were Dr. Charles W. Sechrist of Flagstaff, who presided over the meeting; Dr. O.K. Garretson of Tucson, who gave an opening speech; Dr. Clarence Gunter of Globe, the author of the proposed constitution; Albert Sander of Roosevelt, Arthur Softley of Tucson, Earl Spitler of Jerome, Dr. Taylor Hicks of Prescott, Earl Stone of Phoenix, Nat Dysart of Peoria, Madeline Young of Quartzsite, and Dr. W.R. Davis of Douglas. They made sure that the Executive Council would not be given too much power to spend money. They thought the Legislative Committee should be able to act immediately. They discussed membership and dues. Then they voted, and it was done.

On May 15, 1948, the Arizona State-wide School Board Association was created.

Dr. Charles W. Sechrist,
ASBA’s first president
Decisions still needed to be made regarding how counties would be organized and represented, how small districts would pay required dues, and, most essential, who would lead the association.

The first officer elections were unanimous: the first president of the association was Dr. Charles W. Sechrist of Flagstaff, Arthur Softley became vice-president and Dr. Taylor T. Hicks, executive secretary-treasurer. Dr. Clarence Gunter was given an honorary position as ex-officio vice-president.

The leadership and members set goals, organized county delegates and established a framework for the first annual meeting, which would be held 10 months later.

**A SOLID FOUNDATION**

When the first “Annual Meeting” of State-Wide Arizona School Boards Association took place on March 12, 1949, in a Phoenix-area barber shop, little did the participants know that one of the topics they were going to be discussing, federal aid to education, would still be of critical concern and contention 65 years later.

Cooperation with professional educators, administrators, school trustees and the PTA was not only stressed, it was exemplified as a former superintendent of public instruction, L.D. Klemmedson, two superintendents and a classroom teacher addressed the group.

Topics discussed included revising school laws and reorganizing the State Board of Education. Vice President Softley thought it was important to make textbooks freely available through 12th grade, not just through eighth grade. He also suggested handling the problem of school attendance by authorizing and paying teachers to be truant officers in addition to their teaching duties.

Some of Vice President Softley’s comments reflected the time period: He spoke about the need to provide state aid to districts with “a heavy transient influx” and he had concerns about segregation in schools, which he referred to as “a matter of local option.”

He also brought up membership in the association, which he thought ought to be automatic for all districts, acknowledging that smaller districts might find the dues – 10 cents per pupil and a $5 minimum in one- and two-room school districts – too high.

And finally, he turned to the question of money for public education. He questioned what a district ought to do when it needs to expand but is bonded to its limit. His suggestion was federal aid to public schools.

This began the work of the Arizona State-wide School Board Association. Two years later, it was reassembled as a state agency. At the final meeting of the original, founding body, which was held in Prescott...
on July 21, 1951, Dr. Gunter of Globe made a prediction in his closing remarks to the 34 delegates and visitors who were present: “This organization can be made the most powerful organization in the state of Arizona, to get proper legislation passed through the Legislature for the benefit of the children.”

An organizational meeting of the Arizona School Boards Association, a new body created by an act of the 20th Legislature of the state of Arizona, immediately followed. ASBA was now an agency of the state government, and remained so until July 1, 1974.

Expenses – as well as staff – were kept to a minimum. In 1951, Homer Davis, “a retired school man,” was selected as executive secretary for only $200 per month, an amount he was willing to take because of his interest in the work. By the time he resigned in 1958, his salary had increased to $4,800 a year. Upon Davis’ retirement, Arvid N. Gandrud took over as executive secretary, and his wife, Helen, was employed as a much needed stenographer for $1,200 a year. The ASBA “office” was located at their home.

In 1951, at the urging of Dr. Taylor Hicks of Prescott, for whom a school in that community is now named, the association joined the National School Boards Association. Described as “tireless and inspirational in his dedication to education,” Dr. Hicks, ASBA’s president in 1950 and 1958, served as NSBA President in 1956-1957.

THROUGH THE YEARS

Since its inception, impacting legislation has been a service that ASBA has increasingly and consistently provided to its members. In 1952, ASBA made a move to be able to inform the Legislature of members’ particular position, not related to any other interest group, by the appointment of a Legislative Committee of persons from all over the state acting for the association.

Notable education leaders and local political figures were often invited to attend ASBA meetings. Young Barry Goldwater, a city councilman representing the Mayor of Phoenix, made the welcoming address at the 1952 Annual Meeting.

In 1957, ASBA and the Arizona Association of School Administrators (ASA) held their first Joint Annual Convention. The registration fee was $2 and dinner as $3.50.

Developed during the 1950s, the Association’s “official organ,” the Bulletin, was created to share news about the association and happenings related to public education in the state. By 1959, it had reached a distribution of nearly 1,750. A first-of-its-kind in Arizona handbook for school board members was also published. Written by John T. McGrath and published by Arizona State University, circulation grew to 2,250 in the 1960s.
Another major accomplishment of the 1950s was the development of workshops for school board members, a service that Arvid Gandrud had made a priority during his tenure. “School Law” was the topic of the ASBA’s first workshop. The second was “beamed at new school board members” and to “refresh experienced members.” Under his leadership, ASBA went on to develop the County Meeting program that began in 1958 and that continue to this day.

In 1959, ASBA board members learned they could be held personally liable should it be shown “they let a dangerous condition exist and then someone is injured or killed.” Despite the need for legal protection, there was no money in the budget for legal counsel, leaving the Arizona Attorney General’s office as the only source of assistance. The solution was to bring an attorney onto the Executive Committee, thus, the Executive Board was increased to 14 members.

The decade that followed – the 1960s – was a time of huge population growth for Arizona, with the number of state residents growing by 46 percent, and the number of public schools increasing by 142. Growth was so fast that schools were opened unfinished; a Mesa teacher remembered that when her school opened there was no gym and no auditorium. “In the business department we had no typewriters. For six weeks we taught typing on ‘picture’ keyboards placed on each desk,” she recalled.

In 1961, comprehensive legislation for the education of “educable and trainable mentally retarded” children was enacted, inaugurating financial aid to local districts with approved programs of special education, and establishing by statute a division of special education.

Desegregation was one of the most prevalent and complex issues of the decade following the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision that forced society and schools to make major changes, and forced policy concerns for equality of educational opportunity during the ‘60s and decades to come.

In 1963, voters in the Roosevelt School District elected the Reverend George Brooks to the governing board. He was the first black school board member in Arizona.

In 1963, Helen R. Kolbe of Patagonia became the first woman to be elected president of ASBA.

In 1965, a constitutional amendment to change the composition of the Arizona State Board of Education was approved by voters after years of effort by ASBA and others. The number of members was increased to nine, the membership was changed to include three laymen in addition to various educators, and the governor was no longer a member.

Also in 1965, Dr. Trevor Browne was president of ASBA; he served on the Phoenix Union High School District Governing Board for 30 years. Trevor G. Browne High School in Phoenix Union HSD, the largest high school in Phoenix, bears his name.

Technology brought relief to the ASBA staff in 1969. As reported in the Bulletin, “The salary survey was completed with the association’s new CALCULATOR. Arvid says it was a wonderful feeling not to have to do all those computations by hand...”
AN ERA OF GROWTH

In June 1971, Lou Ella Kleinz, who was president of ASBA that year, became executive secretary-treasurer of ASBA, after Arvid Gandrud, who had served for 13 years, resigned because of poor health. Another staff member was hired as her assistant, Guy H. Clark.

In 1973, the state Legislature recognized a shortfall in education funding, and a special session was called to consider school finance and redistricting. There were increased demands for programs to provide services to specific populations, but no money to pay for them, and no tolerance for increasing taxes. ASBA formed a committee to study funding issues. In 1978, now Executive Director Lou Ella Kleinz met with Governor Bruce Babbitt to ask for a special legislative session to deal with funding issues. In 1979, the Legislature created a new equalization formula ending local property taxes as the major support for public education. The state supported 65 percent of costs, local property taxes picked up approximately 30 percent, and the remaining 5 percent came from federal support.

On July 1, 1974, ASBA made a major organizational change, ending its status as an agency of the state and becoming a private, non-profit. The ASBA Board of Directors increased to 20 members. A new logo was adopted and remained part of the association’s identity through 2012.

Another milestone in 1974 occurred when one of the association’s own was elected to statewide office: Carolyn Warner, ASBA’s vice president, was elected to the position of state superintendent of public instruction.

Revenues to the association began to increase during this time period. The State Compensation Fund formed a dividend group in 1974 that included redistribution of dividends to member districts and some funds to the association for services provided to districts.

The staff started to expand in 1974 when Elsie Miller became the new bookkeeper. Miller was with the association for 30 years, retiring as director of administrative services in 2004. In 1976, ASBA President Art Parker joined the staff as management analyst. In his seven years on staff he is credited with putting
together programs such as seminars, policy development, and the Policy Reference Manual (PRM), the precursor to today's model policy service. The PRM had 188 subscribers by 1987. He also is credited with starting ASBA's executive search service, which was initiated when the governing board of the Mayer district asked Parker for assistance in hiring a new superintendent.

ASBA assisted in developing and updating policies for many districts. An agreement with the National School Boards Association (NSBA) in 1976 allowed ASBA/NSBA to offer Education Policy Services for just $385 for three years. In 1977, 56 districts subscribed to the service.

Services continued to grow. Publications developed in the 1970s include the first "Legislative Report" published in cooperation with ASA in 1972 and sent to 1,500 people. The “Report Card” member newsletter was developed in 1977 and was mailed to members twice a month. The ASBA Bulletin was published nine times a year. To support this increased level of communication, a publications/communications staff member was added in 1975.

In 1979, after the energy crisis of the mid-1970s shook the nation, ASBA co-sponsored an Energy Management conference with Arizona Public Service (APS) and Arizona State University in response to predictions by APS that the cost of electricity would jump 1.5 times the annual rate of inflation.

ASBA President Pam Neal contracted NSBA in 1978 to conduct a complete audit of ASBA's articles of incorporation, bylaws, policies, organization, structure and staffing, and provide recommendations for improvement; they were accepted. At the end of the decade the executive director was given the power to hire, set salary and terminate all staff; the Delegate Assembly was given the sole authority to amend bylaws; and the ASBA Board of Directors set its goals. Goals for the decade to come included four key words: Responsiveness, Visibility, Representation and Service.

In 1980, the ASBA Insurance Trust (ASBAIT), which has grown to become one of the association's largest sources of operational funds, was formed as a result of need and entrepreneurial thinking by Barbara Robey, a member of the Litchfield Elementary School District Governing Board and the ASBA Board of Directors. A medical benefit insurance trust program, it continues to provide a method for school districts to control the cost of employee medical insurance.
In 1982, ASBA began offering policy manuals for member school districts. Fourteen districts used the service. Policy specialist Russ Jensen joined the ASBA staff in 1984 and by 1989 had developed policies for nearly 100 districts. In 1988, due to the success of his efforts, the Special Services Program was created, a cooperative venture with the ASA. Will Lewis joined ASBA in 1988 as demand for the service grew.

*A Nation at Risk: An Imperative for Education Reform*, a report from President Ronald Reagan’s National Commission on Excellence in Education was released in 1983. It warned about the need for improvements in American education and set off a public outcry for change in public education. ASBA identified one of its goals as “achievement of excellence,” and a task force was set up to study “excellence in education,” prepare a report and make recommendations.

In 1983 Attorney Max Jarrett became the first ASBA legal counsel. Legal services became increasingly important in the 1980s.

ASBA purchased an office at 3852 N. 29th Avenue in Phoenix and moved in March 1983.

A new headquarters wasn’t the only upgrade during that time period. In 1984, the ASBA board authorized a study to decide if a computer was needed in ASBA’s office. The answer was “yes,” and the new technology was purchased in 1985 to manage database and word processing needs of the association.

**CALLED TO ADVOCATE**

A variety of issues were affecting schools and students in the 1980s. A third of Arizona students in 1982 were from non-English speaking homes. Bilingual education was needed and was supported by ASBA, provided adequate funding was available from state or federal sources. The 1984 Legislature adopted a bilingual program intended to make children proficient in English, however, appropriate funds were never (and have never been) provided to support bilingual/English as a second language (ESL) legislation.

Two years later, ASBA took a strong position on compulsory attendance legislation, asking that attendance be required through 12th grade or age 18 (later modified to include “or graduation level competency”). The compulsory attendance age was raised from 14 to 16 or through grade 10, a requirement that remains to this day.

“Our number-one priority is legislation,” reported Executive Director Lou Ella Kleinz in 1981, a year in which 92 bills directly or indirectly affecting education were introduced to the Legislature. By 1982, that number increased to 147; by 1986, there were more than 200. ASBA realized full-time advocacy staff was needed, and, in 1987, hired Barbara Robey, who had served as president of the ASBA Board of Directors in 1983, and as the association’s first director of government relations. Robey, who had already begun to
establish her reputation as the *grande dame* of the Legislature as a volunteer, was charged with keeping track of legislative activity and lobbying legislators on issues that impacted public education.

Lobbying for educational programs was authorized by the ASBA Board in 1982. Importantly, in 1986, the chairman and vice chairman of the Legislative Committee, Executive Committee members and the ASBA professional staff were registered as lobbyists providing a strong voice at the Legislature.

School funding problems persisted. In 1987, a coalition called Arizona Citizens for Education – or ACE - was formed. Comprised of members from ASBA, ASA, the Arizona Education Association (AEA), Arizona Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), and community and business leaders, the group began a multiyear effort to gain legislative support for an omnibus education funding bill to provide “educational excellence and equity.” Arizona’s 1988 House and Senate offered to introduce their own version of a funding bill but were turned down by ACE, which determined that the issue ought to be brought to a vote of the people as a Constitutional Amendment on the ballot. The group began working on educating voters for the November 1990 election.

ASBA became a nonprofit 501(C)(3) organization in 1988. The following year, it celebrated its 40-year anniversary with the publication of a book chronicling its history.

As the association reminisced and celebrated, the 1990 ballot initiative that 1988 ASBA President Joanne Mortensen and the ACE Coalition had worked on so tirelessly had yet to reach the black ink pens of voters. One thing was for sure: elections bring change, and more than one was around the corner.
ASBA from 1990 to 2015

In May 1948, the Arizona State-wide School Board Association was created. Reformed as a state agency in 1951, it was renamed the Arizona School Boards Association – ASBA.

Homer Davis was the first executive of the association. He was replaced in 1958 by Arvid N. Gandrud, who is credited with the development of the County Meeting program, which continues today. Lou Ella Kleinz took over as executive secretary-treasurer in 1971, becoming executive director in 1974, when ASBA became an independent, nonprofit corporation. Kleinz’s tenure saw the tremendous expansion of ASBA’s services, from policy and executive searches to advocacy and communications, and the further development of board training through workshops, conferences and events. The creation of the Arizona School Boards Insurance Trust also occurred with Kleinz at the helm.

As the 1990s took hold, ASBA was about to undergo a major transition. After the Annual Board Retreat in Casa Grande in January 1991, Kleinz met with members of the ASBA Board of Directors. She returned from that meeting and, after 20 years of service, submitted a letter of resignation, effective July 1, 1991. The association began searching for its fourth executive in its 43-year history.

Lou Ella Kleinz was, as one staff member expressed, “an icon… who built the foundation of ASBA,” and her departure came as an unexpected change to the ASBA staff, as well as the greater community. Letters poured in from Arizona and all over the country expressing appreciation for Kleinz’s leadership, contribution to school board members, dedication to and impact on children, as well as her friendship and mentorship. Susan Merry, then associate executive director of the National School Boards Association (NSBA), in a handwritten note, expressed, “Indeed, I will miss the sense of pleasure I’ve always felt when I arrived in a meeting and found you there. …I know your accomplishments in Arizona are legendary …however, you have profoundly – and positively – touched many other individuals. …You have proved an impressive role model.” The executive director in Montana was more direct, writing, “Your cut-through-the-bullshit and get to the point way of doing business has been both refreshing and productive.”

In her final letter to members in the Summer 1991 issue of the ASBA Journal, Kleinz was unsentimental, referencing her departure from ASBA only by saying it was her “last opportunity to write under the byline of ‘From Lou’s Desk.’” Her message was a familiar one. With children living with poverty, child abuse, drug dependency, teenage pregnancy, one-parent homes, gangs, homelessness amidst decreasing support from state and federal sources, as well as business and private contributions, it was imperative for local board members and school administrators to remain united. “If we are able to unite the 975 local board members
and every school administrator in Arizona, local boards can exercise considerable influence in establishing state and federal policies.”

Why this call at this time? Backtrack a few years. ASBA was largely influential in the formation of Arizona Citizens for Education, ACE, an educational coalition successfully created in 1986. All prior attempts to create such a coalition in the state had failed. Finally the time was right for organizations to put aside individual agendas and come to the table to create a common agenda to put before the Legislature.

Organizations joining ASBA included the Arizona Education Association (AEA), Arizona School Administrators (ASA), Arizona School Business Officials (AASBO), Arizona School Public Relations Association (ASPRA), Arizona Parent-Teachers Association (Arizona PTA), Greater Phoenix Educational Management Council, Arizona Association of County School Superintendents, Arizona Vocational Association, and the State Council on Vocational Education. Collectively, these organizations represented a membership of more than 60,000 people statewide. Leading the group were school board member Joann Mortensen, who served as ASBA president in 1988, and statewide business leader Edward Basha, Jr., himself a former school board member.

Unifying so many to create a common educational platform for Arizona's children was a remarkable achievement. ACE's goals were to present a united and proactive stance for school-age children, develop a vehicle that outlined the problems facing Arizona public schools, and obtain additional investment of money for public education, with local accountability built in.

Local ACE coalitions were created and patterned on the state model. Individuals, businesses and organizations were recruited from every corner of the state. Members participated in projects including developing a widely used presentation about “The Class of 2000,” projecting what those 56,000 graduating high school seniors would be facing based on demographics of the time, the probable workforce the young adults would be entering, and rounding out the presentation with the history of educational funding in Arizona during the previous decade.

Bills were crafted, one in 1988 and a second for the 1989 session of the Arizona Legislature. Neither bill made it out of committee. ACE was told there wasn't enough money to fund

Making a Difference:
Edward Basha, Jr.

Edward “Eddie” Basha, Jr., whose family owned the Bashas’ grocery store chain, also served on the Chandler Unified District Governing Board for 12 years. He also served as president of the State Board of Education. Well known in business and civic circles throughout the state, his commitment and contributions to public education were so significant that the ASBA Board of Directors honored him in 1989 in an unprecedented action by naming him an Honorary Life Member of the association, an honor automatically conferred on past presidents of the association but never before bestowed upon a non-president. In 2012, Basha would be recognized by ASBA again, this time with the Barbara Robey Lifetime Achievement Award.
the programs, and that members of the Legislature did not believe that the people of Arizona would be willing to pay higher taxes to fund education.

In response, ACE commissioned extensive polling. Results indicated education was a top priority for Arizonans; citizens would be willing to pay higher taxes if the money were to go to classroom spending and if there were a guarantee that spending would be locally controlled.

ACE pushed ahead with the Arizona Classroom Improvement Program, a petition to put a statewide initiative on the November 1990 ballot. The initiative measure required an additional annual investment to the existing state budget of $100 per student for each of the next 10 years to be used in classrooms on educational improvement to help achieve specific goals: improve basic reading, writing and math skills; reduce the drop-out rate; and better prepare students for employment and higher education opportunities. In addition, there was to be a mandate for strategic planning in each school district to help it meet those goals, and a provision for accountability to parents and taxpayers by requiring districts and the State Department of Education to prepare an annual accountability “report card.”

In May 1990, ACE announced it had obtained the necessary 200,000 valid signatures needed to place the education initiative on the ballot that November. ASBA had played a large part in getting the educational community to come together like it had never come together before.

It was a terrible disappointment when the initiative failed to pass.

Kleinz spoke to those hardworking visionaries who had watched what had seemed so probable slip through their fingers. In the final letter from her executive director desk in the summer of 1991, she addressed the 975 local board members, and every school administrator in Arizona, once again summoning them forth to unite. “We are faced with a deluge of criticism of the failure of the schools to educate children,” she writes. “Conscionable acceptance results in accommodating complacency. We cannot be complacent in the face of what is happening to our children today!” Finally, she referenced a popular advertising slogan of the day: “My challenge to you is to assume that leadership role and JUST DO IT!”

**LOOKING CLOSE TO HOME**

A national search was underway in 1991 for a new executive director. Eventually, there were nearly 150 prospects under
consideration. In May 1991, the ASBA Executive Committee interviewed one of the association’s own, staff member Dr. Jack Peterson, who had been encouraged to apply for the executive director position by other members of staff, board members, superintendents and numerous local education leaders.

Kleinz had invited Peterson and his wife, Marlene, to Arizona in 1988, persuading him to leave a 13-year stint as executive director of the Indiana School Boards Association (ISBA) for the position of ASBA's director of membership services (now called leadership development). ISBA was sad to lose Peterson, but ASBA gained a valuable organizational asset.

One of the first responsibilities Peterson remembers tackling in his membership services role was re-envisioning the superintendent search services available to members, a service greatly needed in Arizona as it met the nation’s cry for reform in public education head-on. Governing boards were dealing with pressure to empower their staff, restructure governance, provide open enrollment, and implement site-base management – new buzz words and practices bombarding boards and administrators, and inevitably changing the nature of local school superintendent positions.

A study of Arizona school district governance and administration demographics during 1993 indicated that in a four-year period from 1989 to 1993 nearly 60 percent of Arizona’s superintendent positions changed due to retirement, non-renewal or resignation. During that period 116 superintendent changes took place. Board member turnover paralleled that of administrators. Sixty percent of Arizona school board members were “new” since 1988; 25 boards had all new members during that period. Only 11 Arizona boards had experienced no changes since 1988.

ASBA recognized the opportunity to grow the fledging superintendent search service already available through their membership services, but doing so was slow-going. Districts were wary about being told who they “should” hire by an outside party like ASBA. Peterson took the time needed to communicate his philosophy on the search process, which

---

**The Growth of ASBAIT**

Established in 1979, ASBAIT, the Arizona School Board Association Insurance Trust, sets the standards for service, benefits and affordability for health care for the school employees and their dependents in Arizona school districts and community colleges. With Barbara Robey as chairman, the program began offering services in 1981. Managed by a third-party administrative structure, it allows school districts to offer health insurance to employees, and provides ASBA a steady revenue stream that support its non-fee, mission-based services. Toward the end of the 1980s it had started to struggle. Unwilling to lose the program, by now considered a major footprint of ASBA, Peterson replaced the existing consultant with someone he knew, Jerry Edwards, who had previously run a similar program for the Texas School Boards Association, and now had a private consulting firm, Edwards Risk Management. Largely due to Edward’s expertise chaperoning a highly successful insurance trust, ASBAIT recovered. Today it is one of the leading school association insurance trusts in the country. ASBAIT is responsible for a third of ASBA revenues. Edwards remains active in the enterprise. In 2015, over 22,000 employees from 164 school districts were enrolled, with 32,000 lives covered. Annual contributions were over $150 million.
ASBA continues to embrace today. The governing board maintains authority and, with no exceptions, “the selection would be a school board decision.”

Anita Lichter (ASBA president, 1994), serving at that time on the Nogales School District Governing Board, opened the first door for Peterson. After his presentation to the Nogales board, Lichter lobbied on ASBA’s behalf, convincing the board to hire ASBA as their search consultant. James “Buck” Clark was retiring from the Nogales School District after 30 years of service and ASBA was contracted to find a new superintendent. A week later, Peterson got another call; it was from Willcox.

By the early 1990s ASBA was handling 30 to 35 searches a year, which represented 98 percent of the superintendent searches in the state. In the early 1990s, the rate ASBA charged was a fraction of the $15,000 to $20,000 fee charged by for-profit executive recruitment firms and consultants. In fact, frequently the searches were carried out at a financial loss for the association, but Kleinz and Peterson recognized greater gains: the relationships being nurtured at the 30 to 35 board tables every year were priceless – and continue to be, with search services still far below market price and now a foundational fee-based service available only to ASBA members.

Peterson brought another change to ASBA, a board development program from the National School Boards Association called the Institute of Educational Leadership or IEL. IEL provided materials, programming and support to bring statewide “in-service” training to local board members. Local boards could commit themselves to a progressive instructional process to increase the effectiveness of public school governance in their communities. ASBA improved on the IEL training, developing a Board Member Certification Awards Program in 1990, known today as the Academy of Board Member Development. Members earn continuing education units (CEUs) and recognition as they progress through levels of participation that aim to improve practice in public school governance.

Today, board members can visit the Learning Center on ASBA’s website (azsba.org) to explore the 10 core areas in ASBA’s Master of Boardsmanship program of board professional development for which IEL charted the course. Designed to equip board members with the knowledge and techniques necessary to develop policies and practices to support the organization’s leadership role, courses include instruction in board member orientation, fiscal management and operation; board and superintendent relations; board policy, school law and ethics; current issues and more. Particularly as board members were and are not compensated financially, the opportunity for ongoing education, credit and recognition was and is to this day a benefit provided by ASBA that board members find very attractive.

Board self-evaluation procedures and on-site board trainings also grew out of this period.

NEW LEADERSHIP

Jack Peterson was eager to take his next career step, but there was a caveat. During his interview for the executive director position he made only one demand should he be offered the job: That Elsie Miller stay on as director of administrative services. Miller, who joined ASBA as a bookkeeper in 1974, had a reputation for strong fiscal management and is credited with helping to manage ASBA into a financial position whereby the
association had sufficient revenue to purchase one office building in the 1980s as well as sell that space and buy the building ASBA currently resides in today.

Peterson was assured that Miller would stay on. When he was offered the position he took it, and in July 1991 Peterson became the fourth executive director of ASBA.

During his tenure at ASBA, Peterson had developed a strong respect for the staff, appreciating they were “a dedicated foundation of the association representing the diverse membership in good faith.” However, like all good leaders, he was not satisfied with the status quo. “I strongly believe that associations can always get better – they either take advantage of growth opportunities or they become stagnant... [ASBA] was not immune from the prospects of mediocrity... The best hope for the future is for the organization to improve, become stronger and advance its purposes for an appreciative membership to carry out its mission.”

In Peterson’s first two years as executive director he made some significant additions and changes in staff, some of which would eventually redefine the way that ASBA would interact with members in the future.

Russ Jensen, director of Policy Services and a former superintendent from South Dakota, had his hands full. Working with Will Lewis, a contractor, he established a progressive format to deliver local policy to school districts in three- to four-inch thick manuals.

Then, as now, Policy Services was one of ASBA’s most valued services and provided revenues that enabled the association to provide a variety of non-fee services and benefits, like lobbying, board consultation, newsletters and member magazines.

ASBA’s comprehensive set of policies and regulations were designed to help school districts remain in compliance with state and federal law and the latest court rulings and help create a framework for a governing board to make decisions about local rules. Additionally, Policy Services staff would go out and meet with the superintendent, and the governing board if necessary, to make sure the policies match what the governing board indicated they wanted and assist with

Staff Profile:
Gaye Smoker

Upon the departure of Director of Communications Mary Jane Finley in 1991, Gaye Smoker was hired to become the part-time communications specialist in early 1992. She continued a print newsletter, the ASBA Report Card, providing information about association happenings, events or “calls to action,” mailed to members twice a week, and a quarterly member magazine, the ASBA Journal, that offered members’ relevant news and opinion presented in a longer form, feature articles of current issues, and features on people making an impact in the state. The cover story on one of her first issues as editor featured “Public Education Under Attack.” As well, Smoker handled occasional calls from the media.
periodic reviews to ensure that local policies remained current with the law and court rulings.

The growth of the Policy Services warranted another full-time position, and Dr. Donn Williams was brought on board to assist. He was a great fit. Williams was a former superintendent from Vail, Ariz. He held a doctorate in school administration and a J.D. in school law. He also was particularly interested and adept in technology, keeping abreast of new developments and possibilities for computer-based applications, a passion which would eventually, as Peterson said, lead to the development and implementation of “one of the most accurate, effective and accessible systems of local board policy development in the country.”

Barbara Robey was both a highly competent and respected director of government relations and chairman of ASBAIT, the Arizona School Board Association Insurance Trust, which she championed the establishment of in 1979. From the start, Robey was a lifetime trustee of ASBAIT, as well as its chairman, a role she maintained until 2009, well after her retirement from ASBA. She considered the program to be one of her proudest accomplishments; her dream to provide Arizona school employees and their families’ access to quality health insurance at the lowest rates available had become a reality. Robey had a multifaceted affiliation with education and with the association. She served on the Litchfield Elementary School District Governing Board for more than 20 years, beginning with her first election in 1969. (She also served as mayor of Litchfield Park from 1990-1992.) She began her volunteer work with ASBA in 1974 on the board of directors, serving as Maricopa County director. She was the ASBA president from 1983-84. Robey began to act as a volunteer legislative advocate in the early 1980s. ASBA brought her on staff as full time director of government relations in 1987, a position she held until her retirement in 2004.

Robey is credited with building the association’s first strategic presence at the Legislature. “She knew everybody and she was just one of the most civil and respectful people,” said Tom Pickrell, who joined ASBA as general counsel in 1992 and worked closed with Robey. “She had entrée to everybody, even when there was no way they were going to agree with what she said.”

---

Celebrating Educational Opportunities

In 1991, ASBA joined with California, New Mexico and Texas School Board Associations to develop and implement an exciting project, the Celebrating Opportunities for Hispanic Student conferences to be held annually in the respective four states. The purpose of the conference, said Peterson, was to “enhance the skills, awareness and understandings relevant to the border states for improving student achievement through training, demonstrations and programs for local board members, administrators, professional staff, parents and state associations.” States hosted the three-day event on a continuing rotational basis. California hosted the initial conference in 1992 to begin the series. In 1994, Arizona hosted the 3rd Annual Conference at the Pointe South Mountain. Activist, director and actor Edward Olmos was the featured keynote speaker, appearing before over 600 attendees from the four states. The final Celebrating Opportunities Conference hosted by ASBA was in 2010. Featured speakers were Jacob Moore, Arturo Vargas, Marco Torres and Joe Prince. The conferences continued until 2011.
Peterson took a chance on another addition to the office in 1992: computers. Minute entries from an executive director's meeting show an entry about a computer upgrade: “...option number three... a three-year lease purchase of the system with an anticipated cost of $27,549 for each of the three years. Motion carried.”

Prior to this, ASBA secretaries had typewriters and other staff had only paper and pen. No one had a computer. Then, all at once, every staff member had a newfangled machine sitting on their desks. Pickrell recalls that some older members of staff had to learn to type. Everyone had to learn the basics of electronic documents, saving and storing files. Eventually, questions like “What is a file?” faded away and life got back to more important ASBA business.

Business like using computers to automate conference registration and payroll. Ellen White, now director of administrative services, who was a staff secretary at the time, remembers everything being done by hand or on typewriters, and the relief when registration information was finally put on Excel spread sheets. Elsie Miller also handwrote all checks. Accounts were kept on massive ledgers. Peterson and the ASBA officers finally said, “We've got to get all this stuff automated!” Using the computer to print checks was one of the first things White changed when she took over the books in 2007.

A PROACTIVE POSTURE

In June 1993, ASBA President Al Arellano, a board member from Sunnyside School District in Tucson, was authorized by the board of directors to appoint a Beliefs, Policies and Resolutions Task Force charged with creating a document “that fully supports ASBA's leadership role in the transformation of education in Arizona for the 21st century ...the roles of other stakeholders ...and the underlying beliefs of the association with regard to current fundamental issues in education.” (Goldsmith, Spring 1993, Vol. 23. No. 2) Over the course of the year, at various meetings and conferences, the task force was available for input, comments and review of work to date.

Not only was content being revised, ASBA was looking to completely reformat the publication so that it reflected the new leadership role that ASBA and governing boards were taking in the community. Barbara Robey assisted the committee in preparing the final product, which resulted in two documents that were to drive the association: The ASBA Organizational Agenda and the ASBA Political Agenda, which gave direction to the governing board members and staff working on legislative issues. (The Organizational Agenda ultimately was absorbed into the Political Agenda, creating a single directive.)
ASBA and its membership were carrying great responsibility. In 1992, school boards were employing 63,436 people, including 33,008 teachers. They were overseeing expenditures of $3,351,912,246. Most importantly, they were tasked with educating 606,993 students.

Nationally and locally, school governance and public education were under scrutiny, with policymakers and reform activists receiving plenty of public attention and political support. ASBA and Arizona public education were both under pressure to make changes. Gov. Fife Symington and the Legislature were out to reshape and restructure education.

Three big issues in particular were getting attention – and ASBA was on alert. The first was vouchers, specifically whether parents were actually going to have the option to receive state funding for private education if they chose to send their child to a private school. The governor was very interested in seeing this program take hold. Opponents, ASBA included, saw the call for “choice” not as a constructive market-driven concept, but as a means to fund the exclusive private education enterprise while siphoning education funds from public schools and, thus, undermining the availability of educational opportunities for all children.

The second issue was charter schools. The concept of charter schools was a hybrid public/private concept promoted by a young legislator named Lisa Graham, now Lisa Graham Keegan, who went on to become Arizona’s superintendent of public instruction from 1995 to 2001. A charter school is a public school operated by a public or private entity under a charter or contract with one of several approved entities. After several years of failing, the charter school law passed the Legislature in 1994. In 1995, Arizona’s first charter schools opened.

The third issue was the concept of site-based management (SBM), a public school governance issue that suggested schools would have better results for students if there were more decision making at the level of principals, teachers and parents at school sites, rather than having governing boards making school-based decisions. The SBM team would oversee budget, personnel and instructional issues. School boards would be limited to setting strategic goals and setting accountability systems to ensure schools accomplish the goals.

These were the big three of a very ambitious conservative legislative agenda starting in 1992 and continuing on through 1998.

**Former ASBA General Counsel Tom Pickrell (left) was awarded ASBA's John R. McDonald Award in 2010 for his contributions to the practice of school law in Arizona.**
Peterson understood ASBA faced great legislative challenges and he knew he needed to strengthen his team in order to meet them. In 1992 he overhauled ASBA Legal Services bringing Tom Pickrell on board to take over for Ruth Koester, as well as her husband who had been helping out part time. Though Pickrell had no experience in education law, he brought with him eight years of experience in general private practice and tremendous energy. Peterson concluded Pickrell was sufficiently accomplished to learn on the job as ASBA’s new general counsel. Pickrell knew Peterson took a chance on him, and recalls being both grateful and determined to prove his worth. Pickrell initially found he was spending more and more time assisting Robey, who had no formal assistant, interpret how legislation could or could not be construed. Robey was meeting with legislators and policy influencers, and trying to mobilize the “alphabet soup” of education groups. Her wide network and positive, civil and respectful demeanor gave her remarkable access. Access, however, didn’t always mean wins for the association.

Particularly in the early 1990s when Lisa Graham Keegan, then a member of the Arizona House of Representatives, and others introduced so much legislation, ASBA was caught off guard. The association had general statements about protecting local control and always trying to maximize decision making at the governing board level, but didn’t have positions on key bills staked out, or, as Pickrell recalls, “no specific guidance to some of [those] really newfangled concepts that were coming down.” ASBA needed something different. So Pickrell and Robey, along with the groups they had mobilized, began writing their own legislation. When some new legislation would be proposed, they would very quickly go out and write amendments, and then proposed amendments to that. When legislators gave alternatives, ASBA had their own alternatives and compromises ready.

In addition to keeping up with the Legislature, ASBA was keeping up with its membership. Working subcommittees were put together to help advise on legislation to make sure that when ASBA delegates came together during annual meetings to develop positions on legislation, what was being put together would pass a majority vote.

This was a new ASBA. Rather than taking a defensive posture to protect governing boards’ rights, ASBA was going on the offensive, writing and proposing legislation, and becoming part of the solution.

ASBA was also working differently internally. The new synergy between governmental relations and legal services had created a new way of working – one that has steadily strengthened over time. The intertwined relationship enabled ASBA to approach legislation differently, lobby differently, staff differently, write model policy differently, and inform membership differently. ASBA had become a player.
relationship enabled ASBA to approach legislation differently, lobby differently, staff differently, write model policy differently, and inform membership differently. ASBA had become a player.

While ASBA was busy down at the Legislature, something of great impact was taking place on the November 1992 ballot, its effects still reverberating today. Proposition 108, known as the “It's Time” initiative, was a citizen initiated, constitutional amendment that passed by a wide margin (79 percent yes vote). According to the descriptive ballot title, it amended the State Constitution by “require[ing] a two-thirds vote of the Legislature for passage, and a three-fourths vote to override a governor's veto, of any legislation that would provide a net increase in state revenues through certain changes in taxes, tax rates, tax deductions, fees or assessments.”

ASBA’s analysis of Prop 108 described it in layman’s terms as it related to public education: It would “make it more difficult to raise taxes; would reduce the prospect of any meaningful tax reform; and would make it virtually impossible to do any school finance reform with respect to correcting inequities in assessed valuation or in providing equity among taxpayers.” Equitable funding for school districts through increases in the finance formula used to allocate resources to school districts looked impossible now that Proposition 108 had passed. Any additional funding for expanding programs or to meet needs of individual students had become almost impossible to attain. The bottom line: the possibility for state financial responsibility had decreased, the potential for shifting more tax burden to the local school district level had increased, and the probability that existing inequities would increase grew.

INCREASING LEGAL ADVOCACY
Perhaps ASBA could flex its muscles in another area, the court system.

A huge storm had begun brewing over the education landscape in Arizona. In 1973, the United States Supreme Court “closed the doors of federal courts to school finance challenges.” (Hogan, Fall 1994, Vol. 24, No. 4). Tim Hogan, the executive director of The Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest since 1990 and former chief counsel for the Arizona Corporation Commission, describes the outcome of Shoofstall v. Hollins, a challenge already pending in Arizona's Supreme Court in 1973. The suit was designed to establish that the existing school funding formula for capital improvements, the brick and mortar parts of schools, was unconstitutional. They hit a wall. “Taking its cue from the U.S. Supreme Court, the Arizona Supreme Court... held that the school finance system was constitutional and did not violate the Arizona Constitution’s requirement of a general and uniform public school system.”

In the late 1980s, a number of school districts in Pinal County and lawyers from The Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest (ACLPI) decided to mount another challenge. Rather than focusing on the entire finance system, they chose to focus on capital expenditures. Mr. Hogan stated the following reasons for this strategy. First, “…the difference in capital spending between the wealthiest and the poorest are extreme and can be easily documented without reference to difficult questions regarding curriculum. Second, no attempt had ever been made by the state to equalize capital spending, unlike maintenance and operational expenditures…” which were thought to be the responsibility of local school districts. Finally, it made sense to them to put together a case that was “indisputable factually so we could avoid a lengthy trial. Concentrating
on capital disparities allowed us to do just that.” In May 1991, ACLPI filed suit. (Hogan, Fall 1994, Vol. 24, No. 4)

*Roosevelt v. Bishop* argues Arizona’s constitution provides children will have a right to attend school for free, thus putting it upon the Legislature to create a general and uniform school system for children to attend without charge. Additionally, the suit charged the state had put in place an inadequate system of funding capital improvements, causing vast disparities in school facilities in districts throughout Arizona. ASBA’s role in the lawsuit was remarkable in that it was decided as an association to participate in the court proceedings as an “amicus” party, a “friend of the court.” In this capacity, ASBA was permitted, by court rules as an interested party, to submit briefs explaining how the association thought the law worked.

Never before had ASBA participated in legal advocacy on behalf of its members. This was a major shift for the association and for ASBA’s Legal Services. In this new advocacy role, each time a brief was submitted during those eight years, they needed ‘buy-in’ from ASBA members as to what they were arguing – permission to represent ASBA in that manner. This was no easy task.

ASBA believed the case – and the support of the membership – could be won by arguing that the law was unconstitutional. First, ASBA needed to get members to the table. The ASBA Board of Directors approved a representative committee of members from school districts in urban areas, rural areas and suburban areas with varying amounts of property wealth in their boundaries. Each of ASBA’s position briefs were developed with input from this representative committee.

*Roosevelt v Bishop* was, in fact, a very divisive issue for school districts. Many school districts with high property wealth believed the system was fine, while schools in poorer property wealth districts were crumbling.

ASBA submitted approximately nine briefs in the eight years the suit was in the court system. Before a brief was submitted, it had to pass the approval of the committee; it had to represent ASBA members.

Ultimately, the suit made its way to the Arizona Supreme Court. On July 21, 1994, in a 3-2 decision, the court ruled Arizona’s system of school capital finance violated the Arizona Constitution’s requirement that the state establish and maintain a “general and uniform” public school system. The court held that the school finance system was the cause of the “gross and vast” disparities and was, therefore, illegal.
Pickrell said the ultimate solution to the lawsuit was relatively easy for ASBA to present to members; it was suggested by the court.

In its ruling, the court said the constitution does not require strict uniformity; it requires adequacy, so that all districts who are funded by the state would meet some level of measurable adequacy based on measurable standards. ASBA also supported the view of the court that argued the Legislature should continue to allow districts to go beyond the level of adequacy, if they could persuade their local voters to do that, but the state would not fund beyond the level of adequacy; it would be up to the local voters to go beyond if that is what they wanted to do.

School districts that supported the lawsuit since its filing three and a half years prior recognized the victory for the children of Arizona; but Pickrell recalls there were those among the plaintiffs who were unhappy. Some members in the organization felt strict equality was important in a public school system and argued vigorously for a ruling to reflect uniformity; under the adequacy ruling, rich districts would continue to be able to fund beyond the means of poor districts. Though ASBA considered this point of view fair and reasonable, they settled on the adequacy argument, and supported the view of the Supreme Court.

The court’s decision was met unenthusiastically by the Legislature, “who claimed that the court [had] overstepped its authority and invaded the province of the Legislature.” (Hogan, Fall 1994, Vol. 24, No. 4)

Hogan saw 1994 as a crucial moment in time, a hard-fought moment when parties stood on a fulcrum together. “It is critical that school districts reach consensus in a plan that is fair and equitable for all children. Otherwise the Legislature may attempt to divide and conquer school districts as it has done so often in the past. Opportunities to reform the school finance system do not come along very often and we must make certain that this one is not lost. The only way to do that is by unifying around the principle that all children are entitled to an education on substantially equal terms regardless of where they live.” (Hogan, Fall 1994, Vol. 24, No. 4)

In the ASBA Journal of winter 1994, Pickrell wrote about the Roosevelt v. Bishop decision. He discussed the Legislature’s reluctance to spend money on challenges associated with K-12 education. He pointed out that capital problems are often the lesser of the funding evils that districts deal with, citing that of the total amount of Capital Outlay Revenue Limit (CORL) funding, typical practice was for 75 percent to be transferred to the Maintenance and Operations side of district’s budgets, ignoring capital needs because governing boards believed that available funds were better spent on salaries and programs despite understanding the serious capital needs.

“Getting the Legislature to fully fund K-12 education is a difficult task. Just about everyone agrees that the formula’s weights for ESL [English as a Second Language] and special education students should be revised. Support is also growing for preschool and full-day kindergarten programs. But these items probably cannot be funded without a major tax increase, which would bring the Legislature up against the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds majority in both houses of the Legislature.” Proposition 108, the “It’s Time” Initiative, only two years old, was already making its mark on public education, as it would for years to come.
In 1994, the good news about school finance was that it was in the minds of the entire Arizona Legislature, if not the hearts. Governor Symington asked for the Capital Needs Assessment, passed by the Legislature in 1994, to be accelerated. He also established a committee, headed by Superintendent of Public Instruction C. Diane Bishop to identify the schools with the most pressing health and safety needs.

The study was deemed by the education community as flawed as it didn’t survey enough school buildings in enough districts; the guideline given to districts regarding what equipment they ought to inventory was incomplete; the equipment sent to districts to do the inventorying and surveying was often incomplete or broken; and the portable buildings used in many school districts were not included in the inventory. (Meinke, Summer 1995, Vol. 25, No. 3)

The positives from the study were that the Legislature had the study done in the first place; school districts and individual schools were now aware that people were paying attention to how they spent capital funds – and that they had a fiscal responsibility to spend it as well as they could. Districts were becoming aware of each other and their environments and what a “good” environment looked like; and the study could be “a catalyst for the discussion necessary to address the development of standards for school facilities.” (Meinke, Summer 1995, Vol. 25, No. 3)

ASBA wasn’t waiting for the state to draw conclusions. In July 1994 Anita Lichter, ASBA president, convened the Executive Committee of the board to discuss the importance for ASBA to take a leadership role in the study of school finance. A proposal was made to create a school finance committee. After discussion and input from Robey and Peterson, the Executive Committee directed the staff to develop a Finance Task Force, making appropriate contacts and procedures for the “blue ribbon” group.

The Executive Committee and staff created a list of representatives from ASBA member districts – school board members, superintendents and school business officials – to invite in time for the Sept. 24 meeting that year. Lichter wrote in her closing letter as ASBA president in the Journal’s fall 1994 issue, “We did not know... how quickly we would need to get this rolling, but circumstances the State Supreme Court ruling on the unconstitutionality of our state school finance law made this imperative. This task force... has been formed, met, and will continue to meet, until our task is complete.” (Anita Lichter, Fall 1994, Vol. 24, No. 4)

The state had two major tasks: play a bigger role in funding districts to get to a level of adequacy; and come up with a definition of what “adequacy” meant. Over the course of the next four years, one “remedy” after another was enacted by the Legislature to address the court’s ruling, only to be struck down by the court as unsatisfactory. It would be 1998, when Arizona adopted Student’s FIRST (Fair and Immediate Resources for Students Today) when the court finally decided the legislation proposed satisfied the ruling’s requirement, establishing a School Facilities Board, among other things, to oversee the centralized funding system and other mandates.
The Finance Task Force worked with ASBA staff, particularly Robey and Pickrell, spending countless hours preparing legislation and amendments. Pickrell remembers his life being consumed by the work involved, hammering out the details of what the legislation would look like after the 1994 ruling. He also recalls Peterson and Robey acting as intermediaries with members, reassuring boards each amicus brief was consistent with the adequacy concept and guided by the wishes of the ASBA committee created to represent them.

As unanticipated reactions to *Roosevelt v. Bishop*, and the turmoil associated with charter schools, vouchers, and site-based management bubbled up, ASBA had the attention of governing board members to a degree never before experienced. There was so much at stake. In 1993, for the first time ever, the Arizona School Boards Association achieved 100 percent membership of Arizona school boards.

**POLICY SERVICES PUSHES ASBA INTO THE COMPUTER AGE**

ASBA’s members had, by 1994, come to see ASBA in a new light in terms of government relations and legal services. What members weren’t as aware of was an amazing transformation taking place in policy services.

When Peterson arrived at ASBA in 1988, Russ Jensen was director of policy services. Peterson recalled, “Russ … was a good ‘ol boy from South Dakota, a former superintendent, and smart as a whip. He is the guy who actually began the old paper copies of the [policy service] manuals … of all the school districts. … one room in [our] building was nothing but policy manuals for 225 school districts, and all paper products.”

ASBA already knew it needed to be a computer savvy organization, purchasing desktop computers for all of its employees in 1992. Dr. Donn Williams, who had been brought on as a policy analyst in the fall of 1990, had a desire to pursue the possibility of computerizing ASBA’s Policy Services data. Peterson decided to send him to a company in Salt Lake City – “gurus on the cutting edge of things” that he had heard about at a National School Boards Association convention. “Donn Williams came back the most excited I have ever seen a human being! And we began,” said Peterson.

Not long after, Williams became director of policy services and took on an assistant, Jim Deaton, another former superintendent who was dynamic with the computer. A secretary was hired to assist them. The new team was able to computerize policy service manuals used by Arizona school districts. They created manuals on computer discs for each district. Eventually, the application was expanded so the data would cross reference school board...
policy at the state and federal level, and with relevant court cases, state board of education regulations, federal regulations and case law.

When Williams first got all the governing board policy manuals onto computer discs, Peterson decided it was time to make ASBA’s commitment to the new computer-based systems complete. He was about to make his rounds going to County Meetings, 15 locations, 6,000 miles, in five weeks, where he would be seeing all of the member governing boards. Prior to leaving, he called a dumpster to the ASBA office and the massive collection of paper manuals were thrown away.

“I could see my career flashing into the sunset But there was a lot of excitement about this. I gave them the report on what happened with the dumpster. That we just dumped ALL of your policy manuals into the dumpster and waved goodbye to the truck,” Peterson laughed. “And there were people swallowing hard, there were people breaking out in a sweat... I held up this little disc. I said, ‘All of your policy manuals are on this disc!’ And so that’s the way it started.”

ASBA’s School Board Policy Service system is one of the most advanced in the country today. Because of the legal cross-referencing aspects of the system, it is also used by school attorneys involved in school law.

2100 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE

By 1995, ASBA had eleven people on staff. They were bursting out of their small one-story building Kleinz had purchased back in 1983 on 32nd Avenue and Indian School Road in Phoenix. With only eight offices, a large workroom that doubled as board room four Saturdays a year, and a small conference room, the building no longer met their needs. The staff also wanted to be located in a different part of town, preferably closer to central Phoenix, which would place them closer to the Capitol and other education associations they worked with, and get them out of industrial Phoenix.

ASBA was in a good financial position at the time. At the same time it was growing services and representation, the association had built up a sizable cash reserve with sound fiscal management of their resources. As it is today, ASBA’s three primary sources of revenue were policy services, ASBAIT, and member/conference revenue. The board of directors, led by President Julia Smock, along with staff determined it would be feasible to relocate without “jeopardizing ASBA’s general fiscal position.” (Peterson, Summer 1995, Vol 25, No. 3)

Pickrell, who had some background in real estate law, advised Peterson to consult the Resolution Trust Corporation – formed in the wake of the commercial real-estate crash in 1989. By 1994, the market of RTC buildings had been pretty well flushed out, but surprisingly, ASBA found a gem sitting on Central Avenue and purchased it “for a song and a dance.”

The 15,000-square-foot single story building with a 50 parking spaces beneath was structurally sound but needed serious renovation. ASBA gutted the space and put it back together, keeping 9,000 square feet for its own use. Most of the furniture was purchased from sales and auctions to supplement the existing furniture being brought over from the old location. A new set of furniture had been purchased for the executive
director’s office while ASBA was still located at the office on 32nd Avenue and brought over to the new office; it is still in use there today.

Before the furniture was moved in, the building was blessed by two Navajo medicine men brought to the ASBA office by Window Rock resident and Navajo nation member Larry Foster, who good-naturedly referred to Peterson as “Dances with Boards.” During the sacred ceremony, which took place Jan. 18, 1996, the medicine men conducted two hours of blessings and chants in the large board room as staff and board members looked on from where they sat on blankets around the room. Toward the latter part of the blessing the medicine men went to every eastern door in the building and sprinkled corn pollen on the lintels, acknowledging the rising of the sun.

In every way, 2100 North Central turned out to be good for ASBA. The association had spent a little under a million dollars to buy and renovate the building. ASBA fixed up the 6,000 square feet it wasn’t using for its own offices into four different suites and, by 1996, rented all of them out, primarily to other 501(C)(3) organizations. At one time it was costing only $1.98/month for ASBA to operate the building because of the income from the leases. Within 18 months after the building was built and paid for, the association had recovered its outlay.

ASBA rapidly became a place that outlying school boards would use for business with their lawyers or whatever else they needed to do when they were “in town.” It became a gathering spot for facilitating meetings.

One of the first meetings hosted in the new space focused on defeating vouchers. Board and staff had determined a coordinated effort would be needed. The new office had not officially opened; ASBA was the only group with a place to meet so they became the strategy headquarters for a coalition that included Arizona Association of School Business Officials (AASBO), the Arizona Education Association (AEA), and others. They “put on a blitz.” They had all the school board members – Democrat and Republican – telling their legislators “We’re elected by the same people you are and we don’t want any part of this voucher stuff, or charter schools or tax credits!” With a strategy focused on defeating vouchers in a single chamber, pressure from local school board members, along with their counterparts in their education network, pulled nine senatorial Republican votes; nine votes swung. “We killed vouchers in 1995.” For now, vouchers were off the table. The compromise was supporting a law establishing charter schools.
The charter school law that Arizona enacted in the summer of 1994 was described at the time by charter school proponents as one of the "strongest" and most "expansive" laws in the country (H.B. 2002). (Pickrell, 1998). Conceptually, charter schools were touted as a way to improve student achievement and be laboratories of innovation from which district schools could model. One of the goals for charter schools was that they would be free from "stifling regulations and allowed to compete freely in an open educational marketplace," (Davis, Fall 1995, Vol. 25, No. 4). Except for the requirements in the charter school statute and those in the charter contract between the school and its sponsoring agency, a charter school would be "exempt from all statutes and rules relating to schools, governing boards and school districts." (Arizona Charter School Statute, A.R.S. 15-183.E.5)

Some privately owned corporations operated charter schools. All charters were in the business of providing a public education; they operated public schools with the aid of state funds with the requirement that they accept all students. Property acquired by a charter school was owned by the school's owner. Their teachers did not need to be certified, be paid a standard wage or have contributions made into retirement accounts. Schools needed to assess student achievement using the same standards as other public schools – Stanford 9 and AIMS at the time – but otherwise did not need to follow the course of study prescribed by the State Board of Education. Also of note, during the 1996 Legislative Session, charters had been increased to 15 years, extended from the five years of the initial legislation.

The charter concept had grabbed hold. In 1995, the first year charter schools could operate in the state, Arizona's 51 charters made up a third of the 140 in the United States, with the remaining scattered across 10 other states. When 46 sites opened the first year, four were chartered by local school districts, 22 by the State Board for Charter Schools, and 20 by the State Board of Education. They served almost 7,000 students – one percent of Arizona’s K-12 school population at the time.

By the fall of 1995, 67 new applications had been submitted to the two state boards. As the 1996-97 school year approached, approximately 17,000 students were expected to attend charter schools scattered throughout Arizona in both small, rural communities and metropolitan areas. Some of the schools offered curriculum for “at-risk” students, while others offered Montessori-methods,
school-to-work opportunities, or catered to families looking to place students in settings that might be arts-based, multi-age or some other innovative education setting.

In the spring of 1997, Dr. Gregg Garn and Professor Robert T. Stout from the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University released findings from an ASBA-financed study that examined the progress of the first group of charter schools authorized to open in September 1995. In examining the 46 schools, the authors attempted to address several questions, including who were the people operating the schools; what curriculum was offered; who was attending the schools; how were students performing; and what sorts of issues were schools confronting.

The report was significant in that research to date responding to the pros and cons of “choice” – the driving factor behind charters (and, for that matter, vouchers and tax credits) – was non-existent. The argument proponents of “choice” argued was it would produce competition for public schools which would drive the public school system to make quality and efficiency improvements, and it would allow parents to act in the best interests of their children. Opponents argued “choice” would be inequitable, would increase segregation along racial and ethnic lines, and would threaten the foundation of democracy in Arizona. They also argued that open enrollment laws, passed in 1991, provided enough competition and options.

During the study period, Garn and Stout analyzed charter applications, looked at public records, did site visits, and, while on site, gathered materials and spoke with directors, staff, students and parents as available. At the time the study was released they had plans to analyze financial and achievement records as they became available.

Schools were put into three classifications: Schools focusing on youth who had not been academically successful in “regular schools;” schools which had a prior existence under a specific owner – called proprietary schools, six which were Montessori schools and three which had been independent high school academies or independent elementary schools; and schools which had some form of special curricular focus, designed for regular students, almost all K-8 schools, including three ethno-centric schools (two for African-Americans and one for Hispanics), four “back-to-basics”, three arts academies’ (one a high school), and a smattering of others with curriculum which might have been classified as “progressive.”

When investigating “Who Are the Principle Players?” Garn states that, except for the directors of the former proprietary schools, heads of community-based agencies, and four who had been public school principals, the charter school directors and those involved in the formation of the schools were “essentially, beginners in the business of operating schools.” They were described as being “good-hearted and dedicated people who believe they are building a better experience for their students.” Teaching staff seemed to share that enthusiasm whether or not they were certified and expressed “high levels of satisfaction over their perceived autonomy from ‘bureaucratic hassles.’”

Some directors sought to hire certified staff, others hired the best qualified people regardless of status, and others rejected certified staff on the principle that teacher certification produced “teachers whose bad habits have to be unlearned before they can become good teachers.”

Some schools were doing well, and some were not. With what little information they had available, the researchers reported test scores mirrored the students they had enrolled.
In response to “What Issues Confront Directors,” the lead concern was the “rapidly changing client environment,” though proprietary schools did not have that issue – they were continuing with business as usual. Schools for under-performing students said that other high schools were their most consistent referral source.

Charter school directors were having problems with inadequate technical assistance from state agencies, high turnover from state agency personnel responsible for charter schools, state agencies being thinly staffed, and difficulty staying in compliance with procedures and regulations because they changed and were hard to anticipate and follow.

As with all schools in Arizona, directors complained of low levels of funding.

“Some Matters of Future Interest,” probably chief among was whether charter schools had something to teach us – “an instructional capacity beyond that of regular schools.” “Will they succeed in important ways where other schools have failed?” Will they “infect the others with new ideas and new ways of operating?”

Outsiders saw accountability as an issue; it was part of the charter school debate. For proponents, it remained a non-issue. If the school was open, it was accountable.

Finally, Garn brought up an issue that ASBA was going to be examining for years to come, involving “the intersection of charter school policy and continuing legislator interest in vouchers and tax credits. If vouchers and tax credits become a major funding source for schooling, will anything of significance happen to the charter school movement?”

“An Interim Summing Up” by the researchers points out that the charter school “experiment” was in its infancy. The political climate was “quite favorable to the ideology which spawned charter schools;” in fact so much so that failures of some schools were “celebrated as evidence that the system is working as intended.” Questions about children were unanswerable – were they any more successful than they would have been in life had they not been in a charter school? Garn rightly stated, “This may be an unfair question, but it ought to be kept in mind.”

The release of the 1997 study sponsored by ASBA was part of an ongoing communication with members about charter schools – a conversation complicated by philosophical and political concepts and arguments that ASBA worked to neutralize. The reality was the charter school “experiment” had taken root in Arizona and was growing: 1997-98 saw 184 sites in operation with enrollment of 21,115 students. The compromise had been made; ASBA and Arizona had dodged vouchers for the moment, but charters were here to stay.
MORE LEGISLATION, MORE LITIGATION

“Choice” wasn’t done with ASBA that year; in fact, Arizona Congressman Trent Franks, a Republican, was quoted as saying, “Why do we need vouchers at this point?” He wasn’t anti-voucher; he was the author of the tax credit law that the state enacted in 1997.

The law, A.R.S. §43-1089(HB2074,) provides a dollar-for-dollar, state income-tax credit for two kinds of expenditures: one for donations made to support extracurricular activities at public schools, and one for donations made to private scholarship organizations –or “School Tuition Organizations” (STO).

The STO tax credit, often referred to as the Private Tuition Tax Credit, allows taxpayers to claim a credit against state income taxes for contributions to eligible students, paying for part or all of their tuition at religious or other private schools.

The legislation states that a taxpayer may not earmark their donation to benefit their own dependent. While parents cannot designate their dependents as recipients, they can designate other individuals as recipients. The legislation also stipulated that STOs had to spend at least 90 percent of their revenue on scholarships to students and distribute them to more than one school. In other words, STO operators could keep 10 percent of donations. No penalties were written into the law for non-compliance (only reporting requirements).

While the supporters of the legislation argued tax credits would open up private schools to the less fortunate, opponents of the law quickly recognized STOs were not required to distribute scholarships based on financial need or previous inability to attend a private school. And as long as people could designate specific recipients, people would be earmarking donations to relatives and friends. Other glaring issues - money was being designated for scholarships to religious schools. Receiving schools cannot discriminate against students based on race, color, handicap, familial status or national origin. Receiving schools COULD discriminate against students based on religion.

With AEA in the lead, ASBA, along with a number of other organizations, challenged the constitutionality of the law immediately upon Governor Fife Symington’s signature claiming a violation of the Establishment Clause of the U.S. Constitution (in general terms, directs the national government not to sanction official religion, and the “Aid,” “Religion,” “Gift,” and “General and “Uniform” clauses of the Arizona Constitution.

The Arizona Supreme Court in examining the case, Kotterman v. Killian, determined that the law was constitutional because the taxpayer contributions that are distributed to private schools and STOs are not state public funds because they never enter into the state’s control or reach state treasury. The U.S. Supreme Court declined to take action on the appeal.

In Kotterman v. Killian, ASBA played a larger role in the court than they had previously. AEA was still in the driver’s seat during the tax-credit legal battles, choosing counsel and leading the strategy; ASBA was amicus, providing resources and assisting with litigation.

As the Legislature voted to raise tax-credit limits year after year, (the amount that individuals and married couples are able to donate), the Arizona Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union prepared to file a second legal challenge. Winn v. Hibbs, (later Winn v. Garriott) was filed in 2000, with ASBA as amicus. The case was decided in the U.S. Supreme Court in 2011. The Supreme Court ruled 5-4 that the plaintiffs did not
have standing to bring suit. Ultimately, the Supreme Court found that any damages or harm claimed by the taxpayers by virtue of simply being a taxpayer would be pure speculation because the issue at hand was tax credit and not government expenditure.

A corporate tax credit program was introduced in 2006 allowing corporations to make donations to STOs.

Despite opposition by ASBA and other education groups against tax credit programs, new tax credit legislation was being introduced and passing with each legislative session.

In fact, the state Legislature was getting more involved in different aspects of education every year. Barbara Robey tracked the number of bills introduced that directly or indirectly impacted education. She found they went from 90 in 1981 to more than 200 in 1986. By 1999, ASBA was tracking between 300 and 400 bills each session that affect public education. ASBA lobbying, advocating, researching... legislatively and legally, ASBA was busy.

The association was gaining strength and recognition as a proactive public education advocate, and gaining experience and confidence in the public arena. It was also more aggressively training members on these topics.

The school capital finance debate in the aftermath of Roosevelt v. Bishop continued. ASBA acted as amicus in Hull v. Albrecht in 1997, in which the Court rejected a proposal by the state and imposed a deadline on the Legislature to develop a constitutional system of school capital finance or risk closure of all K-12 schools.

In 1998, Governor Hull asked for ASBA’s support with legislation called Students Fair and Immediate Resources for Students Today. Students FIRST legislation would reform the way K-12 schools are constructed (excluding charter schools). Legislative leaders, favoring a recommendation that would cut $27 million a year from M&O budgets at schools across the state, refused to allow Governor Hull’s aide to testify with her proposal before the House committee. The governor responded angrily, telling legislative leaders she would not sign a budget that “slashes education funding.” ASBA supported Governor Hull’s fight and the school capital finance debate settled down with Students FIRST legislation for FY 1999-2000.
Other significant legislation during this period was passed during the 1998 election season by voters. Proposition 105, the Arizona Voter Protection Act, is a constitutional amendment that prohibits lawmakers from amending laws enacted or amended through an initiative or referendum unless the changes further the purpose of the voter-approved measure. In addition, those changes must receive approval of at least three-fourths of the members of each house of the Legislature. Proposition 105 came into play in 2009 when the Legislature removed $7 million of accrued interest from an Early Childhood Development and Health Fund, “First Things First,” and put the money into the state’s general operating fund. The board overseeing the fund sued the state in May, and in July the Arizona Supreme Court, relying on Proposition 105 in its reasoning, sided unanimously with the fund against the state. ASBA has been a strong supporter of First Things First since its inception in 2006.

The Voter Protection Act would emerge as critical to ASBA members again in 2010 in the legal fight to compel the Legislature to meet its legal obligation to fund inflation as mandated by Arizona voters in 2000 with the passage of Proposition 301.

GROWTH AND TRANSITION

Fortunately, by 1997, ASBA staff was well situated in their new offices, helping to manage committees and meetings, as well accommodate the addition of a new staff member, Bobbi Sparrows, a government relations analyst who joined ASBA as a lobbyist and assistant to Robey now that Pickrell was becoming more involved in litigation.

ASBA also made room in its building for the emerging Arizona Association of School Business Officials, which was beginning to more firmly establish itself with the hiring of a staff member to formalize its work. Peterson said he envisioned the essential partnership that steadily grew between the two organizations.

Other changes were taking place in 1997. Technology continued to march ahead at ASBA. The association’s first website – a single page – was launched at www.azsba.org, a complete computer upgrade took place, which improved the ability to manage financial and personnel records, and Policy Services use of technology also grew.

The structure of the ASBA’s board of directors changed that year as well, with membership voting to eliminate the 2nd Vice President position. Remaining officers who comprised the board’s Executive Committee were president, vice president, secretary, treasurer and immediate past president.
A snapshot of ASBA membership in Arizona at the time showed 970 board member seats on the 222 governing boards in Arizona, with almost all boards seating five members elected at-large. Forty-nine percent of school board members were women. The length of service had decreased in the last decade; over 36 percent of members began service for the first time in January 1997. Only 27 percent of members had served more than six years; 60 percent had served less than three years.

There were 13 board members across the state with more than 20 years of service – the three with the longest service were Robert Cowan, Tombstone, with 22 years, Rev. G. B. Brooks, Roosevelt, with 29 years, and Lee Bistline, Colorado City, with 35 years. Of the 881 members who reported vocations, 48 percent of members were employed in farming, ranching, industry, or business-related professions, in addition to 21 attorneys, 14 physicians/dentists and four ministers. 20 percent held tribal and/or government-related positions.

Though it wasn't until 2010 that ASBA implemented a formal statewide public relations and communications strategy for informing the public about the need for board service and the duties and responsibilities that accompany it, in the spring of 1998, ASBA threw out some humor on the Journal cover that related to it, perhaps in recognition of the more recent trend of shorter member terms, before election season got underway. “WANTED. Persons at least 18 years of age with visions about how the next generation will survive and thrive in the 21st Century. Must understand complex problems and systems, enjoy debating policies, shoulder responsibility without micro-managing procedures, be willing to advocate for kids on controversial issues to State and local taxpayers. Ability to explain phrases like “excess levy referendum,” “site-based management,” and the rationale for why school expenses increase when inflation rises. TOUGH HIDE A REAL PLUS. Length of job varies, frequent night meetings, below minimum wage. Apply by September 4 to your county school superintendent. Equal opportunity; democratic process will fill positions November 3 by 7:00 p.m.” (ASBA, ASBA Spring Journal 1998, 1998)

Sometime during 1998, Peterson began to think about his own transition. His strong belief in the “accountability line where the tax payer [has] a route to the school board table for children” was no longer a straight line as charters and the vouchers made more headway into public education. In these changes, he saw the potential stratifying of the population that was “not in public education's interest to the tax payers of the country.” (Peterson J., 2014)

Peterson understood with great clarity the milestones accomplished during the 10 years he worked for the association. Now he was ready for someone new to drive it forward, and ready to spend some time with his
grandchildren 2,000 miles away in Indiana. “I loved ASBA an awful lot when I was here. Still do. But ... it was a good time to turn around. I have no regrets.” (Peterson J., 2014)

Letters poured in from across the state and the country as Jack got ready to leave. “It has been a real source of strength for me to hear you strongly speak out against the injustices created by educational policies which would make for a less democratic society,” wrote Richard Anderson, executive director, Minnesota School Boards Association. “You can take great satisfaction from the fact that you have had a tremendously positive impact on our public school system,” said Carter D. Ward, executive director, Missouri School Board Association. “None have made a greater difference than you. You have always been one of strong convictions, one who has been unwilling to compromise values, and one who has doggedly pursued remedies to problems that you felt kept public education from succeeding,” expressed Randy Quinn, executive director, Colorado Association of School Boards.

To honor Peterson’s many years of service, two awards were established in 1999. One was for amateur student photographers, as Peterson, himself an amateur photographer, loved shooting photos of Arizona’s natural beauty as he traveled the state: the Jack Peterson Student Photography Contest. An endowment was established to fund a Jack Peterson Scholarship, awarded annually to high school seniors planning on studying to be teachers. The first awards would be made during the 2000 ASBA/ASA Annual Conference. In all, 40 students have received scholarships.

EXPANDING THE FOUNDATION

Panfilo H. Contreras became ASBA’s Executive Director in late July 1998. He had served 11 years on the Flowing Wells Unified School District Governing Board in Tucson, and been president of the ASBA Board of Directors in 1995. A champion of governing board members, he was determined to raise their level of influence with the state Legislature and the State Board of Education, where he thought school official’s financial stewardship of district resources was too often questioned.

In his welcoming interview, he is quoted as saying, “School districts run a tight ship governed by prudent fiscal policies.” He backed up his statement, citing a study commissioned during the Symington administration, a performance audit of financial practices of school districts across the state, including the district where he had served. “That report generally found school districts are running as efficiently and economically, and many times better than, private industries.” (Contreras, 2015)
Contreras recognized that board members were often so busy representing their constituents, dealing with policy, and making sure schools were running well that they didn’t do a very good job with public relations. That was part of his impetus for bringing a full-time public relations staff person on board starting in October 1998 - Sunny Hemphill, a former reporter for the *Arizona Capitol Times*. Mike Martin, a data research analyst, had also been added to the staff that year; usable statistical data was needed for lobbying and public relations efforts.

Another focus of Contreras’ efforts was ensuring new and experienced members were aware of training opportunities for board member development. “What I’d like to see ...is that each individual member become more active in their own development as a local board member ... [and] recognize that expanding themselves outside their immediate world gives them more tools and information with which to go back and make good decisions in their own world.” (Contreras, 2015) This would be a message he would deliver in one form or another in his “Viewpoint” letters for many years to come.

Bringing issues of diversity to the forefront also continued to be a priority for Contreras who recalled, “I was the first, and only, to-date, person of color, Latino, to serve in that school district... and it was interesting to me because I never felt like there was a real issue particularly in Tucson, as diverse as it was.”

As a school board member, Contreras had been a founding member of ASBA’s Hispanic and Native American Indian Caucus in the early 1990s. Among their goals was to affect the leadership of ASBA by encouraging and promoting people of color to run for positions of office not only on school boards, but also on the association’s board of directors. The caucus was successful. Al Arellano from Nogales became ASBA President in 1993, followed by many others, including Contreras himself in 1995, Manuel Ruiz in 1999, Cindy Matus Morriss in 2003, Mike DeLaO in 2007 and Jesus Rubalcava in 2015.

Contreras recalls that when Peterson announced his retirement, the ASBA Board of Directors outlined their interest in making sure there was diversity on the staff. “In my hiring, after going through the process, I became the first minority individual, person of color, to have been hired in ASBA’s executive officers (from left) Immediate Past President Manuel Ruiz, 1st Vice President Harry Garewal, Treasurer Cheryl Main, President Elect Linda Lopez, Secretary Cindy Matus Morriss and (seated) President Myrna Sheppard as Arizona delegates for the National School Boards Association Delegate Assembly in 2000.
the Arizona School Boards Association on a permanent basis... at any staff level.” (Contreras, 2015)

As he took over the office of executive director, Contreras was given direction by the board of directors to try and make the staff more diverse. “We were able to do that. We ended up having representation for the Black community, Native American community... and other Hispanic individuals were staffed.” (Contreras, 2015)

Those concerns of the board were addressed over the first few years he was with ASBA.

As well, he worked to address ongoing misperceptions regarding the Hispanic-Native American Indian Caucus (HNAIC) and, in later years, the Black Caucus, established in 2010, dispelling the idea that they were exclusively for membership of people of color. In fact, the purpose of both was and is the opposite; it is to involve school board members in those caucuses that have significant diverse populations in their districts and to provide opportunities to learn about issues, and share concerns, road blocks and barriers, so they could serve those communities in terms of the policies they were making in their school districts. “The caucuses continued to provide me with ideas for breakout sessions; presentations that we could bring; speakers that could come; so we could have some diversity in terms of our programs over all.” (Contreras, 2015)

Today, caucuses continue to influence diversity in programming. The chairs of both the HNAIC and the Black Caucus are members of the Board of Directors.

Though it was a time of transition, when another voucher proposal reared up in December 1998, ASBA didn’t miss a beat.

A statement from the association went out on Dec. 30, 1998, in a press release, saying, “It [is] unthinkable, in a year when the state budget faces a projected deficit, for this state to talk about anything other than shoring up the shortfalls in public school funding.” (Contreras, 1998)

“Arizona School Boards Association believes every child in the United States of America needs a good education. The splintering of public education funding into the creation of small schools that tend to keep children with other children who look, think, and worship and behave only as they do is not a desirable goal. Diversity is and always has been the great strength of our nation; it is also our great challenge. Today, more than ever, it is vital that our children learn to work, plan and live with others who do not look, think, worship and behave as they do.” (Arizona School Boards Association, 1998)

ARIZONA ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND AIMS

In 1995, in response to the passage of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1993, with Lisa Graham Keegan, now state superintendent of schools, and the State Board of Education taking the lead, thousands of Arizona educators began participating in designing a set of academic standards in the following content areas: language arts, mathematics, science, the arts, comprehensive health, and foreign language, technology, social studies, and work place skills. Teams of teachers, parents, school administrators, students and community members were involved with national organizations, educators and other resources. Design teams distributed drafts to parents and the education community. Public meetings, focus groups and hundreds of individuals gave feedback. The result was the Arizona Academic Standards. Time magazine recognized Arizona as having one of the strongest sets of content standards in the
ASBA FROM 1990 TO 2015

nation. (Orr, 1997) The American Federation of Teachers and the Thomas Fordham Foundation found Arizona’s academic standards to be the best in the country. Arizona was following the nation in the movement to set standards in curriculum for students. They addressed basic issues facing public education institutions everywhere. The premise of setting standards is they provide common academic expectations for students, teachers and parents. Because standards apply to all children, and are designed under the assumption that “all children can learn,” theoretically, they bring about academic equity to all children. Standards ought to also reduce the negative impact of student mobility; regardless of where a student lives in the state, the standards are the same. Standards-based education is an opportunity to align curriculum, instruction and assessments; as students move through the K-12 school system, their curriculum should be seamless as teaching is aligned to the standards. Additionally, they provide universities and colleges a basis for training the state’s teachers. Finally, standards are the starting point for greater accountability for students, schools and districts. (Orr, 1997)

AIMS was not just about student assessment. Schools would be assessed based on how well students were performing in their assessments. There were accountability outcomes for schools not indicating an increase in student performance.

By 1998, Arizona’s Academic Standards were in the hands of educators, accessible to parents and the public online on the Arizona Department of Education’s website, very much a part of education vernacular. The hot topic was now student assessment, and Arizona’s answer for that was the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS). Jaime Molera, policy advisor to the governor, was candid. “At stake is the future of whether or not our state embraces or discards the idea of rigorous academic standards.” (Molera, 1998) Governor Hull’s administration was strongly behind AIMS, committed to budget resources and sought to block attempts to water down the standards. “Once fully in place, AIMS will give Arizonans the accountability they demand, and should expect, from our public education system.” (Molera, 1998)

AIMS was not just about student assessment. Schools would be assessed based on how well students were performing in their assessments. There were accountability outcomes for schools not indicating an increase in student performance.

These developments added a larger degree of involvement for ASBA in legislative advocacy and especially with the state board of education.

In 1999, ASBA added an Accountability section of the Beliefs and Political Agenda. Most pressing was ASBA’s position in regards to “measurement of districts and school performance; and effective assessment of student competencies and performance.” ASBA advocated for state-level incentives for schools and districts that demonstrated improvement in student performance; and supported legislation that provided for state intervention as an appropriate accountability measure for a school that was failing so long as specific provisions of support from the State Board of Education, outlined in the Agenda, were in place. “This is not an easy issue. ASBA will continue to try and resolve the questions related to student achievement and its
measurement... in hopes that an accountability bill that meets ASBA’s litmus test for support can be crafted.” (Robey, 1999)

At the end of 1999, problems with standards alignment in the public education system were already glaring. The newly adopted standards required proficiencies in higher level math that didn’t align with the State Board’s minimum course of study for high school graduation requirement. Teachers with no training in the standards or AIMS continued to teach courses as they had in the past. Many school districts had yet to align curricula with the standards; the result was the possibility of students starting high school with no real possibility of passing AIMS, a requirement for high school graduation.

High-stakes testing had arrived, bringing with it legal and political scrutiny. Arizona’s senior classes of 2002 were slated to be the first class taking an AIMS test that mattered and underachieving students could be denied diplomas. Unfortunately, while the Arizona State Standards were ranked among the best in the nation, the Arizona public school system did not seem able to show student proficiency in them through the 12th grade; students and schools were not AIMS ready.

As the decade moved to its close, ASBA could see that accountability was becoming an issue for members, that legislation was moving in a direction that was more restrictive rather than supportive of governing boards. Issues also were mounting around English as a second language, state trust land, and redistricting.

ASBA released the 2000 Legislative Agenda approved by the 1999 Delegate Assembly. Among top priorities was support for increased funding for all-day kindergarten; preserving election of local school board members and resisting attempts to weaken local control; affirming charter school accountability to the public; opposing direct or indirect use of public funds to support private schools; and advocating increased transportation support levels to reflect the actual costs of transportation to districts.

ASBA AT 50

Amid this, ASBA took time to celebrate, as 1999 commemorated both 50 years of service to governing boards, and 25 years as a nonprofit. The fall 1999 ASBA Journal was dedicated to the anniversary, the cover highlighting pictures of schools as far back as the late 1800s. The entire staff shared short biographies of themselves, including those of new staff members: Renae Watson, who came in as policy technician assisting the expanding Policy Services, and Eleanor Andersen, who was taking over as media and communications specialist. Longtime Director of Membership Services Al Shockley bid farewell to ASBA at the end of the year.
There was a grand announcement in the issue as well: Dr. Donn Williams and staff were still doing their magic. “Arizona School Boards Association announces Policy on the Internet effective immediately. Your policy manual may already be on the Internet and waiting for you to search and retrieve data. Policy Services ... can immediately make available to subscribers the entire text of their policy manual on the Internet. A school district may choose to have access to policy for community members, staff and administration. The Internet version of the manual will be fully searchable by words, phrases, codes, and policy names. ... members can search an index to all policies in a manual. Subscribers can also gain access to statutory and regulatory law, and attorney general opinions hyper-linked to particular policy as found on the Internet. Current subscribers to the electronic info-base program will receive this service free of charge...” No more computer disc!

In the beginning of 2000, Dr. Linda Schmitt joined the staff as director of member services taking over the vacancy left by Al Shockley’s departure the previous year. Training had always been an important aspect of member services and the annual new board member workshop was well attended. As boards faced increased scrutiny and accountability, the need and opportunity to expand the association’s trainings became clear. Regional workshops called Board Operational Leadership Seminars (BOLTS) were added. Law and individual on-site, board trainings were added not long after. Within five years, training services had expanded enough to require an assistant trainer.

At the end of 1999, ASBA deepened the bench in its government relations department, bringing on a new government relations analyst who was also an attorney. Chris Thomas, who had served an internship in the

**School Safety in the Spotlight**

April 20, 1999, tragedy struck on a high school campus in Littleton, Colorado. Two high school seniors began firing shots on campus, murdering 12 classmates and a teacher, and injuring 24 other people. They then turned the guns on themselves and committed suicide. The shock and horror of the massacre reverberated throughout the world. In the days and weeks that followed schools around the nation saw outpouring of sympathy for the Littleton community, extreme fear and shock, and sadly on some campuses threats of similar acts of violence. Parents, teachers and especially children were left unsure how to move forward – what was the new “normal?”

Unfortunately, Littleton changed the nature of violence in schools. School safety, students and campus security, and student rights were among issues that were to become national conversation.

In Arizona, a group of educators and business representatives met on April 21 seeking a way to reach out to the Littleton community and find a way to support Arizona students and educators. “Safe Schools Day” was planned for April 30. Thousands of people signed posters and letters that were collected and sent to the Colorado community. ASBA, county school superintendents, Tosco Marketing Company, Circle K, Exxon, Bank One, Fry’s Grocery Stores, school districts around the state and people all over the state helped to make Safe Schools Day a reality. The activity helped people have a public conversation about the event and reach out to Littleton.
Legislature before law school, brought both lobbying and legal skills to bear. “From a lawyer’s perspective, you’re an advocate no matter what,” said Thomas. “…You could draft a bill, have it pass committee, and you have it on the fast track and change things on a very quick basis for a broad amount of people. So that was always the appeal for me.”

It was a busy time for anyone involved with education policy. At ASBA, the first six months of 2000 were focused on gaining support for Proposition 301, also known as the sales tax increase for education. The measure, referred to the voters by the Legislature, contained five issues.

It would create a funding stream for public education from sales tax for 20 years. Since sales tax fluctuates, the monies available to school districts would fluctuate annually. The intent of the majority of the Proposition 301 K-12 funding was to increase teachers’ salaries, increase accountability among public educational institutions and reward high performing teachers. (Chandler Unified School District, 2015)

If passed, a state tax increase of 0.65 percent would be instituted through June 30, 2021, the revenues going to a myriad of education-based purposes and ending with the Classroom Site Fund, which could be used for class size reduction, AIMS intervention programs, teacher development and dropout prevention programs.

Another aspect of the referendum was to require annual inflation adjustments in the state base support level for public schools; this would become a critical issue for ASBA. The Legislature would be required to increase the base level and other components of the revenue control limit by 2 percent for fiscal years 2001 – 2002 through 2005 – 2006. For fiscal years 2006 – 2007 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Legislature would be required to increase the base level and other components of the revenue control limit by the lesser of 2 percent or the change in the gross domestic product price deflator or, in layman’s terms, inflation.

A third piece of the legislation was a termination of the exemption from the Revenue Control Limit (RCL) for excess utility costs which was to expire at the end of the 2008-2009 budget year. (In FY99-00, school districts budgeted $51 million for excess utilities outside the RCL.)

The Delegate Assembly approved ASBA’s positions on the ballot measure in June and ASBA immediately joined other public education advocates to sell the proposal to the voters on the November ballot.

That wasn’t the only proposition needing attention from education advocates. That year’s ballot had three other very critical propositions. Proposition 107 was an Income Tax Repeal whose long term effects would devastate funding for public education. It prohibited the Legislature from levying income tax on any person or corporation after December 31, 2004. Arizona voters turned it down.
Proposition 203, English Language Education for Children in Public Schools, was sponsored by Ron Unz, a wealthy Californian hoping to replicate his success with a similar proposition in California. He was successful. The proposition got the nod of 63 percent of voters and went into effect during the 2001-2002 school year. It repealed the current statutes on bilingual education and English as a second language and replaced them with one-year sheltered English immersion, a “one size fits all” language program.

Proposition 106, Fair Districts/Fair Elections (Proposition 106), was a redistricting proposition. Legislative district boundaries and congressional districts are redrawn after each 10-year census. Doing so is considered to be among the most political of all processes. When it was the task of the Legislature, it was considered by many to be a conflict of interest. Proposition 106 placed the responsibility of drawing boundaries with an independent redistricting commission. Voters passed the proposition. (The Arizona Legislature filed suit and lost in 2014. They filed with the U.S. Supreme Court, had their day in court in March 2015. The ability of Arizona voters to designate authority to draw congressional districts to an independent redistrict commission was upheld in a 5-4 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court during the 2014-15 term.)

Proposition 200, Healthy Children/Healthy Families, was about the use of tobacco settlement monies, delegating 70 percent of the tobacco tax revenues for programs for family support services. The ASBA supported proposition passed. One of the more impactful aspects of the initiative was KidsCare, which provided at least 50,000 uninsured working parents with health insurance for their children.

At the end of the day, ASBA had cause to celebrate. Most importantly, Arizona voters passed Proposition 301, the sales tax increase and inflation funding measure for education, a resounding “yes” vote for public education.

**IMPACT AT THE BALLOT BOX**

By the time the November ballots had been cast, much had changed in the ASBA office. In the summer, Tom Pickrell had been wooed away from ASBA after eight years, taking a position as general counsel for Mesa Public Schools. Chris Thomas, eager to delve deeper into school law, applied for and became ASBA’s director of legal services.
Janice Palmer arrived in November 2000 as ASBA’s government relations analyst with experience in lobbying, campaigning and advocacy, having worked at the Legislature as well as on the Healthy Children/Healthy Families campaign.

Robey and Palmer worked together well, bringing their different but complementary strengths and styles to bear. Robey, was able to focus on being a strategic presence with key contacts she had fostered through the years since becoming the ASBA’s first lobbyist in 1990. She crafted short fact-sheets describing ASBA’s persuasive and pointedly factual policy: “Here’s why this is important; how could you not vote with us?” Palmer was a strategist, part of a new breed of lobbyist who saw that facts and policy were important, but that a transition was slowly taking place in the Legislature requiring ASBA to be willing to lobby and maneuver more aggressively. “It was an absolute chess game.” (Palmer, 2015)

Another transition was happening as well. Education was becoming more politicized, putting a brazenly non-partisan organization like ASBA in an excellent position. New leadership was taking over in both the Arizona House and the Senate after the 2000 election. ASBA was concerned about efforts to force districts towards unification. Large questions loomed regarding the implementation of the English Language Immersion initiative. AIMS testing was not going well and questions were being asked about implementation. ASBA had success harnessing local grassroots advocacy to impact legislation during the election. After the election, Palmer used her campaign experience and the pre-election effort to continue to grow advocacy amongst members, helping members understand how to communicate with the Legislature about these issues.

ASBA also became educated in a little understood amendment to the Arizona Constitution and the Enabling Act concerning state trust lands. As Arizona approached statehood in 1910, the state received millions of acres of federal land, primarily for the benefit of the public schools, through the Arizona Enabling Act. When Arizona attained statehood in 1912, the constitutional conditions and limits on the management and disposal of the state school trust lands became a part of Arizona’s “fundamental law.”

In 2000, 87 percent of the trust lands (8,113,912 of 9,280,421 acres) were dedicated to Arizona public schools. ASBA has for years taken a leadership role in supporting modernization of the State Land Department so they can provide better stewardship of the land. Additionally, ASBA has been urging that revenues from state trust lands be used to supplement rather than supplant the general fund revenues for public schools, in other words add to education funds allocated by the state as was the original intent, rather than replace funds. (Robey, Capitol View. The Conservation of State Trust Lands, Winter 2000)

In 2002, ASBA supported three measures for the ballot. Proposition 101, Exchange of State Trust Lands, dictated better management and conservation of the trust lands, and enhanced the School Trust Fund. Proposition 104 would assist with allocating monies already authorized by voters in 2000 when Proposition 301 was approved, and additional monies generated by School Trust Lands designated for the Classroom Site Fund. Proposition 300, the final piece of the portfolio, would assure that additional revenues generated through interest from the Permanent School Land Trust and income from leases of School Trust Lands go into the Classroom Site Fund.
Proposition 101 and 104 of the state trust lands ballot package were successful, thanks to Robey’s incredible foresight and groundwork on the project and the teamwork of all of ASBA’s staff.

State trust lands did more for ASBA than first meets the eye. The association’s ability to work with both sides of the Legislative aisle led to an incredibly successful lobbying effort including some homebuilders and cattle growers. With these unlikely allies, public education found itself on the same side as some traditionally Republican interests, and it became a turning point in how ASBA was positioned. This willingness to work outside traditional education circles to meet the needs of public schools was a paradigm shift. It put ASBA on the map.

It was a real turning point in more than just the issue at hand. All of a sudden, ASBA was the lead education association for the first time on an issue, and, in doing so it had made deep Republican inroads. The relationships from this issue carried on into other issues. As a lobbying, government relations, public policy association, ASBA was a major player with some formidable friends outside of the traditional education circle.

In terms of state trust lands, there were huge negotiations. It was put back on the ballot to address the “supplement versus supplant” question so that that the Legislature couldn’t change the financial formula in the future. ASBA led the ballot efforts with funding and working with constituencies. Trust land reform continues to be on the ballot almost every four years; ASBA is at the negotiating table every step of the way – it’s sometimes tough going, but victories have been won. And rewards reaped.

In May 2004, ASBA President Cheryl Main accompanied staff to a State Land Trust Auction as one of only 100 witnesses to what was predicted to be a record-breaking bid for a parcel of Arizona State Trust Land. The Arizona media broadcast the event live. The bidding approached the estimated record bid of $75 million and continued to climb. When it was all done, the final winning bid totaled $100.5 million for the purchase of 276 acres. The proceeds go to the Arizona State Trust Land Permanent Trust Fund. The major beneficiary of the trust is Arizona’s K-12 schools. (Main, 2004)

Teachers received their first checks from the Classroom Site Fund in summer 2005. “The surprise and happy reaction of the Arizona teachers ... was great,” wrote Mark Winkelman, the state’s land commissioner in the ASBA Journal. “Bonus checks, increased salaries and smaller class sizes are long overdue. The entire Land Department staff is working for
teacher bonuses and other benefits from revenue generated by the Land Department to be the rule, and not the exception.” (Winkleman, 2005)

ASBA had new status in the Legislature. The association was lobbying differently. It was less partisan and had greater reach.

THE ERA OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Governor Hull called the Legislature back in special session to look at her plan to ultimately result in a referendum to improve education. It was passed as a bill called Education 2000, a comprehensive education bill funding reform and accountability.

In January 2002, President George Bush signed his landmark education program into law - No Child Left Behind – the federal legislation regarding accountability. Dr. Linda Schmitt, ASBA’s director of membership services, worked with Arizona Department of Education to create a program about accountability requirements. ASBA began providing training and material for members about the law at Summer Leadership Institute in Flagstaff in July 2002.

In May 2002, Governor Hull signed Arizona LEARNS, a bill that represented the combined efforts of ASBA and others in the education and business community. It put into place an accountability system that emphasized student achievement and supported Education 2000, providing details on assessment of school performance with four classifications: improving, excelling, maintaining or underperforming. ASBA fully supported the bill. (Andersen, 2002)

At the same time, the governor signed the last of four other priority bills for school districts including one regarding accountability for students, which was key to school performance labeling beginning in October 2002; another about whether schools would be able to spend Prop. 301 monies, as well as trust land interest earnings, to increase teacher salaries and classroom opportunities for students; and one that would allow school district’s alternative schools to continue to operate to serve their most vulnerable, at-risk youth. (Palmer, 2002 Legislative Session Adjourns with the Passage of all Identified K-12 Education Priority Bills, 2002)

In 2002, Jaime Molera, Arizona’s Superintendent of Public Instruction, announced the launch of the Arizona Business

Staff Profile: Dr. Roger Short

In 2003, Dr. Roger Short took over for Dr. Linda Schmitt as Director of Member Services (now called Leadership Development) and continued outreach of training for members. He also worked on Superintendent Search Services throughout the state, doing on average more than 35 searches a year.
and Education Coalition (ABEC) and “put faces and names to the idea that long-term educational improvement is about partnerships.” ASBA had been fostering the partnership with schools, businesses, parents, teachers and students. This group of people had already worked hard to put Molera’s proposal, Arizona LEARNS, into legislation.

Beginning in spring 2003, many school districts complied with provisions of Arizona LEARNS and No Child Left Behind by notifying parents and community members school status in a variety of formats about how schools in their district were performing. Articles appeared in newsletters and parents in some districts received weekly updates. Some schools were performing well. Others were not. There was often confusion about what the labels meant for schools and for students. Schools worked hard to explain what their achievement profiles meant. Governing boards held forums.

ASBA continued to be involved with the actual law concerning Education 2000 for two to three years after the bill was passed. “We probably had five or six Attorney General Opinions that came our way that helped define what that law was, and ASBA was there every step of the way.” (Thomas, 2015)

Though externally it might have seem as though Government Relations was lobbying and advocating for legislation, Policy Services was focused on member policy, Member Services was off training somewhere, communications was sending out Journals and media releases, and Legal Services was handling legal cases and writing legislation the reality was that ASBA was incredibly interconnected. Legislative issues were and are also a legal issue, which in turn were and are also a communications issue. Policy and training elements naturally interconnect. Teamwork was critical. Palmer points out then, as now, it was a key to ASBA’s success.

On July 1, 2004, Barbara Robey, ASBA’s Director of Governmental Relations retired, and Janice Palmer was promoted to Director of Governmental Relations.

BUILDING AND BOLSTERING PUBLIC SUPPORT

In 2003, Janet Napolitano became governor of Arizona. In 2005, Gov. Napolitano issued a proclamation at the ASBA annual legislative conference designating February to be “School Board Recognition Month” in Arizona. Included in the proclamation are the words, “locally elected school boards are the heart of our public education system.” (Andersen, Governor Napolitano Proclaims School Board Member Appreciation Month, 2005)
But the public didn’t necessarily show they loved the local school board – or public schools - as much as the governor. A heightened focus on accountability at the national and state level had led to a heightened number of negative news stories, which were negatively influencing public opinion about public schools. Polls nationally and locally were being taken asking about how people thought public schools were doing. A 2005 ASBA poll showed only 11 percent of respondents “had something positive to say when asked their first impression about how public schools are doing in Arizona. When asked to grade public schools in general, only 25 percent would give a grade of A or B. When asked to grade their local schools, about half would give a grade of A or B. Yet, when asked to grade their neighborhood school, more than 70 percent would give an A or B. ... How could this be?” (Contreras, Viewpoints, 2005)

The ASBA Board of Directors wanted to combat a relentless stream of negative news with stories of the good news happening in local schools. In 2006, the AZ Public Schools Making a Difference Every Day campaign was announced as a way to help make people aware of the great things happening in public education across the state every day. Key elements of the campaign, which launched in 2007 and continued for four years, were a website where people could read and post stories, and media pitches. Though stories about good things happening in schools were being highlighted, it became evident that more direct approach was required.

The negativity wasn’t just having an effect on the public. There were legislators who wanted to control anything and everything to do with schools: curriculums, budgets, superintendents. Particularly as schools spent beyond their squeezed budgets or failed to perform under the assessment guidelines, there was pressure from the Legislature to hand over control.

Communication needed to reach beyond members. More aggressive media and public advocacy was needed that moved conversations about attempts to control public education in the Legislature to being a part of public conversation.

Supporting public schools and school boards in the public policy arena. Influencing public conversation. These became important parts of ASBA’s activities. The association had made a commitment to expanding grassroots advocacy. One of the new programs was ASBA’s Action and Response Team (AART) which held its first Shadowing Program Day in February 2005 at the Arizona State House and Senate Education

A Lifetime of Servant Leadership

In 2007, the ASBA Board of Directors established the Barbara B. Robey Lifetime Achievement Award. Panfilo Contreras, former ASBA executive director, presented it to Robey, the first recipient, at the ASBA 50th Annual Conference. The award pays tribute to an individual in the educational community who has made an outstanding contribution to public education and ASBA's mission through servant leadership over an extended period of time. Jeretta Douglas, Charlotte Patterson, Dr. Chuck Essigs, Ruth Solomon, Edward Basha, Jr., Carolyn Warner and Cindy Matus Morriss have also received the award. Barbara Robey passed away on June 10, 2014.
Committees. Participants interacted with legislators and saw firsthand how bills are introduced. The program involved grass roots activities such as meeting with legislators, organizing volunteers and testifying to the Legislature. In a nutshell, the program gave AART participants an introduction to the world of politics and the legislative process.

Members were also strongly urged to follow the legislative session online by signing up for regular emails from ASBA.

With each passing legislative session, the need for more voices was greater. ASBA’s public policy strategies had begun to be more and more defensive, with numerous voucher and tax credit proposals, legislation to erode local control, and old and new ways of eroding the budget appearing annually.

How did the 2005 session look? The Tax Payers Bill of Rights (TABOR) was a tricky piece of legislation and ASBA opposed it. It would change the Arizona Constitution to limit state budget increases to population growth and inflation. It instituted an arbitrary cap on expenditure growth that didn’t account for particular pressures. It was bad legislation. It failed in the House.

A unification bill made it through the Legislature. Minimum tax credits amount limits for School Tuition Organizations, better known as STOs, which provide tax credits for contributions to private school tuition, continued to creep higher.

In November 2006, voters passed a sales tax increase on cigarettes to create a funding stream for First Things First, an initiative for early child care and education. ASBA supported the initiative early on after Nadine Basha, who crafted the program, came to present its scope to the association. Simply said, money raised through the sales tax would be disbursed through regional councils into the local communities, helping children from birth to five years old be prepared to enter kindergarten.

In 2006, ASBA greatly increased its focus on grassroots advocacy helped by a new government relations analyst with a gift for working with members, Beth Sauer. Membership in ASBA’s Action and Response Team (AART) jumped. ASBA members who couldn’t physically come down to the Capitol were encouraged to get involved by going online to share their stories and voices with legislators.

ASBA created a comprehensive guide for members explaining how to do effective advocacy. It contained step-by-step discussions of how bills moved through the Legislature, explained how to write effective letters and emails, and how to establish coalitions in your neighborhood. Individualized advocacy trainings for school boards were now available teaching members how to utilize their community resources and form coalitions.
By 2009, ASBA offered free K-12 Advocacy Training Workshops in eight Arizona counties. Understanding that communicating with the Legislature doesn’t come naturally to everyone, ASBA gave workshops about how to effectively engage legislators on K-12 issues important to the community, including school funding. More importantly, the workshops were open to more than just school board members. They were open to parents, students, teachers, community members, city and town government officials, school administrators, district and school employees and “any others who want to lift their voices for public schools.” (Sauer, 2009)

In 2010, “Quality leadership and advocacy for children in public schools” as stated in ASBA’s vision statement was being touted loud and clear. ASBA had opened options up to help their members be more informed and connected with 24-7 access to powerful information. Visitors to the website (www.azsba.org) could access news from the Arizona Capitol with the Daily In-Session Updates, review all education legislation in the Comprehension Brief, and access ASBA’s Advocacy Guide which provided “step-by-step instructions on how to navigate the legislative process and become an effective advocate.” (Sauer, Advocating for Students in the Community and at the Legislature, 2010)

As accountability ratcheted up, ASBA took on a greater and greater role as defender of public schools. They were doing a lot in a lot of places – legally, legislatively, in policy, in advocacy – but there was still a disconnect. While helping so many others get out their voice, it was more and more obvious that ASBA’s could be louder.

In 2007, upon the departure of communications specialist Eleanor Anderson, ASBA hired Tracey Benson. In addition to her experience as a journalist and communications and public relations professional, she brought strategic messaging expertise the association needed.

Her charge was to help ASBA be more “outward facing,” and find additional ways to immerse ASBA in the dynamic dialogue surrounding public education – and to lead it.

At the time, ASBA had three communications mechanisms: A newsletter, a member magazine, and a bare-bones website.

**An Annual Highlight**

Over the years, ASBA members have welcomed dozens of nationally known keynote speakers to the association’s major conferences and events. Some have inspiring, some humorous, and some controversial. All have illuminated the leadership, education and policy issues most important to Arizona’s public education leaders.

There was a lot to write about as ASBA held their 50th ASBA/ASA Annual Conference in December 2007 at the Arizona Grand Resort in Phoenix. Mentoring was the theme. Al Shapiro, the Oscar and Emmy award winning producer of the documentary, “Scared Straight,” spoke on topics about how to handle ethical dilemmas, and his “failure is not an option” success strategies during his opening keynote address. More than 500 school board members and school superintendents attended. Barbara Robey was the recipient of the first Barbara B. Robey Lifetime Achievement Award. And new at the conference that year was a pre-conference workshop, a joint legislative workshop with school business officials and legislators.
ASBA began an aggressive statewide media relations effort coupled with opinion editorials in publications from *The Arizona Republic* and *Arizona Daily Star* to the *Arizona Capitol Times*. Once ASBA started talking, members wanted more. Within a few years, the association had become a primary resource for print and broadcast reporters on public education.

“We were a hidden gem here in terms of the expertise of our staff, and more aggressive media relations changed that,” Benson said. “It was a great opportunity to open up the door to us and let our words go out, and also let our influence go out.” (Benson, 2014)

ASBA also started Facebook and Twitter pages to engage members and other public education supporters through quickly growing social media platforms.

In 2008, ASBA launched its new website. The site had a new look, and much greater ease of navigation that accommodated the association’s beefed up advocacy and communications resources – such as the Daily In-Session Updates. ASBA added Election Issues 2008 with resources to assist board members in understanding key ballot measures, including a school district unification referendum opposed by most public school leaders.

Since 2006, the Arizona School Redistricting Commission had been holding hearings and deliberating but, many thought, largely ignoring the input being given to them by local districts as evidenced by the plan and recommendation they presented to the governor and to the secretary of state for inclusion on the November 2008 ballot. The ballot measure called for the unification of 76 local school districts into 24 large unified districts. ASBA opposed the plan on a basic principle: Unification should be a local initiative, not a top-down effort that sidestepped the local control of governing boards. ASBA went all in, implementing aggressive advocacy, communication and legal strategies to stop the plan. The association believed the two main rationales used by proponents didn’t hold water.

These two main rationales were that large unified districts would cut administrative costs putting more money into the classroom, and that curriculum would be more aligned in unified districts. Neither claim was thought to be valid. To the claim of reduced administrative costs, ASBA countered with research that indicated maximum economies of scale in school administration are served when a district achieves a student count of 5,000 – 6,000. Beyond that it adds layers of administration. (Thomas C. P., Unification: Seperating the Facts from Wishful Thinking, 2008) As for the claim of delivering a continuum of curriculum
that doesn’t exist in non-unified districts, that claim could be refuted by explaining that Arizona has statewide academic standards. All districts unified or otherwise, already were using the same standards.

Many districts where unification was being proposed were angry. Community members had indicated that they were not interested in unification. They were quite vocal that the redistricting commission had ignored their input completely.

ASBA’s Delegate Assembly discussed the issues and came to a position. They took into account the input from members whose districts were being affected. There was no floor discussion and the vote was nearly unanimous. ASBA opposed the plans put forward by the Arizona School Redistricting Commission where all of the school district governing boards affected in a given plan have provided input opposed to unification. This position was adopted by ASBA’s membership on June 28, 2008, at the 2008 Delegate Assembly. That November, local voters defeated nearly every unification plan on the ballot. The few that passed were challenged in court and negated.

In spring 2008, several significant conversations were taking place that would have short and long range effects on Arizona’s public education future. In the short term were FY 2009 and FY 2010 budget shortfalls, which proved to have staggering effects on education budgets. An AIMS Task Force had been convening – ASBA was a participant – and was ready to make recommendations that graduation requirements ought to include reading, writing, and mathematics.

Another conversation having long-range implications was a “Tough Times or Tough Choices” pilot. Arizona had been chosen to participate as one of six states in which the pilot was to take place. It was committed to “significantly improve student achievement through dramatic overhaul of its state education system.” Pilot projects would be underway involving 5 percent of Arizona’s K-12 students at schools and districts volunteering to participate.

A long-range issue ASBA provided funding for was School Finance Reform identified through Arizona Business and Education Coalition (ABEC). Throughout 2008 a framework had been developed for the initiative meant to redesign the state’s school finance system so it

supports increasingly higher levels of learning in all public schools.

Other efforts were underway to increase awareness and educate the public about education issues, and get people involved in the conversation and democratic process of voting on education issues. As part of this effort in 2009, ASBA Board of Directors provided financial support as a charter donor to Expect More Arizona, a public-private partnership launched in April of that year and dedicated to providing public awareness about the importance of improving education in the state.

All were a part of increasing ASBA’s and Arizona’s commitment to public education and children. ASBA was finding and using new ways to influence beyond what they had done in the past. Local control was being threatened, the budget being whittled, and it was questionable as to whether the new Legislature and the newly appointed Governor Jan Brewer had education as a top priority.

It was the perfect time to rally ASBA’s growing number of partners and grassroots advocates. On February 14, 2009, statehood day and Valentine’s Day, they staged the L.O.V.E. – Lifting Our Voices for Education – rally in the Wesley Bolin Plaza, adjacent to the Arizona State Capitol. Parents, teachers, school board members, administrators, and members of the business and civic community came out enforce. They shared personal stories about what public education meant to them and brought Valentine’s cards with positive messages about public education to Gov. Brewer and the state Legislature hoping they would get the message that supporting public education ought to be a top priority of the state. Print and television media were there to cover the event.

Ultimately, advocates were no match for the Great Recession, which had taken a heavy toll on the American economy. With state revenues so heavily dependent on sales tax, cuts were inevitable. FY09 saw $133.2 million in cuts to K-12 education which had to be taken by June 30. FY10 had already been forecasted to be worse at the time the FY09 budget was announced.
Some early education bills in 2010 were significant for ASBA which had had a successful year implementing strategy with the help of both House and Senate leadership. Parameters were set for “Move on When Ready” and “Move on When Reading” both parts of Arizona’s new school reform initiative – Arizona Ready, which ASBA supported. Move on When Ready, a performance-based system was designed to prepare high school students to be college and career ready. Students were offered an alternative “Grand Canyon Diploma” when they mastered subjects on their own that qualified for college level work, in place of a standard high school diploma.

Move on When Reading was an Arizona statute stipulating students in third grade must be reading at proficiency level in order to be promoted to grade four. It was part of an overall strategy of academic outcomes to increase the percentage of third-graders meeting state reading standards to 94 percent in 2020 from only 73 percent in 2010.

Also in 2010, Arizona decided to participate in the federally funded Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), agreeing to develop its own standards in line with Common Core Standards, a national initiative spearheaded by the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers.

The need for additional resources, in light of new education reform measures and the financial pressure of the recession, was both clear and urgent, so when a coalition, led by Governor Brewer was formed to pass a one-cent sales tax to help buoy the budget, ASBA stood strongly in support. Proposition 100 was a success. A special election ballot in May 2010, this was an Arizona sales tax increase projected to generate approximately $1 billion a year. It was only a temporary three year sales tax increase of 1 cent on every dollar of taxable items purchased. The measure passed with 64.3 percent yes votes.

**KEEPING VOUCHERS AT BAY**

Major legal advocacy efforts were underway, too. In 2006, the Legislature passed and Governor Napolitano signed two voucher programs. One of the programs benefited special education students and the other students in foster care.

In 2011 and 2012, ASBA asked school board members to use their positions as community leaders and meet with families, programs, youth serving organizations and faith communities in their districts and talk about the concept of a “web of support.” Working with nationally-known youth development expert Derek Peterson, they had people identify assets and indicators necessary for student success being mindful that every school district had unique cultural, socio-economic, historical and geographical elements. The collected information was organized into a book titled “Helping Kids Succeed – Arizona Style,” which was released on the centennial anniversary of Arizona’s statehood, February 14, 2012. (Peterson D., 2010)
Unlike the tax credit program, it was state money flowing directly to private schools.

ASBA, AEA and AASBO believed the vouchers violated the Arizona Constitution. At ASBA's urging, Phoenix attorney Don Peters, a Constitutional expert, was selected to represent the plaintiffs. Significantly, it was the first litigation where ASBA was on equal footing with the AEA and had selected the litigating attorney. Peters has been ASBA's litigation attorney since then on vouchers, as well as other issues including education (empowerment) savings account (ESA) litigation and inflation funding.

The voucher case, *Cain v. Horne*, was first tried in Maricopa County Superior Court, where Judge Bethany Hicks ruled the two voucher programs to be legal under the Arizona Constitution and existing court precedents. Not to be deterred, ASBA *et al* took the case to the Arizona Supreme Court, where the court unanimously held that school voucher programs providing state funding for the private education of disabled and foster children violated the Arizona Constitution.

It was a win for public education and a milestone for ASBA. Thomas laid it out: “Unlike those other cases where we just reacted and were friend of the court, *amicus*, we actually became a litigant and created a litigation coalition with individuals who would contest bad laws.”

After that ASBA began taking the lead in other litigation, always guided by the ASBA Political Agenda. Within just a few years, ASBA was in that role again.

*Niehaus v. Huppenthal*, an ASBA-led coalition contested the constitutionality of Educational (or empowerment) Savings Accounts, a new version of vouchers the Legislature passed and Governor Brewer signed with the belief new elements of the program could withstand a court challenge. The coalition challenge was unsuccessful. The Maricopa County Superior Court ruled against them in February 2012, and again in Arizona Court of Appeals in October 2013.

**OTHER LEGAL HIGHLIGHTS**

In *Craven v. Douglas/Hobday v. Douglas*, ASBA intervened in the case on the side of the state regarding whether funding for charter schools violates the General and Uniform Clause of the Arizona Constitution, and whether school overrides violate the same clause. Parents of students were claiming that the state was not funding charters as well as traditional public schools and this violates the state constitution. The Maricopa County Superior ruled against the parents. On June 11, 2015, the Arizona Supreme Court denied review of the motion to dismiss, which was granted by the Superior Court and upheld by the Court of Appeals, effectively ending *Craven v. Douglas* and putting to rest the constitutional challenge of the dual funding systems between school districts and charters.

In two cases, ASBA was an *amicus curae* (friend of the court). In *Rumery v. Baier* the Arizona Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional the Legislature’s attempt to use state trust land proceeds to fund the State Land Department. In 2009, the Legislature passed a bill funneling state trust land proceeds, which formerly went straight to fund education, into administrative costs. The Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
(ACLPI) successfully challenged the bill and as a result these dollars were put back where they belong. (ACLPI, 2013)

The second, *Gilbert Unified School District v. Arizona*, was a case deciding whether the Career Ladder program violated the Arizona Constitutions General and Uniform clause since only 28 districts were able to participate. ASBA was *amicus* on the state’s side in the case. Maricopa County Superior Court ruled the program violated the General and Uniform clause of the Arizona Constitution. As ASBA feared, the Legislature used the ruling to eliminate the Career Ladder Program (rather than allowing others districts to join). (Thomas C., Education and the Law: ASBA Advocacy: From the Capitol to the Courts, 2013)

**FRIENDS OF ASBA**

Just as ASBA responded aggressively when an increased need for legal advocacy arose, so too did the association when its ability to engage in issue-based campaigns drew the Legislature’s ire – and then was cut off.

In 2012, the Legislature proposed Proposition 302, Arizona First Things First Program Repeal. ASBA went into action, providing funding to say “no” on the 302 campaign in order to protect the early childhood program. Lawmakers were attempting to shut down the program in order to take its $324 million and put it into the general fund, stating they would manage the money for health and human services for children. The program was already carefully constructed so that regional councils in each county worked to identify what kinds of services were needed the most, and funds were requested and distributed based on each region’s unique needs. It was a very tricky ballot initiative as ASBA and First Things First supporters had to get support by explaining that a “no” vote was a “yes” vote. The campaign was successful and First Things First retained control of their funding. (Cole, 2010)

But ASBA became a target for the part it played. In an attempt to reduce ASBA’s influence on future measures, the Legislature passed a bill, HB2002, effective July 20, 2011, directly aimed at the association that prohibited school districts from belonging to any organization that attempted to influence the outcome of any election. It effectively took ASBA out of issue-based campaign activity that IRS rules say its 501(c)(3) status allow.

ASBA had been preparing for a 501(c)(4) long before the legislative attack was mounted. In fact, staff and board had been discussing the possibility of such an action for several years and were prepared to create an affiliated organization. In advance of that law being effective, an organization called the Friends of ASBA was
formed and the ASBA Board of Directors voted to make a significant contribution that would become the corpus that established Friends.

As a 501(c)(4) the organization has different rules. Under IRS rules, 501(c)(4)s can engage in an unlimited amount of lobbying and can be involved in issue and candidate elections. Because Friends does not receive dues from school districts, its hands are not tied in the way ASBA’s are.

Moving forward, using interest from the corpus, Friends of ASBA can fund contributions to measures that are on the ballot. They even have leeway to give money to independent expenditure campaigns that support candidates but don’t directly give money to their campaigns. It allows Friends of ASBA to be more engaged and active in a wider variety of campaigns than ASBA ever was.

TRANSITION AND TRANSFORMATION
In July 2011, ASBA announced Panfilo Contreras would be leaving after more than a decade as executive director. A reception was held at that year’s annual conference to recognize his years of service.

The ASBA Black Caucus
At the annual membership meeting in 2011, ASBA delegates voted on behalf of their boards for some changes to the Bylaws. Included was Section 2, Board of Directors where President of the Black Caucus was added to the board of directors. The Caucus met officially for the first time at the ASBA/ASA Annual Conference and voted David Evans (Chandler USD) as president for 2011.

In 2013, ASBA’s Hispanic - Native American Caucus honored Contreras, who had been a founding member of the caucus while a board member himself, dedicating a scholarship fund in his name. Recipients are Hispanic or Native American high school students who will attend an Arizona accredited institution to further their education. Three students received the first Panfilo H. Contreras Honorary Scholarship at the 2013 ASBA/ASA Annual Convention, and four received scholarships in 2014.

While the process for hiring a new executive director was under way, the board of directors brought on an interim executive director, Dr. Chuck Essigs, through the winter of 2012. Essigs took a

One of Dr. Tim Ogle’s first official acts as executive director was addressing legislators at a joint meeting of the House and Senate Education Committees, including Senate Chair Rich Crandall and House Chair Doris Goodale.
leave from his role of director of governmental relations for AASBO to stand in at ASBA.

In 2012, Dr. Timothy Ogle, a successful superintendent in a suburban Indianapolis school district got a call from Jack Peterson, a fellow son of Indiana. The two knew each other professionally, as Ogle spent more than 30 years as an educator and public school leader there. Peterson told Ogle he would be getting a call from a headhunter and he shouldn’t ignore it.

At first Ogle declined, but a month later, after he was called by the headhunter again, he submitted an application. He was selected by the board in December 2011, and started on Feb. 1, 2012. (Ogle, 2015)

Dr. Tim Ogle was the new executive director of the Arizona School Boards Association. The professional challenge was intriguing, as was what he called “the tremendous upside potential of this organization.” The board had tasked him with making ASBA bigger and broader, expanding programs and continuing to grow the association to more relevance statewide.

“The synergy that occurs when our team is working together is just tremendous,” said Ogle “And this organization and our members do such good things for communities and kids and their schools, and that’s when it’s magic. The more that we can do to facilitate that around the state and local districts, the better off we are. There are very few opportunities that you get in life to move the needle in such a critical way, but this is one of those.”

Ogle and his team saw ample opportunities for taking a proud past and creating an exciting future. How about a cadre of trainers sent around the state training boards and board/superintendent teams virtually every day? Or being the first in the nation to offer web-based, real-time editing of policies for districts through the new PolicyBridge software? Or expanding communications outreach with AZEdNews, a statewide education news service? Or deepening relationship with trusted, long-term business partners like the Risk Retention Trust of Arizona, which provides property casualty insurance to most of the school districts? All came to pass.

Ogle was passionate about what was happening at ASBA and saw the potential for more as tremendous. “My hope is that it becomes evident as time passes that the whole organization is being elevated with higher expectations along the way.”

By July 2014, the board of directors approved the creation of the associate executive director position to expand the association’s capacity for growth.

School board service and exemplary board members were celebrated at School Board Appreciation Night with the Arizona Diamondbacks in 2012.
Tracey Benson was appointed to the position. In October 2014, Heidi Vega, a former school district communication and community engagement director, was named to replace her as communications director, bringing expertise in marketing and social media to the organization.

An outward sign of the changes afoot was the adoption of a new logo in 2012 that replaced the mark ASBA had used for the previous 25 years. It launched its new “graphic identity” that fall with the mailing of the 2013 Political Agenda. The new look was described as a “reflection of a re-energized organization – one with a solid foundation and proud history, and with its eyes firmly focused on the possibilities on the horizon for Arizona’s children, your board and community, and ASBA.”

There were three key factors prompting ASBA to re-energize the association’s brand identity: A new executive director, a new strategic plan, and an education public policy climate focused on reform and improvement. The process of research and analysis that preceded “re-branding” resulted in a change to organizational culture based on input by members, the ASBA Board of Directors and staff.

Two other results were the redesign and repositioning of the association’s website to better spotlight the key work of the organization, and adoption of new communications and business practices to support ASBA’s strategic plan and ambitious brand attributes.

The association had five initial implementation strategies: Increased use of e-promotions, electronic delivery of all conference materials and availability of wi-fi at all events, an updated online event registration process, availability for online credit card payment processing, and developing and deploying the new PolicyBridge software offering web-based, real-time editing of policies for Policy Services subscribers.

A new sense of possibility that turned into action didn’t stop there. In 2013, a new government
relations analyst, Geoff Esposito, was hired. His campaign background coupled with skills in data management added another layer to ASBA’s grassroots advocacy. The association began extending advocacy to new groups such as Mi Familia Vota and Promise Arizona - though immigration may be their priority issue, education is also on their agenda. Arizona Coalition for Quality Education brought parent groups in contact with ASBA. Other advocacy organizations like Children’s Action Alliance were valuable partners helping to mobilize grassroots efforts.

ASBA strove to meeting advocates where many of them were spending more of their time - online using social media. The association began using an online program with a built-in data management system that made engaging advocates and legislators more efficient and effective, and at the same time allowed the association to collect and process information about people using the site, reading their emails, sending letters, and responding to requests for advocacy support. ASBA could begin to quantify its grassroots advocacy for the first time. Once they started tracking various advocacy activities, they knew they would never go back. Administering and managing data was now an integral part of their grassroots advocacy strategy, allowing ASBA to analyze statistics, measure results and to mobilize more effectively and efficiently.

Another innovation, a streamlined Political Agenda also supported and strengthened advocacy efforts. First adopted by membership in 2013 for the 2014 legislative session, a single-page document outlines a timetable for achieving priorities, replacing the multi-page document focused around key issues.

With grassroots advocacy making significant strides, ASBA turned energies towards another strategic aspect of the new ASBA, adoption of new communications strategies that would further enhance ASBA’s reach and influence.

The nine-month development process for Arizona Education News Service – AZEdNews – started in March 2013. The concept for starting AZEdNews grew out of recent ASBA successes ASBA had achieved in strategically creating public conversation about public education. “AZEdNews was an evolution of this whole idea of being a bigger part of the whole conversation. As we saw traditional media taking fewer and fewer opportunities to cover important stories about education, we decided to be the change we wanted to see. We could be part of the news business and we could be creators of news content and not just recipients of coverage.” (Benson, 2014)

The statewide source for journalism on education policy and practice in Arizona launched with its own website, e-weekly and social media pages in January 2014. Veteran reporter Lisa Irish was hired as lead reporter. AZEdNews delivers original reporting and the latest state and national education news headlines,
Board Training: Times Change, But Issue Remain Much the Same

Over the past 25 years, ASBA has had an esteemed group of staff members in its Leadership Development department, bringing their own leadership strengths and experience to the important task of providing professional development and consultation on leadership topics to Arizona board members. For most of those years, former educators and school district superintendents with experience working effectively with boards guided the department. They have included Dr. Jack Peterson, Dr. Al Shockley, Dr. Linda Schmitt, Dr. Roger Short and Dr. John Gordon. In 2006, Karen Beckvar, who was a serving school board member and had a background in adult education, took the reins, followed in 2013 by Karen Loftus, who brought a new skillset and perspective – adult education, strategic planning and human resources – to bear.

These varying backgrounds provided unique lenses of experience through which they have guided boards on critical issues. Remarkably, though, despite changing political winds, the ebbs and flow of the economy, new standards and assessments, and dramatically changing demographics, the foundational leadership development needs of Arizona school board members has remained remarkably consistent, and ASBA has consistently been a leader in meeting those needs.

And what are those needs and issues? Section B policies. Board authority from a legal perspective. The differing responsibilities of boards and superintendents. Micromanagement – what it is and what it isn’t. Arizona’s Open Meeting Law. The board’s role as an ambassador for the district. Team transitions.

In the past decade, as public education has become more focused on accountability, many boards have sought to take leadership roles in those areas as well, turning an eye towards effectiveness and accountability and engaging ASBA Leadership Development for assistance with strategic planning and board self-evaluation.

and essential data, and reports on education topics including achievement, funding, policy and reform, and legislative and legal happenings, and spotlights the lives of Arizonans who influence or are affected by education policy and practice. Free subscriptions to e-publications could be received via email after signing up through a link (www.azednews.com/subscribe) (Benson, About AZEdNews, 2014). Through its various channels of distribution. AZEdNews articles reached about 15,000 people a week in its first year.

Seven years prior, ASBA’s member magazine and newsletter, each with circulation of about 2,000 and limited to its member districts, were the association’s only communication outlets – just as they were when ASBA closed the book on its first 40 years with the first published history of the association.
AT THIS MILESTONE

As the final quarter of 2015 arrived, a major victory for ASBA was on the horizon – the resolution of Cave Creek USD, et. al. v. DeWit, et. al., a legal case with perhaps the largest, longest reaching impact in ASBA history. After more than seven years of legislative and legal conflict, a settlement to the inflation funding issue was imminent. It had been more than seven years since ASBA first called out the Legislature for failing to meet its requirement in Proposition 301 to raise the per-pupil base level annually by 2 percent or the rate of inflation, whichever was less, and five years since ASBA and two plaintiff partners, as well as a handful of Arizona school districts, had filed a lawsuit against the state.

In fact, the history of the conflict over inflation funding and ASBA's defense of this provision of Proposition when back far longer. In the closing days of the 2000 legislative session, Governor Jane Hull called representatives of the education community into a closed door meeting. There she unveiled her plans to call the Legislature into a summer special session to deal with education funding, the result of which – it was hoped – would put a referendum for the people to vote on the November 2000 ballot. The bill, Education 2000 (SB1007), was passed as a result and serious consideration was given to the items that the people would vote on directly. Why? Because of the recently passed Voter Protection Act from the 1998 election, which stipulated that anything voted on by the people must be followed by the Legislature and was protected from amendments that would undermine those same votes.

Included in Education 2000, which became Proposition 301, was a provision to provide inflation funding at a rate of 2 percent for the first five years and then 2 percent or the rate of inflation, whichever was less, thereafter. Unlike the sales tax that funded the Classroom Site Fund also contained in the referendum, which had a shelf life of 20 years, the inflation mandate was perpetual – it would exist forever, or until the people of Arizona chose to repeal it. Proposition 301 passed in November 2000 by a slim margin.

From 2001 until 2008, everything went according to plan. The Legislature provided the necessary inflation funding and schools began to see funding progress, moving up from the 50th place in education funding among the states, up to 46th place.

From 2001 until 2008, everything went according to plan. The Legislature provided the necessary inflation funding and schools began to see funding progress, moving up from the 50th place in education funding among the states, up to 46th place.
OR other components of the funding formula (which is primarily transportation) that the Legislature had the flexibility – particularly in tough economic times – to fund only the “other components” of the formula, a significantly lower number than the base level that drives funding in the entire system. Worried about this, ASBA worked with state legislators to get an Attorney General Opinion (AGO 101-020) confirming that the law required increases to BOTH the base level and the other components of the school funding system.

Then in October 2008 the U.S. economy collapsed.

ASBA has been involved since 2008 in litigation to enforce the inflation provisions of 15-901.01, as mandated by Prop. 301. In 2009, ASBA sent a letter to the Arizona Legislature stating that the association believed that the inflation mandate had to be followed, even in difficult economic times for the state. However, in that same letter, ASBA stated that it would not sue the state for violation of the law if the Legislature appropriated the proper funding for inflation but cut overall education funding. At the heart of the compromise was that the per-pupil base level would be increased as required by Prop. 301. With the support of then-Governor Brewer, the Legislature did just that in the 2009 legislative session.

In 2010, the Legislature refused to meet their obligation to fund for inflation for a second year and many stated that they were ready to go to court believing that 1) the 15-901.01 mandate gave the Legislature the choice to fund either the base level or transportation (the “and/or” argument); 2) that Prop. 301 was not covered under the provisions of the Voter Protection Act of the Arizona Constitution and 3) the Voter Protection Act could not mandate the Legislature appropriate monies for some future date since appropriations were purely a legislative prerogative. Thus, the Legislature funded only inflation to the transportation formula in the FY2010 budget. It did so again in fiscal years 2011, 2012 and 2013.

ASBA partnered with the Arizona Education Association (AEA) and the Arizona Association of School Business Officials (AASBO) to hire Don Peters of Peters, Cannata and Moody and Tim Hogan of the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest to represent our interests in litigation. School district partners were brought on board (Cave Creek USD, Crane ESD, Palominas ESD, Yuma Union UHSD, Casa Grande ESD).

In September 2014, ASBA and its plaintiff partners held a news conference regarding inflation funding litigation, at which attorney Don Peters (right) reiterated the plaintiffs’ interest in resolving the case. It is worth noting that the initial goal of the litigation was to get a court to clearly and specifically define what the law required and hope that the Legislature would follow the law from that point forward. There was no discussion of a “reset” amount, nor any belief that “back pay” could be provided for the
cumulative lack of inflation funding. In essence, the best hope at the outset of litigation was to return to a period of receiving $70 million to $80 million a year moving forward.

The litigation had an inauspicious beginning: In February 2011, Superior Court Judge Ken Mangum found for the state, agreeing with all three of the legislative arguments. The case then went up to the Arizona Court of Appeals. Fortunately, there in January 2013 a unanimous court reversed Judge Mangum and found for the plaintiffs. The case was then appealed to the Arizona Supreme Court, which also unanimously affirmed the Arizona Court of Appeals ruling in September 2013. The case was sent back to the Superior Court for orders consistent with the opinion.

In July 2014, Superior Court Judge Katherine Cooper ordered the state reset the base levels for Fiscal Years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 to what they would have been had the state complied with the inflation mandate. Judge Cooper also ordered a five-day trial on the cumulative funding not provided during this same period (the so-called “back pay” issue), which took place in October 2014. (To date, there still has been no ruling as to back pay). The plaintiffs made a formal offer of settlement following these actions. The offer was to increase the base level to the reset levels ordered by Judge Cooper in exchange for dropping all claims to back pay. This offer was summarily rejected by the Legislature.

In January 2015, Judge Cooper urged the Legislature, Governor and plaintiffs to enter into mediation talks with a panel of three Arizona Court of Appeals judges. A gag order was placed on all proceedings and all litigation was placed on hold during the mediation. After eight months of talks, in August 2015, the plaintiffs declared an impasse in the mediation and proceeded with litigation while continuing to have discussions with the Governor and legislative leadership. In September 2015, the Arizona Court of Appeals issued a discretionary stay putting Judge Cooper’s reset order on hold while the case is proceeding on the merits at the Court of Appeals.

In July 2015, Governor Doug Ducey announced a plan to put additional dollars into education by increasing the draw from the state land trust, specifically the so-called “corpus” of the permanent endowment fund, which consists of sale proceeds from the State Land Trust. Proceeds are then invested into equities and bonds in the market resulting in an additional return, which adds to the fund. While not endorsing this plan,
ASBA and its plaintiff partners expressed support for increased educational funding and continuing discussions as to how best to accomplish this.

Legal, political and financial forces were aligning and ASBA was involved in all areas. Public pressure to adequately fund public schools had grown more intense over the past year. The moment was ripe. In September 2015, ASBA and its plaintiff partners were invited to the governor’s office to begin vigorous direct settlement negotiations to resolve Cave Creek USD, et. al. v. DeWit, et.al. These talks were fluid and intense from mid-September to late October, at which time all parties agreed on a compromise that they felt would resolve the seven-year-old conflict. Because it required legislative approval, the governor called a special session on Oct. 28, 2015. The three-day session yielded legislation that began the process of settling the inflation funding lawsuit through the referral of Prop. 123 to a special election on May 17, 2016. If Arizona voters approve the measure, the agreement will go into effect, and by the end of fiscal year 2016 schools will begin receiving funding that has been withheld since 2008. In total, it will secure $3.5 billion for Arizona’s public schools over a 10-year period and constitutionally protect inflation funding in perpetuity.

If Prop. 123 fails, the parties will go back to court and ASBA will continue to litigate and advocate on its members’ behalf as it has done so strenuously in this matter since 2008.

PROUD OF THE PAST, EXCITED ABOUT THE FUTURE

The history of ASBA, its member, staff and allies can be expressed in the words of Margaret Mead: “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.”

While much work is left to be done for Arizona students, ASBA has been a leader in positive change for its members and Arizona public school students since the association’s inception and is poised to be in the future.

The organization’s ability to accomplish so much is remarkable. The government relations department and legal department have not expanded since 1990. Policy services, membership services and communications have expanded slightly to accommodate new programs. In 1990, there were 12 staff including administrative support. In 2015, there were just 18. Cross-training, and overlapping and leveraging skill sets have allowed staff to effectively expand services and extend the reach of its voice – the voice of Arizona’s elected school leaders, its students and the communities that support them.

Sixty-six years after ASBA’s first annual meeting was held, ASBA is Arizona’s most steadfast and influential education organization. It has carried out its work, on behalf of Arizona’s elected and appointed local school leaders and the children they serve, with a relatively small staff and boards comprised of people who are mission-driven, imaginative, courageous, prudent, generous and very hard working. They leverage. They innovate. They advocate. They cooperate. They influence. They take action. They are dedicated to quality leadership and advocacy for all children in public schools. Some things never change.
ASBA Member Districts (2015)

In 2015, all Arizona public school districts were members of ASBA.

APACHE COUNTY
Alpine ESD
Chinle USD
Concho ESD
Ganado USD
Mc Nary ESD
Red Mesa USD
Round Valley USD
Sanders USD
St. Johns USD
Vernon ESD
Window Rock USD

COCHISE COUNTY
Apache ESD
Ash Creek ESD
Benson USD
Bisbee USD
Bowie USD
Cochise ESD
Cochise Technology District
Double Adobe ESD
Douglas USD
Elfrida ESD
McNeal ESD
Naco ESD

About “Active”/District Members

ASBA bylaws refer to district members as “active members.” Any governing board of an Arizona school district is eligible to be an active member of the association. Membership is classified under the name of the district represented.

Individual members of active member governing boards:

- May attend ASBA workshops, conferences and events at the member rate.
- Receive all ASBA member publications, including the ASBA Journal quarterly member magazine and the ASBA Report Card twice-monthly e-newsletter.
- May be appointed to serve on ASBA committees and task forces.
- May be elected to serve on the ASBA Board of Directors.

Active member governing boards may:

- Subscribe to ASBA Policy Services and also utilize ASBA’s Executive Search Service.
- Utilize ASBA’s customized team training services.
- Participate in insurance programs offered by ASBAIT (the Arizona School Boards Association Insurance Trust).
- Participate in workplace safety programs offered by SCF Arizona.

Active member boards have the following voting privileges:

- A delegate of each active member board may vote at the Delegate Assembly, where ASBA’s Political Agenda is determined.
- A delegate of each active member board may vote at the Delegate Assembly, and at the association’s annual business meeting, where officers are elected and bylaw changes are voted upon.
ASBA MEMBER DISTRICTS (2015)

Palominas ESD
Pearce ESD
Pomerene ESD
San Simon USD
Sierra Vista USD
St. David USD
Tombstone USD
Valley UHSD
Willcox USD

COCONINO COUNTY
Chevelon Butte ESD
Coconino Association for Vocations, Industry and Technology (CAVIAT)
Flagstaff USD
Fredonia-Moccasin USD
Grand Canyon USD
Maine CSD
Page USD
Tuba City USD
Williams USD

GILA COUNTY
Globe USD
Hayden-Winkelman USD
Miami USD
Payson USD
Pine-Strawberry ESD
San Carlos USD
Tonto Basin ESD
Young ESD
GRAHAM COUNTY
Bonita ESD
Fort Thomas USD
Gila Institute for Technology (GIFT)
Pima USD
Safford USD
Solomon ESD
Thatcher USD

GREENLEE COUNTY
Clifton USD
Duncan USD
Morenci USD

LA PAZ COUNTY
Bicentennial UHSD
Bouse ESD
Parker USD
Quartzsite ESD
Salome ESD
Wenden ESD

MARICOPA COUNTY
Agua Fria UHSD
Aguila ESD
Alhambra ESD
Arlington ESD
Avondale ESD
Balsz ESD
Buckeye ESD
Buckeye UHSD
Cartwright ESD
Cave Creek USD
Chandler USD
Creighton ESD
Deer Valley USD
Dysart USD
East Valley Institute of Technology (EVIT)
Fountain Hills USD
Fowler ESD
Gila Bend USD
Gilbert USD
Glendale ESD
Glendale UHSD
Higley USD
Isaac ESD
Kyrene ESD
Laveen ESD
Liberty ESD
Litchfield ESD
Littleton ESD
Madison ESD
Mesa USD
Mobile ESD
Morristown ESD
Murphy ESD
Nadaburg USD
Osborn ESD
Palo Verde ESD
Paloma ESD
Paradise Valley USD  
Pendegast ESD  
Peoria USD  
Phoenix ESD  
Phoenix UHSD  
Queen Creek USD  
Riverside ESD  
Roosevelt ESD  
Saddle Mountain USD  
Scottsdale USD  
Sentinel ESD  
Tempe ESD  
Tempe UHSD  
Tolleson ESD  
Tolleson UHSD  
Union ESD  
Washington ESD  
West-MEC  
Wickenburg USD  
Wilson ESD  

**MOHAVE COUNTY**  
Bullhead City ESD  
Colorado City USD  
Colorado River UHSD  
Hackberry ESD  
Kingman USD  
Lake Havasu USD  
Littlefield USD  
Mohave Valley ESD
Owens-Whitney ESD
Peach Springs USD
Topock ESD
Valentine ESD
Western Arizona Vocational Education (WAVE) JTED
Yucca ESD

**NAVAJO COUNTY**
Blue Ridge USD
Cedar USD
Heber-Overgaard USD
Holbrook USD
Joseph City USD
Kayenta USD
Northeast Arizona Technology Institute of Vocational Education (NATIVE)
Northern Arizona Vocational Institute of Technology (NAVIT)
Pinon USD
Show Low USD
Snowflake USD
Whiteriver USD
Winslow USD

**PIMA COUNTY**
Ajo USD
Altar Valley ESD
Amphitheater USD
Baboquivari USD
Catalina Foothills USD
Continental ESD
Flowing Wells USD
Marana USD
Pima County JTED
Sahuarita USD
San Fernando ESD
Sunnyside USD
Tanque Verde USD
Tucson USD
Vail USD

**PINAL COUNTY**
Apache Junction USD
Casa Grande ESD
Casa Grande UHSD
Central Arizona Valley Institute of Technology (CAVIT)
Cobre Valley Institute of Technology (CVIT)
Coolidge USD
Eloy ESD
Florence USD
J.O. Combs USD
Mammoth-San Manuel USD
Maricopa USD
Oracle ESD
Picacho ESD
Ray USD
Red Rock ESD
Sacaton ESD
Santa Cruz Valley UHSD
Stanfield ESD
Superior USD
Toltec ESD
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
Nogales USD
Patagonia ESD
Patagonia UHSD
Santa Cruz ESD
Santa Cruz Valley USD
Sonoita ESD

YAVAPAI COUNTY
Ash Fork Joint USD
Bagdad USD
Beaver Creek ESD
Camp Verde USD
Canon ESD
Chino Valley USD
Clarkdale-Jerome ESD
Congress ESD
Cottonwood-Oak Creek ESD
Crown King ESD
Hillside ESD
Humboldt USD
Kirkland ESD
Mayer USD
Mingus UHSD
Mountain Institute JTED
Prescott USD
Sedona-Oak Creek USD
Seligman USD
Skull Valley ESD
Valley Academy for Career & Technical Education (VACTE)
Williamson Valley ESD
Yarnell ESD

**YUMA COUNTY**
Antelope UHSD
Crane ESD
Gadsden ESD
Hyder ESD
Mohawk Valley ESD
Somerton ESD
Southwest Technical Education District of Yuma (STEDY)
Wellton ESD
Yuma ESD
Yuma UHSD
ASSOCIATE MEMBERS 2015

Academy of Math & Science
ASU Preparatory Academy
Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections
Arizona Schools for the Deaf and the Blind
Aztec High School
Ball Charter Schools
Coconino County Accommodation School
Coconino County Superintendent
Dan Hinton Accommodation
Eastpointe High School
First Mesa Elementary School
Ft. Huachuca Accommodation School
Gar, LLC
George Gervin Prep Academy
Gila Community College
Gila County Regional District
Greenelee Accommodation
Ha:San Educational Services
Harvest Preparatory Academy
Hopi Jr./Sr. High School
Horizon Community Learning Center
Imagine Schools
Kestrel High School
Kingman Academy of Learning
Maricopa Community Colleges
Maricopa County Regional School District

About Associate Members

The following non-district governing boards are eligible for association membership:

- Accommodation schools within the state of Arizona
- Charter school governing bodies
- Accredited community colleges
- Arizona county school superintendents
- The Arizona State School for the Deaf and the Blind
- The State Juvenile Education System Board
- Agency school boards, or local school boards, as established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States Department of the Interior
- Tribal school boards

In addition, any former member of a public school governing board may apply to the executive director for associate membership.

- Individual members of associate member governing boards:
- May attend ASBA workshops, conferences and events at the member rate.
- Receive all ASBA member publications, including the ASBA Journal quarterly member magazine and the ASBA Report Card twice-monthly e-newsletter.
- Associate member governing boards may:
- Subscribe to ASBA Policy Services and also utilize ASBA's Executive Search Service.
- Participate in programs offered by ASBAIT (the Arizona School Boards Association Insurance Trust).

Associate members are not eligible to vote at the ASBA Delegate Assembly or the association's annual business meeting. Membership privileges of associate members are determined by the Board of Directors.
Mary C. O’Brien Accommodation School
Mingus Springs Charter
Mohave Accelerated Schools
Mohave County Community College
Navajo County Accommodation
New School for the Arts Middle School
Northland Preparatory Academy
Paragon Mgmt., Inc./Paradise Ed. Center
Pathways Km Charter
Paulden Community School
Pima Accommodation District
Pointe Schools
Prescott Valley Charter School
Rising Schools, Inc.
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community Schools
Santa Cruz County Community College
Second Mesa Day School
Shonto Preparatory School
Southgate Academy Charter
Summit Management Services
Yavapai Accommodation School
ASBA Organizational Affiliate Members (2015)

1GPA
A Quality HVAC Services LLC
ABM Janitorial
ADM Group Inc.
Adolfson & Peterson Construction
Ameresco, Inc.
American Fidelity Assurance
Arizona Correctional Industries
Arizona Gym Floors
Arizona Public Employers Health Pool
Arizona School Plans (ASBAIT)
Arizona State Impact Aid Association
Arizona Technology Council
ASBAIT
Assessment Technology, Inc.
Auto Safety House
The Bagnall Company
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Arizona
Boardbook P.C.
Chartwells School Dining Services
Climatec, LLC
Core Construction
Corporate//Education Consulting, Inc.
Cost Control Associates
Dairy Council of Arizona
Debra Raeder Consulting
DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy
DLR Group
eBOARDsolutions P.C.
Edgenuity
Edupoint Educational Systems, LLC
EMC2 Group Architect Planners
Fagen Friedman & Fulfrst LLP
The Family Voice Advocate

About Organizational Affiliate Members

Commercial or professional service firm that wishes to participate in the programs and activities of the association are eligible for organization affiliate membership. For their support of public education in Arizona, they receive recognition in ASBA publications and on its website, and a variety of other benefits.
FCI Constructors, Inc.
First Financial Group of America
First Things First
Futures Healthcare
G.V. Enterprises
GCA Education Services
Grand Canyon University
Gust Rosenfeld
H2 Group LLC
Haci Service, LLC
HDA Architects LLC
Holbrook Asphalt
Hufford & Horstman
Hunt & Caraway Architects
Immedia Edu
Insurance Professionals of Arizona
Konica Minolta Business Solutions, USA
Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP
M.L. Riddle Painting, Inc.
Mangum, Wall, Stoops & Warden
McCarthy Building Companies, Inc.
McKinstry
The Menta Group
Midstate Energy
Mohave Educational Services Co-Op
National School Boards Association
NTD Architecture
The Orcutt/Winslow Partnership
Peters, Cannata & Moody PLC
Piper Jaffray & Company
Practice Max, Inc.
The Professional Group
Provista
Pueblo Mechanical & Controls, Inc.
RBC Capital Markets
Regional Pavement Maintenance
Ridenour Hienton & Lewis PLLC
Rodel Charitable Foundation
Sletten Construction Company
Smartschoolsplus, Inc.
Sodexo
SPS + Architects
Stifel Nicolaus
Sunland Asphalt
Technology Coordinators
The Trust (Arizona School Risk Retention Trust)
Traaen & Associates, LLC
Udall | Shumway, PLC
Valic
Valley Schools Management Group
Western States Fire Protection
Wholesale Floors LLC
ASBA Bylaws

Last amended December 11, 2014

Article I - Name of the Association
The Association shall be called the ARIZONA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Article II - Purpose of the Association
The Purpose of the Association shall be:

Section 1. To promote the general advancement of public education in the State of Arizona and the United States of America and its Territories.

Section 2. To promote lay control of public education.

Section 3. To coordinate educational policies and procedures and promote uniform application of school laws of the state.

Section 4. To coordinate the activities and interest of school boards and accommodation schools within the State of Arizona.

Section 5. To present reports, recommendations and information concerning education to the Legislature, State Board of Education, and other governmental officials and agencies.

Section 6. To provide leadership to the local school boards.

(a) By exchanging information and ideas pertaining to all aspects of education.

(b) By encouraging effective communication with students, parents, community, school personnel, legislators and appropriate agencies.

(c) By encouraging the most desirable and effective communication between school boards and school personnel, the Legislature, and the general public.

Section 7. To cooperate with other organizations for the benefit of the children in the public schools of the state and nation.
Article III - Policies of the Association

The adoption of the beliefs, of the Arizona School Boards Association, changes thereto, or additions thereto, shall require a majority vote in favor of such adoption by the delegates of member boards. Changes to bylaws and core beliefs may occur by an electronic vote of the membership using a procedure adopted by the Board of Directors.

Article IV - Membership

Section 1. Classes of Membership

(a) Active Member –

Any governing board of a school district of the State of Arizona is eligible to be an active member of the Association, and membership shall be classified under the name of the district thus represented.

(b) Honorary Member –

Each past president of the Association shall automatically become and remain an honorary life member. The Board of Directors of the Association may elect additional honorary life members.

(c) Associate Member –

Accommodation schools within the state of Arizona; the Arizona State School for the Deaf and the Blind; the State Juvenile Education System Board; agency school boards, or local school boards, as established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States Department of the Interior; tribal school boards, charter school governing bodies; and accredited community colleges shall be eligible for Associate Membership. Any former member of a public school governing board shall be eligible for Associate Membership upon written application to the executive director and upon the payment of dues as established by the Association. Membership privileges of the Associate Members shall be determined by the Board of Directors.

(d) Organization Affiliate –

Any commercial or professional service firm that wishes to participate in the programs and activities of the Association shall be eligible for Organization Affiliate Membership upon written application to the executive director and approval by the Board of Directors.

Section 2. Voting Powers of the Membership

(a) Active Members –

A governing board that is an active member of the Association shall be deemed present at a membership meeting if one or more members of such governing boards are in attendance.
On each matter presented to the membership for vote, each governing board that is an active member shall be entitled to one vote, provided such governing board has paid dues as established and assessed in section 3(a) hereafter. The right to the floor for the purpose of discussion shall, however, be open to any and all members of a governing board who is an active member.

(b) **Honorary Members** –
Honorary members shall also have the right to the floor for the purpose of discussion but shall not be entitled to vote.

(c) **Associate Members** –
Associate members shall have the right to the floor for discussion purposes but shall not be entitled to vote.

(d) **Organization Affiliate** –
Organization affiliate members shall not be entitled to vote.

**Section 3. Dues of the Membership**

(a) **Active Members** –
The dues of each active member shall be established by the Association at an annual membership meeting or as established by law.

(b) **Honorary Members** –
Honorary members shall not pay any dues.

(c) **Associate Members** –
The dues of associate members shall be as established by the Association by an electronic vote of the membership using a procedure adopted by the Board of Directors.

(d) **Organization Affiliates** –
The dues of organization affiliate members shall be as established by the Association by an electronic vote of the membership using a procedure adopted by the Board of Directors.

**Section 4. Resignation**

Any member of any classification may submit a resignation in writing to the executive director and such resignation shall be effective ten (10) days after receipt.

**Section 5. Suspension and Expulsion**

Failure to pay dues shall be grounds for suspension or expulsion from the Association. The Board may also terminate the membership of a member for actions of the member contrary to ASBA’s bylaws, under procedures adopted by the Board. Suspension or expulsion shall
automatically constitute a termination (in case of suspension, however, only for the period of suspension) of all member’s rights and privileges in the Association.

Article V - Officers and Board of Directors and Executive Committee

Section 1. Officers and Terms of Office

The officers of the Association shall be president, president-elect, treasurer, secretary, and immediate past president, each of whom shall serve a term of one (1) year or until the selection and/or qualification of his/her successor. Upon election as the president-elect, he/she shall accede automatically to the presidency at such time as he/she is duly qualified. No two offices may be held by the same person.

Section 2. Board of Directors

The governing body of the Association shall be a Board of Directors consisting of the officers, one representative from each of the counties of the state, except Maricopa and Pima counties which are allotted two (2) representatives. County representatives shall serve for a period of two (2) years with no member serving more than three (3) consecutive two (2) year terms. However, at the first meeting of the Board of Directors after the adoption of the bylaws, county representatives shall determine by lot the one-half of their number who will serve for one (1) year and the one-half who will serve for two (2) years. Thereafter, members of the Board of Directors shall be elected by member boards of their counties at their annual County Workshop meetings. Ex-officio members of the Arizona School Boards Association Board of Directors shall be:

(a) Any person residing in Arizona who is either an officer or director of the National School Boards Association during his/her term of office in the national body, and

(b) Any member of an ASBA active member Governing Board serving as President of the Arizona Hispanic Native American Indian Caucus and Black Caucus during his/her term of office in the Caucus.

Section 3. Qualifications

Each officer and director, with the exception of the immediate past president, shall be a member of a governing board which is a member of the Association. No more than one (1) elected officer shall be elected from any one member board and no two (2) board of directors’ positions may be held by the same person.

Section 4. Authority

The board shall manage the affairs of the Association and shall have the power to adopt such rules as are consistent with the bylaws.

Section 5. Nominations and Elections
A nominating committee shall be constituted and selected as follows: the immediate past president of the Association shall serve as chairman of the committee and the remaining members shall be appointed by the president in consultation with the directors from those counties in which a county representative to the Board of Directors is elected for a two-year term. No two (2) members of the nominating committee shall be from the same county, and no more than three (3) members, in addition to the past president, shall be members of the Board of Directors. The committee shall submit a slate of officers consisting of one or more nominees for each office to the general membership at an annual membership meeting. Additional nominations may be made from the floor provided the consent of the nominee has been obtained.

The election of officers of the Association shall take place at the annual membership meeting. The election shall be by written ballot when there is more than one nominee for any office and only designated delegates shall be allowed to vote. The officers, county representatives, and ex-officio members of the Board of Directors shall take office at the close of the annual membership meeting. County representatives to the Board of Directors shall be nominated and elected by the official delegates of the governing boards of school districts at the county workshop of each county.

Section 6. Selection of Executive Director

The executive director shall be appointed by the Board of Directors, with a contract not to exceed four (4) years. He/she shall receive such salary and expenses as the Board shall determine or as may be consistent with the laws of the State of Arizona providing therefore.

Section 7. Duties of Officers, Board of Directors and Executive Committee

The president shall have such power and duties as are usually exercised by such an officer. He/she shall preside at meetings of the Association, the Board of Directors and of the Executive Committee. Unless otherwise provided for herein he/she shall appoint all standing and special committees. The president shall be ex-officio member of all committees, except the nominating committee, with voting power. The president-elect, in the absence or disability of the president, shall have the authority and perform the duties of the president. The treasurer and secretary shall have such powers and duties as are usually exercised by such officers. The treasurer shall collect dues and receipt therefor; shall receive and cause to be deposited all monies belonging to the Association, shall disburse the funds of the Association in accordance with the dictates of the Board. He/she shall report regularly to the board, prepare a budget report to be presented to delegates and membership and shall perform such other duties as are delegated to him/her by the president or by the Board. The secretary shall keep the minutes of all meetings of the Association, the Board, and the Executive Committee; shall keep a membership roster up to date at all times; shall preserve the records and the files of the Association; shall give all notices required.

Section 8. Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be composed of the officers of the Association.
Duties:

(a) The Executive Committee shall have the authority of the Board to act on any emergency when the president deems it impracticable to call a meeting of the entire board.

(b) It may review plans and programs to be presented to the Board at their regular meetings.

(c) It shall have authority to give direction or delegate that such direction be given on legislative action to come before the State Legislature on which there is no formal Association position.

(d) All actions of the Executive Committee shall be subject to ratification by the Board of Directors.

Section 9. Vacancies and removal from office.

A vacancy in any office or on the Board of Directors occurring between annual membership meetings shall be filled by a vote of the Board of Directors. Such person shall hold office until the next annual membership meeting of the Association. Any officer or director who misses more than one meeting out of any four (4) consecutive meetings, unless he/she is excused by the Board for a valid reason, may have his/her office vacated by action of the board.

Article VI - Meetings and Voting

Section 1. Membership Meetings

The Association shall hold an annual membership meeting, and in addition an annual Delegate Assembly at a time and place designated by the preceding annual membership meeting, by a vote of the membership, or by subsequent determination by the Board of Directors. Notice of the time and place shall be given by written notice to all members at least sixty (60) days but not more than ninety (90) days prior to the meeting. Special meetings of the membership may be called at any time by the Board of Directors or by the president; and the president shall call a special meeting promptly upon receipt by him/her of a petition stating the purpose of the meeting signed by no less than ten (10) active members. Notice of the time and place of a special meeting shall be given to members at least fifteen (15) days prior to the meeting date, and such notice shall specify the business to be transacted. The presence of representatives of no less than twenty-five (25) active members shall be necessary to constitute a quorum at any meeting of the membership.

Section 2. Meetings of the Board of Directors and Executive Committee

The Board of Directors shall meet at least once each quarter of each calendar year. Special meetings shall be upon the call of the president, and such meetings shall be called upon written request of five (5) members of the Board of Directors. All members should be given notice of time and place of special meetings at least five (5) days prior to the meeting date. The Executive Committee shall meet from time to time as it deems necessary or upon call of the president.
Section 3. Annual Delegate Assembly

(a) The annual Delegate Assembly shall be held to establish the political agenda items which support the beliefs of the association in the legislative process and in the priorities of the Association. Action agenda items may be submitted to the annual Delegate Assembly of the Association by the action of member boards, the Board of Directors of this Association, or any committee appointed by it, and shall be transmitted to the executive director not later than sixty (60) days before the opening date of the annual Delegate Assembly. All action items so submitted shall be forwarded immediately to the legislative committee for consideration.

(b) The legislative committee is charged with creating a draft political agenda and shall consider the district action agenda item submitted. The draft legislative agenda shall be sent to members at least twenty (20) days prior to the annual Delegate Assembly by the legislative committee.

(c) Other action agenda items submitted to the chairman of the legislative committee during the annual Delegate Assembly and prior to the last business session shall be considered by the membership at said meeting, provided that such action agenda items are in proper written form and signed by registered delegates from at least ten (10) active members.

(d) The reporting member of the legislative committee shall be authorized, on behalf of the committee, to move for floor action on action agenda items and beliefs.

(e) All action agenda items reported out of the legislative committee shall be duplicated as soon as possible and made available to the delegates.

(f) Action agenda items passed at the annual Delegate Assembly will constitute the Political Agenda and shall be considered the position of the Association until the next Delegate Assembly.

(g) The presence of representatives of no less than twenty-five (25) active members shall be necessary to constitute a quorum at the Delegate Assembly.

Article VII - Committees & Caucuses

Section 1. Standing Committees

Standing Committees of the Association shall be a nominating committee and a legislative committee.

The nominating committee shall be so constituted and have such powers as previously provided herein.

The legislative committee, consisting of as many members as deemed advisable by the president and the Board of Directors, shall meet upon the call of the president to consider legislative matters, and the effect thereof on governing boards.
Section 2. Caucuses

Caucuses shall exist to enhance the work of the association by addressing the unique needs of member districts. Caucuses of ASBA are considered to be affiliated with ASBA as a program provider with responsibility for the caucuses. Each caucus is expected to adopt its own bylaws for operating, programming and governing within the context of the relationship with ASBA described herein.

With the adoption of this section, the Black Caucus of ASBA and the Hispanic/Native American Indian Caucus of ASBA are hereby established.

Caucuses shall be added or eliminated to this provision through the amendment process described in article VIII of this document.

Article VIII - Amendment of Bylaws and Core Beliefs

Section 1. These Bylaws or the Core Beliefs may be amended or repealed, or new ones adopted as follows:

(a) By a vote of two-thirds of the member boards using an electronic vote of the membership using a procedure adopted by the Board of Directors.

(b) Amendments may be submitted by action of a member board, the Board of Directors of this Association, or any committee appointed by it, and shall be transmitted to the executive director not later than September 15. Such amendments shall be forwarded to the membership at least thirty (30) days prior to the opening of electronic voting as approved by the ASBA Board of Directors.

Article IX - Parliamentary Authority

Section 1. The rules contained in the current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order newly revised shall govern the proceedings of the ASBA in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order that ASBA may adopt.

Adopted by the ASBA Delegate Assembly, April 6, 1974.

2015 Political Agenda

(Approved by members at the ASBA Delegate Assembly on Sept. 6, 2014)

LONG-TERM FOCUS

These overarching issues must be addressed for public schools to excel and provide an opportunity for every child to succeed. Providing high quality public education is the best investment to grow Arizona’s economy. The items below reflect those key issues on which we will concentrate over the next 5-10 years.

1. Structurally change the school finance formula to equitably and adequately fund public schools to:
   a. Assure a more stable and reliable source.
   b. Maximize local school district flexibility in managing these funds.
   c. Require the same accountability measures of all schools and individuals that receive public funds.
   d. Repeal any program that gives public monies to private schools.

2. Uphold preservation of local control to reinforce the connection between the community and its elected governing board members.

3. Meet the unique educational needs of every student so that every student has the opportunity to reach his/her full potential.

SHORT-TERM FOCUS

Building toward our long-term areas of success, the following items represent critical needs to put us on that path, and will engage our energies up to the next 3-5 years.

1. Fund voluntary, full-day kindergarten and include kindergarten students in the override calculation.

2. Reinstate and fund capital funding formulas to comply with at least state school building minimum standards.

A Member-Driven Process

The Arizona School Boards Association represents and advocates for the diverse interests of public school governing boards and the approximately 1 million Arizona children whose education is entrusted to their care.

ASBA’s position on issues is based on the association’s political agenda, which is discussed, debated and approved by ASBA membership at the annual Delegate Assembly. Every district member board has the opportunity to influence the yearly agenda. The association’s Legislative Committee, composed of interested school board members from throughout the state, provides leadership throughout the process of developing and adopting the political agenda.
3. Provide greater equity in funding and access for special education students within the public school system.

4. Allow public school tax credits to be used as determined by local districts.

5. Establish appropriate financial and academic accountability for Empowerment Scholarship Accounts.

6. Maximize trust land income for teachers’ salaries and student classroom opportunities.

**2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION SPECIFIC**

Building toward our long-term areas of success, the following items reflect issues that will not only move us forward, but we believe can be accomplished next year given the legislative atmosphere and current public trends.

1. Advocate to lessen unfunded mandates and administrative burdens.

2. Restore Building Renewal funding to ensure school facilities are adequately maintained.

3. Change “override/budget increase” language to “locally controlled funding” to better reflect what voters are being asked to support.

4. Allow school districts greater flexibility in the divestiture of property to address population and course needs.

5. Allow districts the option to operate individual schools for 200-day school years and increase accompanying funding to 8 percent from 5 percent to improve student achievement.

6. Restore 9th grade funding for CTE/JTEDs, and fully fund JTEDs at 100 percent, so that students have the opportunity to be exposed to and pursue career fields and/or certification completion.

7. Reinstate the ability of districts to charter schools for innovation.

8. Fund the implementation costs of Arizona’s new standards, assessments, and technology and provide for adequate assessment transition time.

9. Lead efforts to align Arizona’s accountability system with the criteria desired for student, school, and district success.

10. Fund inflation fully in the manner prescribed by statute mandated by Arizona voters.
11. Establish appropriate financial and academic accountability for Arizona Online Instruction programs.
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