

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
TEACHER AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS COMMISSION
HODGE EDUCATION BUILDING
2500 NORTH LINCOLN BOULEVARD
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

September 12, 2011

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission began its regular meeting at 1:00 p.m., September 12, 2011, at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Agenda was posted at 12:30 p.m., Friday, September 9, 2011, in accordance with 70 O.S. § 6-101-.17.

The following were present:

Mr. Michael Toth, Chief Executive Officer, Learning Sciences International
Ms. Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent of Student Support, Oklahoma State
Department of Education

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present:

Dr. Janet Barresi, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chair)
Secretary Phyllis Hudecki, Secretary of Education
Mr. Ed Allen, American Federation of Teachers
Dr. Phil Berkenbile, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education
Ms. Sheila Groves, Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association
Ms. Susan Harris, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce
Dr. Jeff Mills, Oklahoma State School Boards Association
Ms. Linda Reid, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation
Mr. Joel Robison, Oklahoma Education Association
Dr. Cynthia Ross, Cameron University
Mr. Robert Ross, Inasmuch Foundation
Ms. Ginger Tinney, Professional Oklahoma Educators
Ms. Amy Polonchek, designee for Dr. Keith Ballard, Tulsa Public Schools

Attendees from the Oklahoma State Department of Education and other guests:

See Attachment A.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Superintendent Barresi called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.. Ms. Holland called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

WELCOME, COMMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS

Superintendent Barresi welcomed the members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission.

MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 23, 2011, REGULAR MEETING APPROVED

Superintendent Barresi requested approval on the August 23, 2011, minutes. Mr. Robison moved to approve, Dr. Mills seconded. With this change, the motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Dr. Berkenbile, yes; Mrs. Groves, abstain; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Dr. Ross, yes; Ms. Tinney, yes; Ms. Polonchek, designee for Dr. Ballard, yes.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON CURRENT TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

- a. Dr. Gracy Taylor, current Contract Trainer for the State of Oklahoma

Dr. Taylor gave information on what is currently being done in the State of Oklahoma in regards to teacher and administrator evaluation. She stated that the law that is currently in place passed in 1984 and the training of administrators to enforce this system began in 1985. She said that there was no Grandfather Clause in this system, so when it started all administrators had to be trained.

The old system has some good points that might be used in the new system. In the current system there is a set of standards of performance for administrators and teachers. She stated that there are 20 standards of performance for teachers and 17 standards of performance for administrators. She stated that nobody has a choice about that; you have to use those standards of performance. You can add to them, they were originally called the minimum criteria; this was the minimum that you would expect of a teacher or administrator if they were going to be effective in the classroom, in a school, or school district.

For example, districts had to do observations as part of their system. The districts could add criteria to what they were doing, but they couldn't subtract from the minimum. The State decided that observations will be part of the system and the local district would decide how to structure those observations. The State decided that there would be minimum set standards of performance and the districts got to decide if they wanted to add set standards of performance.

The current system has 20 identified criteria and was based on the research of Effective Teaching and Effective Classroom Management, and on the research on Teacher Expectations. They were divided into 4 categories:

- Classroom management;
- Instruction;
- Teacher products; and
- Achievement.

The 17 administrative criteria were largely based on the research on Effective Schools and Effective School Leadership. They were divided into 3 categories:

- Administrative management;
- Instructional leadership; and
- Administrative products.

The current system does have one criteria that addresses student achievement. While we are talking about qualitative criteria there, you will have to move to the quantitative at some point. The current system does have a criteria that says a student will demonstrate mastery. But again, it was up to the local district how they measured that criteria. Whether they used actual test scores or looked at other information to measure that criteria, there is a semblance of the quantitative criteria in the current system. (A copy of the current law is attached to your handout.)

The five components of a good system are:

- Set of research-based performance;
- What is the definition of those standards;
- Rating guide;
- Instruments for gathering evidence and procedures; and
- Training.

Questions or comments:

1) Q: Mr. Allen - From your experience, what are the pros and cons of having that mix of state standards and then the districts having some ability to...

A: Dr. Taylor - One thing I was impressed with, in listening to the presentation from Tulsa last time was how much they seem to have invested in terms of giving people input, in teamwork and working together to develop an "in-house system", but still tied to some fairly significant state standards. I think that you build a lot of buy-in if you have a chance to build a system inside, like they did, but there has to be some standards, that have to at least have these components, and have to at least meet these things. I see that as a nice mix and I see that we have some standards of performance based in research that people are already familiar with, that could make the transition to the new system easier.

2) Q: Mr. Allen - So you wouldn't see some kind of inherent flaw if we developed a mix, a flaw that might be in conflict with the new legislation? From your perspective, could you develop something from your perspective?

A: Dr. Taylor - I don't personally, but then I am not on the Commission, either, and so that is a judgment call that you all are going to have to make. I see in the law an opportunity for districts to develop a high quality system that would meet the requirements and still have the input that creates buy-in at the local level.

3) Q: Ms. Tinney - In the system each school district could pick and choose the tool that would best meet their local school's needs.

A: Dr. Taylor - Yes.

4) Q: Mr. Robison - Did you see, as a trainer, that there was any conflict with that system or did it work pretty well?

A: Dr. Taylor - Districts who did a good job of looking at the research and seeing what makes a good system, have one. There are some districts who, like any other thing, say what I can do to get by. And so, as the people come through the training, you can tell which kind of a system that they come from. Whether it's the one that took some time to build some buy-in and do some training and then

there are districts where it hasn't worked very well. They all do have a set of common standards, I will say that, and they all do have to meet some basic requirements. So I think that one advantage of the new law is that we have upped the requirement, we've said, now you have to have a rating system and you have to have a rating guide that defines what those things are. Those are not options, but then it gives some leeway for local districts to build a good quality rating guide.

5) Q: Mr. Robison - I'm not saying that it's not critical yet, but it's true that we have a percentage of teachers in our classrooms now that are ineffective and have been ineffective, and the current system has been used, doesn't that indict that the current system is not adequate to do what it was intended to do?

A: Dr. Taylor - I think that the system is not so much at fault as the people implementing the system. And that is going to be true of any new system that you adopt, too. People have to believe that this is a process worth doing and they have to believe that it is worth doing right, and that it has a beneficial effect when it's worth doing right, and there are people out there that no matter what system you give them, they don't have any intention on doing it the way it is supposed to be done. It's not so much an indictment of the system as an indictment of some people who have never taken this process very seriously in implementing it.

A: Ms. Tinney - That's true in that, regardless what we decide or choose, it really is up to that administrator. We've heard testimony from them, previously, that until they really take it seriously and do this, it really doesn't matter.

6) Q: Mr. Allen - Are you aware of any states that require that folks who have gone through the training to be an evaluator, where they are tested on their knowledge right after they take the training, and if they need to pass?

A: Dr. Taylor - I am not aware of any currently, but I will tell you that when I was a principal in Mississippi, we implemented an evaluation system where there was a test. We watched a videotape, we had to rate a teacher and then the rating was compared to what the intended rating was supposed to be. Then we were all tested and we had to be within a certain percentage of that. But that system is no longer in place. That was the only one that I was involved in and that I am familiar with. I know of no other right now, but that does not mean there isn't any.

A: Ms. Polonchek - There are a number of districts that are doing what we are calling test driving of evaluators, in the Gates network in particular, maybe half a dozen. Tulsa is going to implement that this year, but it is a similar process. Principals or whoever the evaluators are look at videos, score, externally evaluated, and certified. So there are some districts that are using that.

A: Dr. Taylor - Many districts that I have worked with have done that on an informal basis to develop inter-rater reliability so that everybody looking at the same performance see similar things.

7) Q: Dr. Berkenbile - Are any of our technology centers using this, and if not, can it be modified for their use where they have a large number of adults and a few secondary students, or vice versa?

A: Dr. Taylor - Actually, all of the career tech administrators went through the same training that the regular administrators go to. I usually have three or four in every training session. And we talk about modifications, the fact that while the system is intended for certain things, here is a way that you can modify it to make it fit. Even in regular ed. settings there have to be some modifications to fit some special education programs and some other programs within the regular ed. setting.

8) Q: Ms. Groves - Are our school board members throughout the state, obviously, if you're going to have some of the components decided by the districts, going to have some sort of training on the system and given some buy-in on the system that's used? So that they can then talk to their superintendents?

A: Dr. Taylor - I can only speak to a few districts that I have worked in with school board members, so I would say right now that if that happens, it's because the superintendent and the board want it.

REVIEW OF THE MODELS THAT BEEN PRESENTED AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS

a. Ms. White presents the teachers first. Eight checklists were provided. The first four are for the teacher components and the second four are for the leader components. She reminded them that they are focused on the 50% qualitative section of the evaluation system. These are the models that have been presented to the Commission members with one addition, a leader checklist for the Marzano Leader Tool that was not formally presented to you, but was recently developed. And just for comparison purposes, that checklist was included for you to review. If you would like additional information on that system, we will get that to you at a later time.

Ms. White pointed out a couple of pieces on the documents. In the left hand column it says required by statute, so if that is not checked then it means it is not currently in the law requirement, but it is something that is a part of a national best practice. And in the right hand column, a combination of reviewers who have looked at these documents to give you some feedback, in particular in an area where maybe it says, "does not meet criteria", it explains that it may be possible for that model to meet the criteria, but it does not yet or has not been designed in that way. She pointed out that just because it says "does not meet criteria", that it's automatically something that we would not want to consider.

b. Mr. Michael Toth, Learning Sciences International

Mr. Toth walked the Commission members through the documents and what they mean. He stated that there are three things that they need to separate.

- The framework;
- Procedures and policies; and
- Implementation.

Ms. Kerri White discussed the public comment information and the discussions on the recommendations for the qualitative portion of the evaluation system.

Dr. Barresi discussed the consideration of the systems separately, one for leadership and one for teacher. Supt. Barresi stated that as they begin work with the Commission, there was a question with legal counsel, regarding the word “system”. What was the intent of the legislature? Is it the intent of the legislature that we pick one system, one teacher evaluation system, one leader evaluation system, or do we create criteria for a system under which tools could qualify or fail to qualify to meet those requirements. The question was not settled, but she asked the Commission to take that up in terms of their discussions today. Supt. Barresi’s suggestion was that they begin with the teacher evaluation system and that would possibly give them some indication and guidance as they develop the leader evaluation system. She requested comments on that question.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Tinney - I think it’s dangerous just to go into one system, because what if that system fails. I would rather we have criteria so that we have a free market approach. Gives the schools some flexibility and that way they are not locked into one company, because of what happened with Pearson. You don’t have a nightmare happening with just one company. If we have criteria, where it’s free market, then the schools would have flexibility, I think that would be ideal.

Mr. Ross - If it is more than one, does that create difficulties in comparing districts to other districts? Can someone address that? It seems like we do want the ability to look at districts to compare and contrast the evaluations. Maybe that is something that we want or maybe it’s not. How would that impact the comparison if we took the position that this was just a list of criteria and they could go pick what company or whatever model or too that they wanted to use?

Supt. Barresi - It would be my thinking that the metric would be evaluated based on student results. How has this system been found to actually affect practices within the classroom and therefore, student outcomes.

Mr. Robison - I was going to weigh in on an even approach, I do have concerns, that you have multiple systems out there, teachers, if the law is fully implemented, not only are their jobs going to be evaluated, but very possibly their compensation, may hinge on how these evaluations turn out. If you have a hodgepodge of systems out there in the state, I think some teachers may be put in an unfavorable position by doing that. I think we would be better off to apply one system over the state and let that system be evenly applied so that everyone is treated fairly.

Supt. Barresi - As we go into this, and again, as a staff we have talked about all of the different various combinations and it got very complicated. So we can select one system and the Commission may decide to do that. If the Commission decides to set criteria for a system, the Commission also may qualify 2, 3, 4, also designate certain criteria under which other district led development of an evaluation system, or the Commission can decide to determine a default system and allow districts to choose from another system, or 2 systems, or 3 systems. The possibilities are endless, this isn’t like just an either/or. We are going to have to decide one way or another and then based on that move forward.

Dr. Berkenbile - (1) Right now we are using a combination of a lot of different things in technology centers. And I wonder how this will affect those we're already doing, because they value that Baldrige award very highly.

(2) This question came from one of our pre-engineering teachers that teaches AP Physics and was wondering if they have a tremendous class of students who are scoring 28 or 27 on the ACT and very high level, how do they continue to improve and show improvement on that? And what happens if it goes to pay performance? They were concerned about that and I didn't have an answer to either one of those questions.

Ms. White - (1) I am not an expert on many of those that you mentioned, however, it is my understanding that in most of those systems that do some type of awarding of recognition of teachers, school districts, and school buildings, they base you against the criteria that you have set, typically. So, for example, if we are looking at being recognized as a Blue Ribbon School, the evaluation system that Oklahoma chooses would not hinder or advance one building over another from becoming a Blue Ribbon School. They are going to look to see how you compare based on the system that is in place here in the State. Some of the others, I am not as familiar with, but I don't believe it would have serious impact.

(2) To your second question regarding showing improving, there are two pieces that you need to keep in mind, one, when you're talking about the student achievement component, that quantitative component, we'll look at the value added in the coming weeks and how that piece will play out; to the qualitative side, my experience with other states who have used some of these other systems, I think it would be incredibly difficult, if not, theoretically impossible, for a teacher to score at a superior on every one of these indicators that's included in one of these systems. So there is always room for improvement, until you hit superior in all 20 indicators or all 61 indicators, there is always some room for improvement. I think that's where we have heard from teachers, particularly some of the Tulsa teachers in their videos that you heard last week, talked about they got that feedback so they knew specifically what they could do better. When we have good teachers, they don't know what they need do in order to continue to get better, so the more specificity that we can give them, the more likely that they are to know how to improve that craft, even if it is in those small increments over time.

Dr. Mills - I would like to back up and disagree with you all, not that we agree on everything. But, when I think of a system, I think we develop a framework or we work together to develop a framework that says, local school boards, administrators, and teachers, similar to what's happened in Tulsa, you set down and develop your system. Because, if it's my understanding, we are not looking at this model to compare one school to another, that will happen, but that's not the crux of what we are focusing on. We are focusing on improving instruction in the classroom, and I think the thing that has been significant about the Tulsa model, is that they sit down together and worked out those kinks (if you will) and made that system work. I think you'll continue to see, it may not have some of the time that has been obligated to the Marzano or some of the others, but I also think that the cookie cutter system that says here is the only way, is not acceptable for local boards, administrators, and teachers.

Supt. Barresi - So if I understand, you are more in favor of developing a system of criterion whether or not we select certain ones under that or leave it open. Thank you.

Ms. Reid - I would tend to agree that you would get more buy-in, if we develop something similar to this, that is a crosswalk or measure, so to speak, that any system that is approved for use has to at least meet the criteria of everything on whatever crosswalk the State develops for use. But, within a district perhaps they could develop a system or modify one of the systems or take one that we have adopted in whole, as long as it meets those criteria. And we might indeed get, what you referred to, more buy-in from the district because they had a hand in developing it. I appreciated that as well about the Tulsa model, because I'm a former classroom teacher and those teachers had a piece in it. I think that could be crucial to the success of the system.

Ms. Polonchek - We're talking only about the qualitative today, but I keep thinking about the whole piece. And, eventually, when we get to 2013, we'll have each of our teachers and each of our leaders will have a 5 score, 1-5 that encompasses the qualitative and quantitative. There will be some balance there and it will help to either make things consistent, depending on how the State Board goes in terms of adopting that. We, in Tulsa, have started with the qualitative and have gone ahead and started to gather and develop a value added model and we'll be real interested and will use that to validate our studies. I have a hard time thinking about just one piece vs. the other piece. The buy-in is really important as is the district comparison which will happen. One thing, I don't remember exactly how it says this in 2033, for example, teacher evaluation data will be available for teacher prep institutions. If I was at a teacher prep institution, I would be concerned if there was too much difference and patrons were making decisions that way. I also like one other piece, no matter what recommendations the Commission makes, there has to be some room for some piloting of and changing, because if you value this collaboration piece and if you recognize that we are so new into folks taking this type of thing seriously. If we've gone too far and 20 is not enough and 25 is just right, then lets make some allowance for it, with Oklahoma on the cutting edge of this, and it would be nice not to lock ourselves in.

Mr. Allen requested to hear from the experts in the room regarding the number of indicators that Marzano has on the higher end vs. the 20 or 25, the lower amount, for example, Tulsa went down to 20 from 37.

Ms. Polonchek answered the question regarding Tulsa using 20 indicators vs. 37 and how that came about. They met and decided what was working and what was not working. Both teachers and administrators were involved in lowering the number of indicators.

Supt. Barresi requested that Dr. Staples and/or Mr. Springer explain the implementation of the Marzano model.

Dr. Staples and Ms. Greathouse gave information on that implementation.

Ms. Harris commented on Marzano/Tulsa in regards to small rural districts.

Supt. Barresi said that they did say that one option is to mandate a default system under which the state would focus its resources and allow districts to other systems that they could choose from, but if they want to do training, it would not be through state support.

Ms. Reid commented on OCTP study and IHEs data.

Secretary Hudecki commented on the potential of so many variations and opportunities for variations to enter into even using the same instrument. The principal piece of this is training is so important and it would be very difficult to have consistency and continuity, and to have as much of it as you can through good training on the same system if you have a whole bunch of different ones going on.

Dr. Ross said she agreed, it needs to have system criteria that's specific enough to where it's rigorous so that it meets the letter and the spirit of the statute with some kind of default with the training, or a very limited number of options that are controlled.

Supt. Barresi asked the Commission if they agreed with that and that they needed to develop a system that names a default around which training and resources are devoted. And the question to allow other systems to be named from which districts may choose. It allows flexibility and local control.

Mr. Robison asked that there be some language in the final verbiage that would speak to a limited number of options.

Dr. Ross said that there needs to be necessary approval and be controlled.

Ms. Harris asked if we could manage districts changing the numbers of indicators in the framework.

Supt. Barresi said Yes and No. She said that changes to the systems might be like a deregulation issue that would require approval by the State Board.

Ms. Polonchek suggested that further research might lead to a needed change that could then be approved by the State Board.

Mr. Toth explained the impact on student learning and if there is sufficient evidence to warrant the changes that they request in changing the numbers of indicators. He discussed systems and models used in other states and the results from those systems.

Supt. Barresi asked that the Commission make a decision about the recommendations. The Commission had further discussions about the process for receiving public comment on the recommendations.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS
TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RELATED TO THE
QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENTS FOR THE TEACHER AND LEADER
EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION SYSTEM (TLE)**

Superintendent Barresi suggested Preliminary Recommendations related to a default framework, additional frameworks, and processes for approving modifications.

Commission members discussed various wording edits in order to ensure that the recommendations stated clearly what the members supported.

Mr. Robison made a motion to delay naming a default until after public comment; Dr. Mills seconded. Superintendent Barresi called a point of order that recommendation #1 needed to be voted on first.

Preliminary Recommendation #1: For both the Teacher Evaluation System and the Leader Evaluation System, the TLE Commission recommends that the Oklahoma State Board of Education name a default framework that is paid for by the state in terms of training and implementation requirements to serve as the qualitative assessment component that must comprise 50% of the total evaluation criteria required by 70 O.S. § 6-101.16.

Teacher Framework

- The default for the teacher framework should be named after public comment from the list of: Danielson's Framework for Teaching (pending correlation to statutory criteria), Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model, and Tulsa's TLE Observation and Evaluation System (pending correlation to statutory criteria).
- A limited number of frameworks that meet specific criteria, including all statutory requirements, may also be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education for district selection supported by local funds.

Dr. Mills moved to approve, Ms. Tinney seconded. With this change, the motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Dr. Ross, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Ms. Tinney, yes; Ms. Polonchek, designee for Dr. Ballard, yes.

Preliminary Recommendation #1 (Continued):

Leader Framework

- The default for the leader framework should be named after public comment from the list of: Marzano's Leadership Evaluation System (pending correlation to statutory criteria), McREL's Principal Evaluation System (pending correlation to statutory criteria), and Reeves's Leadership Performance Matrix (pending correlation to statutory criteria).
- A limited number of frameworks that meet specific criteria, including all statutory requirements, may also be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education for district selection supported by local funds.

Mr. Allen moved to approve, Mr. Robison seconded. With this change, the motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Dr. Ross, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Ms. Tinney, yes; Ms. Polonchek, designee for Dr. Ballard, yes.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: For both the Teacher Evaluation System and the Leader Evaluation System, the TLE Commission recommends that any modifications to the default framework or other approved frameworks must be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education against a specific set of criteria, including all statutory requirements, based on impact to student learning.

Mr. Ross moved to approve, Dr. Ross seconded. With this change, the motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Dr. Ross, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Ms. Tinney, yes; Ms. Polonchek, designee for Dr. Ballard, yes.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Superintendent Barresi adjourned the meeting.

The next regular meeting of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission will be held on Wednesday, September 28, at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will convene at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln, Suite 1-20, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Janet Barresi, Chairman of the Board

Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent

Attachment A

Oklahoma State Department of Education attendees:

Ms. Mary Colvin, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Christa Knight for Ms. Malissa Cook, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Mr. Marty Fulk, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Other guests:

Mr. Lou Barlow, Barlow and Associates
Ms. Gracie Branch, Oklahoma Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administration (CCOSA)
Mr. Howard Kuchta, Cameron University
Mr. Jim Hawkins, Cameron University
Mr. Leroy Walser, Choosing Excellence, LLC
Ms. Robyn Miller, OACTE
Mr. Joe Robinson, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education
Ms. Gracy Taylor, Oklahoma Educational Service, LLC
Mr. Karl Springer, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Mr. Brian Staples, Oklahoma City Public Schools
M. Randa Pirrong, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Lynn Stockley, TCTA / TPS
Ms. Teena Nations, OCTP
Ms. Pamela Greathouse, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Katie Hawk, OEA
Ms. Alicia Priest, OEA
Ms. Jennifer Pettit, MC3
Ms. Lisa Holder, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Ms. Lorri Thomas, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, GEAR UP
Ms. Amy Polonchek, Tulsa Public Schools
Mr. Jason Nelson, State House
Mr. Corey Holland, State House
Mr. Jack Herron, Professional Oklahoma Educators