

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Board of Education Agenda

Date of Meeting: February 15, 2006

Time: As Shown

Location: Conference Rooms C & D, James Monroe State Office Building
101 North 14th Street, Richmond, Virginia



9:00 a.m. FULL BOARD CONVENES

Moment of Silence

Pledge of Allegiance

Election of the Offices of President and Vice President of the Board of Education, 2006-2008

Approval of Minutes of the January 11, 2006, Meeting of the Board

Public Comment

Recognition

➤ Recognition of the 2006 Regional Teachers of the Year and the Virginia Teacher of the Year

Action/Discussion on Board of Education Regulations

A. First Review of Proposed Revisions to the *Regulations Governing Secondary School Transcripts* (8 VAC 20-160-10 et seq.) (Revised)

Action/Discussion Items

B. Report from the Board of Education's 2005-2006 Student Advisory Committee

C. First Review of Proposed Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*

D. First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Grant Continuing Program Approval to the University of Mary Washington and Sweet Briar College

E. First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Establish Cut Scores for the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment

Action/Discussion Items (continued)

- F. First Review of the Proposed Procedure for Appointment of a School Division Superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education Pursuant to Sections 22.1-60 and 22.1-61 of the *Code of Virginia*
- G. Final Review of a Proposal to Revise the Accreditation Guidelines to Clarify the Pass Rates Required for the New Reading and Mathematics Tests at Grades 4, 6, and 7 in the 2006-2007 Accreditation Ratings

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES - by Board of Education Members and Superintendent of Public Instruction

ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Board of Education members will have dinner at 6:30 p.m. at the Crowne Plaza Hotel on Tuesday, February 14, 2006. Items for the Board agenda may be discussed informally at that dinner. No votes will be taken, and it is open to the public.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

1. The Board of Education is pleased to receive public comment at each of its regular monthly meetings. In order to allow the Board sufficient time for its other business, the total time allotted to public comment will generally be limited to thirty (30) minutes. Individuals seeking to speak to the Board will be allotted three (3) minutes each.
2. Those wishing to speak to the Board should contact Dr. Margaret Roberts, executive assistant for board relations at (804) 225-2924. Normally, speakers will be scheduled in the order that their requests are received until the entire allotted time slot has been used. Where issues involving a variety of views are presented before the Board, the Board reserves the right to allocate the time available so as to insure that the Board hears from different points of view on any particular issue.
3. Speakers are urged to contact Dr. Roberts in advance of the meeting. Because of time limitations, those persons who have not previously registered to speak prior to the day of the Board meeting cannot be assured that they will have an opportunity to appear before the Board.
4. In order to make the limited time available most effective, speakers are urged to provide multiple written copies of their comments or other material amplifying their views.

Summary of Major Elements:

A summary of proposed changes to the secondary school transcript regulations includes:

1. Changes to the definitions section to provide clarity and to ensure that terms are defined in the same manner as other Board of Education regulations.
2. Revision of the effective date of the regulations.
3. Revision(s) and additions to the information required on the transcript.
4. Revision(s) to the required information on the profile data sheet.
5. Revision of sections concerning the weighting of advanced-level courses to ensure that they comport with other state requirements.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education waive first review and authorize staff of the Department of Education to proceed with the requirements of the Administrative Process Act. In addition, the Board may wish to authorize the department staff to make minor technical or typographic changes as necessary.

Impact on Resources:

The impact on resources for the revision of these regulations is not expected to be significant.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

The timetable for further review/action will be largely determined by the requirements of the Administrative Process Act.

Proposed Revisions to

CHAPTER 160

SECONDARY SCHOOL TRANSCRIPT

(8 VAC 20-160-10 et. seq.)

February 15, 2006

CHAPTER 160

SECONDARY SCHOOL TRANSCRIPT.

8 VAC 20-160-10. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this chapter, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"Accelerated course" means a course that can be completed in less than the normal amount of time; the process of progressing through the school grades at a rate faster than that of the average student, either by skipping grades or by rapidly mastering the work of one course and moving on to the next higher course.

"Advanced-level courses/programs" means those academic, career/technical, fine and performing arts, or interdisciplinary high school courses/programs that enable students to acquire and master advanced knowledge. Such courses may be suitable for weighted credit in order to encourage students to take these courses and to be rewarded for the extra endeavor and academic performance these courses/programs require.

~~"Advanced course" means a course that presents material and concepts beyond the introductory or the elementary; a course that carries on from an introductory or elementary course given in the same school.~~

"Advanced Placement (AP) course" means an advanced-level course with a syllabus equivalent to the relevant Advanced Placement syllabus disseminated by the Educational Testing Service The College Board.

"Assessment component" means any of the means by which one obtains information on the progress of the learner and the effectiveness of instruction; quantitative data, objective measures, subjective impressions, tests, and observations may all serve as instruments for deciding whether instructional objectives have been attained.

"Certificate of Program Completion award date" means the date when a certificate of program completion is awarded. A Certificate of Program Completion is not to be included as a diploma option.

"Commonwealth College Course Collaborative (CCCC)" means a set of approved courses taken in high school that fully transfer as core requirements and degree credits at Virginia colleges and universities.

"Credit" means a Standard or a Verified Credit as specified in *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (8 VAC 20-131-10 et. seq.).

"Credit Summary" means the number of courses successfully completed in each discipline as required for graduation.

"Curriculum" means an official guide prepared for use by administrators, supervisors, and teachers of a particular school or school system as an aid to teaching in a given subject or area of study for a given grade; includes the goals and objectives of the course, the expected outcomes, assessment component, and the scope and nature of the materials to be studied.

"Dual enrollment course" means a course that carries both high school and college credit.

"Grade point average" means a measure of average scholastic success in all high-school-credit-bearing courses~~school subjects~~ taken by a student during a certain term or semester, or accumulated for several terms or semesters; obtained by dividing grade points by number of courses taken.

"Graduation Date" means the date when diploma requirements have been met and a diploma is awarded.

"Industry certification credential" means a career and technical education credential that is earned by successfully completing a Board of Education approved industry certification examination, a state issued professional license, or an occupational competency examination.

"International Baccalaureate (IB) course" means an advanced-level course with a syllabus approved by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) and meeting the criteria offered through the IBO program.

"Honors course" means a course offered to academically advanced students to provide opportunities to study and learn with other advanced students and to accelerate their learning in a specific content area. These courses are designed to be more challenging by covering additional topics or some topics in greater depth, ~~at the high school level, that limits enrollment to exceptionally capable students; provides for independent or tutorial work, places the responsibility for student progress more on the student than on the teachers, emphasizes reading and self-instruction.~~

"Secondary school profile data" means information given in a summary format of a particular secondary school, such as location, description, achievement data, definition of curriculum, grading scale, grade distribution, weighted grades, rank in class if a ranking procedure is used, graduation requirements, and explanation of advanced-level, accelerated, advanced placement, honors courses, industry certifications, and other specialized programs.

"Secondary course" means a high school-level course of study that awards high school credits to meet graduation requirements. In addition to providing content and knowledge, secondary courses encourage students to develop higher level thinking skills such as problem solving, critical analyses and syntheses of idea. Students are encouraged to understand, appreciate, and formulate ideas related to scientific, technical and social concepts. ~~course of study planned especially for people of ages approximately 12 to 17, in which the emphasis tends to shift from mastery of basic tools of learning, expression, and understanding to the use and extension of the tools in exploring areas of thought and living, and in exploring and acquiring information, concepts, intellectual skills, attitudes, social, physical, and intellectual ideas, and habits, understanding, and appreciation.~~

"Secondary school transcript" means an official list of secondary courses taken by a student except those purged from a middle school record in accordance with (8 VAC 20-131-10 et. seq.) *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, showing the final grade received for each course, with definitions of the various grades given.

"Weighted course" means ~~advanced placement, advanced or honors level courses~~ an advanced-level course in which credit is increased as determined by local school board policies and defined on the school profile ~~usually by reason of quality of work accomplished.~~

8 VAC 20-160-20. Effective date.

The secondary school transcript regulations shall become effective ~~with seventh grade for~~ students, who take secondary courses for credit in 2007-2008. ~~beginning in the 1988-89 school year.~~

8 VAC 20-160-30. Format options.

Localities have ~~two~~ options for the secondary school transcript format. They may use the Department of Education model or develop their own following board regulations. Localities may also use a digital data exchange format for electronic transcript transmission at such time as one is adopted by the Department of Education. ~~Transcripts developed locally shall be approved by the Department of Education. No standard format is required.~~ The accreditation status of a high school shall not be included on the student transcript provided to colleges, universities, or employers.

The required information is as follows:

1. Name of school division;
2. Student legal name;
- ~~3. Student number;~~
3. State Testing Identifier (STI);
4. Birthdate;
- ~~5. Sex~~ Gender;
6. Home address;
7. Home telephone number;
8. Graduation date;
9. Type of diploma, to include "Advanced Studies," "Standard," or "Other Diplomas Authorized by the Board of Education";

10. Type of industry certification credential and date of completion, if applicable;
11. Certificate of Program Completion and award date, if applicable;
12. Notation of Early College Scholar Designation
130. Name, address, and telephone number of schools student attended each year;
141. Number of days absent within given school year;
152. Course work listed by year with grades;
163. Total credits earned by year;
174. Total A list of verified credits earned;
185. Credits to date;
1916. Grade point average;
2017. Credit summary for entire school experience;
2118. Key to symbols and abbreviations used to denote accelerated, advanced-level courses, Commonwealth College Course Collaborative courses advanced placement, honors, and summer school courses;
1922. Notification of whether school/program ranks students; if so, the rRank in class with given number of semesters used for computation;
230. Final driver education grade;
241. Test record, to include results-highest score earned on college performance-related standardized tests such as College Entrance Examination Board or equivalent SAT and ACT, excluding Standards of Learning (SOL) test scores;
252. Signature and title of school official;
263. Date of school official signature;
274. School name;
28. School Address;
2925. Telephone number of school;
30. Fax number of school;
3126. The school's Department of Education 7-digit code number.

8 VAC 20-160-40. Profile data sheet.

A secondary school profile data sheet for each school reflected on the transcript, that includes the required information, shall be attached to each student transcript sent to colleges, universities, and prospective employers. Schools may furnish additional information. The accreditation status of a high school shall not be included on the school profile data sheet. No standard format is required. The profile data sheet must contain the following information~~required information is as follows:~~

1. Name of ~~guidance director or~~ school counseling director or school counselor;
2. Name, address, and telephone number of school;
3. Description - school/community;
- a-4. Achievement data to include ~~College Entrance Examination Board/Scholastic Aptitude SAT and/or ACT Test code, scores using the most recent data available mean Scholastic Aptitude Test score for the graduating class, average Scholastic Aptitude Test/American College Test scores for the school in comparison with Virginia and the nation;~~
 - b-5. ~~Definition~~Description of curriculum;
6. Grading scale;
7. Grade distribution;
8. Explanation of ~~advanced placement~~, advanced-level, accelerated, and honors courses;
9. Weighted grades, explanation of weighting courses and the computation;
10. Explanation of r~~R~~ank in class, if applicable:
 - _____ a. List courses excluded from computation;
 - _____ b. Explanation of computation of pass/fail courses;
 - _____ c. Student groups included/excluded from ranking in class;
11. Graduation requirements;

8 VAC 20-160-50. Weight of AP~~AP~~advanced-level courses.

All advanced placement (AP) courses shall be weighted for computing the student's grade point average. Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses shall be weighted. Local school boards shall determine which other courses/programs are to receive weighted credits, the amount of weight such courses shall receive, and how those weighted credits will be used in the determination of grade point averages in the school or school division.

8 VAC 20-160-60. Elements for weighting.

~~Advanced, accelerated, advanced placement, and honors level courses to be weighted shall~~ If the course is to be weighted, it must have the following elements:

1. ~~Defined~~ Specified curriculum approved by local board or outside agency meeting criteria of program and/or organization;
2. Standards that exceed normal course requirements; and
3. Defined assessment component.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ B. _____

Date: _____ February 15, 2006 _____

Topic: Report from the Board of Education's 2005-2006 Student Advisory Committee

Presenters: Mrs. Isis M. Castro and Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw, Members of the Board of Education and Sponsors of the Student Advisory Committee

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by
 State or federal law or regulation
 Board of Education regulation
 Other: _____

Action requested at this meeting

Action requested at future meeting: Final report and recommendations will be presented at the April 26-27, 2006, Board of Education meeting

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action
date: _____
action: _____

Background Information: Members of the 2005-2006 Student Advisory Committee were selected from more than 100 nominations received in November 2005 from public middle and high schools across the state. Each middle school and high school was eligible to nominate one student for consideration. Statewide student organizations were also invited to submit nominees. The nominees completed an application packet that included letters of recommendation and essays.

Representatives of the Board of Education reviewed all applications and selected the new members according to Board of Education policy. The membership of the Student Advisory Committee is set forth in Article X of the Board of Education's bylaws. Of the 12 members of the Student Advisory Committee, one high school student is selected from each of the Department of Education's eight Superintendents' Study Group regions, and four middle school students are selected at-large (see attached membership list).

Summary of Major Elements: During the first meeting in December 2005, the members of the Student Advisory Committee discussed a broad spectrum of issues and concerns for students in the public schools across the state. From this discussion, the committee members selected three topics for in-depth study and divided into small work groups focused on the three topics.

At the committee's second meeting on February 14, 2006, the members will continue their discussions and formulate preliminary findings.

At the February 15th Board of Education meeting, the members of the Student Advisory Committee will be introduced and will present a summary of the topics selected for in-depth study.

Superintendent's Recommendation: N/A

Impact on Resources: Department of Education funds are used to support the work of the Student Advisory Committee by reimbursing for travel and other expenses related to the committee's meetings.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: The 2005-2006 Student Advisory Committee is scheduled to hold its final meeting on April 25-26, 2006. The committee will present its findings and final recommendations to the Board of Education at the April 26, 2006 meeting.

Members of the 2005-2006 Student Advisory Committee

Victoria Artis
Daniel Morgan Middle School
Winchester, Virginia

Christina Azimi
James W. Robinson Jr. Secondary School
Fairfax, Virginia

Michael Burt
Hidden Valley High School
Roanoke, Virginia

Taikein Cooper
Prince Edward County High School
Farmville, Virginia

Jennifer Deskins
Bruton High School
Williamsburg, Virginia

Vincent Feucht
West Point High School
West Point, Virginia

Carlie Fogleman
Lebanon High School
Lebanon, Virginia

Stacey LaRiviere
Bailey Bridge Middle School
Midlothian, Virginia

Adrian Lehnen
George Washington Middle School
Alexandria, Virginia

Dion Quick
Hugo Owens Middle School
Chesapeake, Virginia

Franklin Tennyson
Hermitage High School
Glen Allen, Virginia

Alexandra Whitehead
Staunton River High School
Moneta, Virginia

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: C.

Date: February 15, 2006

Topic: First Review of Proposed Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Presenter: Dr. Linda M. Wallinger, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Reporting

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2034
(804) 225-2102

E-Mail Address: Linda.Wallinger@doe.virginia.gov
Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by
 State or federal law or regulation
 Board of Education regulation
 Other: _____

Action requested at this meeting Action requested at future meeting: March 22, 2006 (date)

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action
date _____
action _____

Background Information:

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), requires all state educational agencies (SEA) to submit for approval to the United States Department of Education (USED) individual program applications or a consolidated state application. In May 2002, the Virginia Board of Education submitted and received USED approval for its initial Consolidated State Application under the NCLB law. The NCLB application process involves multiple submissions of information, data, and policies. A major component of the consolidated application is Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook that describes a single statewide accountability system for the commonwealth. Virginia received USED approval for its accountability workbook in June 2003. Additional amendments were made to Virginia's workbook in September 2003, May 2004, and June 2005. The policies and procedures that were used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) ratings for the 2005-2006 school year based on 2004-2005 assessment results are described in the amended workbook dated June 22, 2005.

States are permitted to revise their Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook by submitting requests for review and approval to USED. Guidance from USED suggests an April 1, 2006,

deadline for requesting changes that would impact AYP determinations for the next academic year. Based on four years of implementing NCLB, the Virginia Department of Education has identified certain procedures in implementing AYP policies that may result in unintended consequences. As a result, the board is requested to consider the attached proposed amendments for submission to USED.

Summary of Major Elements

Revisions are being proposed to several critical elements in the Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan. The statutory authority that permits states to request, and the U.S. Secretary of Education to approve, waivers to requirements in NCLB is found in Section 9401 of the federal law:

“SEC. 9401. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

- (a) IN GENERAL – Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory or regulatory requirements of this act for a state educational agency, local educational agency, Indian tribe, or school through a local educational agency, that –
- (1) receives funds under a program authorized by this act; and
 - (2) requests a waiver under subsection (b).”

Virginia’s proposed amendments fall under seven major areas: (1) reversing the order of the school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) sanctions; (2) targeting choice and SES only to the subgroup and individual students not making AYP; (3) identifying for improvement only those schools that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject and subgroup; (4) including the passing scores of all retests of SOL assessments required for graduation in the calculation of AYP; (5) including test scores from only certain grade levels in the 2006-2007 AYP performance calculation for subgroups; (6) extending flexibility in AYP calculation policies for students with disabilities; and (7) modifying testing and AYP calculation policies for limited English proficient (LEP) students. Attachment A describes each proposed amendment, the current NCLB policy approved for Virginia, and the rationale for the proposed request.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept for first review the proposed amendments to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan as permitted in Section 9401 of the federal law.

Impact on Resources:

The provisions of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* require the Department of Education to collect and analyze data related to determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all schools and school divisions in the state as well as to collect and report additional data on the English language proficiency and of limited English proficient (LEP) students. These requirements will continue to have an impact on the agency’s staff resources.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Following final approval, the proposed revisions will be submitted to the United States Department of Education as amendments to Virginia’s Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook by the deadline of April 1, 2006.

Proposed Amendments to Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Required in NCLB

February 2006

NCLB Statutory Authority for Amendment Requests:

“SEC. 9401. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of this act for a state educational agency, local educational agency, Indian tribe, or school through a local educational agency, that —

(1) receives funds under a program authorized by this Act; and

(2) requests a waiver under subsection (b).”

1. Reversing Order of School Improvement Sanctions (Critical Elements 1.6 and 4.1)

Request: Virginia will allow schools the flexibility to reverse the order of sanctions in the first two years of school improvement. Supplemental educational services may be offered to eligible students attending Title I schools in improvement in the first year and public school choice in the second year.

Rationale: Currently, USED requires Title I schools in Year One Improvement status to provide eligible students the option of public school choice. Title I schools in Year Two Improvement status must provide eligible students supplemental educational services and continue to offer choice. An effective school choice plan requires time to develop and communicate to parents and the public. AYP is calculated using test scores from the spring administration and, therefore, AYP determinations are not available until late July or early August. This is too close to the opening of school for choice plans to be implemented effectively. A more effective intervention strategy for the first year of improvement is offering eligible students supplemental services while planning for choice implementation. If the school moves to Year Two Improvement status, the school would offer choice while continuing to provide supplemental educational services.

For the 2005-2006 school year, Virginia is participating in a USED pilot that permits four school divisions to provide SES to eligible students in Title I schools in the first year of school improvement in lieu of choice, thereby reversing the order of sanctions as specified in the law. The pilot divisions are reporting favorable results both in terms of a high level of student participation in SES and anticipated improvements in student achievement.

2. AYP: Targeting Choice and Supplemental Services (Critical Elements 1.6 and 4.1)

Request: Virginia will target supplemental educational services and public school choice for Title I schools in School Improvement only to the subgroup(s) and individual students that are not meeting the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets in reading/language arts and/or mathematics. Choice and supplemental services will be implemented only for the subgroup(s) and individual students not making AYP.

Rationale: The statute treats all schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) equally, regardless of whether such failure is based on one subgroup failing to make AYP in one subject, or all subgroups failing to make AYP in both reading and mathematics. Currently, all students in a Title I school in school improvement status are eligible for school choice, and all low-income students in a school that is in the second year of school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are eligible to receive supplemental services, regardless of their performance on the Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Using federal funds to provide school choice to all students reduces the amount of funds available to serve students in the school that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments. Additionally, school divisions have reported that the majority of students who choose the choice option are not from low-income families nor are they students who are struggling academically. Similarly, using federal funds to provide tutoring services to all low-income students in a school reduces funds available to serve individual students in subgroups that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Since NCLB focuses on ensuring that 100 percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, it is imperative that all available resources are targeted toward those students who are not proficient. Using financial resources for students who are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics limits the resources that could be used for students who are not proficient.

3. AYP: Consecutive Years Same Subject and Same Subgroup (Critical Element 1.6)

Request: Virginia will identify for improvement only those schools that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject and for the same subgroup.

Rationale: Currently, USED requires that Title I schools that fail to meet AYP for two (or more) consecutive years be placed in Title I school improvement. USED regulations permit states to identify for school improvement only those schools that fail to meet AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject, but prohibit states from treating subgroups the same way. This model raises reliability concerns given the many subgroups (i.e., seven in Virginia) that could fail to demonstrate AYP for any given year. This policy also fails to recognize the different educational challenges and interventions that may be appropriate in cases where different subgroups fail to make AYP. Identifying schools in improvement based on not making AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject and same subgroup will target resources to the particular subgroup(s) that need them most.

4. Scores on Retests (Critical Element 3.2)

Request: Virginia will count a student's passing score on a retest of a Standards of Learning test in the calculation of AYP. Retests are provided to students who have previously failed a test they need for graduation.

Rationale: Virginia allows students who need a test for graduation to continue to take the test until they pass it. Currently, USED allows Virginia to count the scores of students who retake and pass expedited end-of-course tests in the calculation of AYP. Virginia requests to expand this policy to include the passing scores of all students who retake tests needed for graduation. Virginia believes counting a student's passing score on a retest rewards the student and the school for student success and will increase the validity of AYP determinations.

5. Grade Levels Included in AYP Calculations (Critical Element 3.2b)

Request: For the 2006-2007 AYP ratings based on tests administered in the 2005-2006 school year, the AYP *participation* rate calculation will be based on reading and mathematics tests administered in grades 3 through 8 and end-of-course. For the *all students* subgroup, AYP *performance* calculations will be

based on tests administered in grades 3 through 8 and end-of-course. The *performance* calculations for the other subgroups (e.g., students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, Black students, White students, and Hispanic students) will be based on tests administered at grades 3, 5, and 8. The newly implemented reading and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, and 7 will be included in the AYP performance calculation for these subgroups only if their inclusion improves the rating of the school or division.

Rationale: As allowable under the final Title I regulations and approved in Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, critical element 3.2b, a state may re-evaluate and adjust periodically the annual measurable achievement objectives and starting points, especially as new tests are introduced. With the introduction of new tests at grades 4, 6, and 7 for the 2005-2006 school year, Virginia will need sufficient time to evaluate the resulting data and determine if adjustments to the starting points and annual measurable objectives are warranted. Such data will not be available until the late summer or early fall of 2006. Based on this timeline Virginia is requesting permission to evaluate the test data from 2005-2006 and to re-set, if necessary, the starting points and annual measurable objectives for the 2007-2008 school year based on tests administered in 2006-2007. For 2006-2007 AYP ratings the current annual measurable objectives would be applied. All tests in reading and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 and end-of-course would be used in calculating the participation rate as well as in the performance measures for the all students subgroup. The scores for the newly implemented reading and mathematics tests for grades 4, 6, and 7 would be included in the performance calculations for the remaining subgroups only if they improved the school or school division's AYP rating. This procedure would take into account the fact that the reading and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, and 7 were not represented when the initial starting points and annual measurable objectives were determined.

6. Assessing Students with Disabilities – Inclusion of SWD Scores for Two Additional Years in AYP (Critical Element 5.3)

Request: Beginning with the 2006-2007 AYP ratings based on tests administered in the 2005-2006 school year, Virginia will include the test scores of students previously identified within the students with disabilities subgroup for up to two years after they no longer receive special education services.

Rationale: In December 2005, USED released proposed regulations for special education students to assist states in improving how they measure the achievement

of students with disabilities. One of the proposed flexibility allowances is to permit states to count the scores of special education students in the students with disabilities subgroup for up to two years after they are no longer labeled as a student with disabilities. This flexibility will permit states to be given credit for the work that has been accomplished to increase the academic achievement of the students with disabilities.

7. Assessing Students with Disabilities – Use of Two Percent Proxy and One Percent Exception (Critical Element 5.3)

Request: Virginia will continue to implement the U.S. Secretary of Education’s Transition Option #1 (two percent proxy) for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the 2006-2007 school year, based on assessments administered to those students during the 2005-2006 school year. The proxy will be calculated in accordance with guidance disseminated by USED on May 10, 2005. The proxy percentage applied in Virginia is 14 percent for reading and 17 percent for mathematics. In addition, Virginia requests an exception of 1.1 percent to the one percent cap on the number of proficient and advanced scores from alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards that may be included in AYP.

Rationale: The U.S. Secretary of Education has extended the use of a proxy for students with disabilities who are pursuing modified achievement standards until final regulations on the application of flexibility for these students are promulgated. Virginia is requesting a continuation of the use of the proxy for these students under this extension.

The exception of 1.1 percent to the one percent cap on the number of proficient and advanced scores from the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) that may be included in AYP is being requested because final data on proficiency scores for VAAP are not yet available. It is possible that the number will fall below 1 percent. However, approval of the use of a 1.1 percent cap will provide the Virginia Department of Education with sufficient flexibility to work with those school divisions that have justifiably exceeded a one percent cap for the VAAP proficiency rate.

8. Inclusion of Limited English Proficient Students in State Assessments (Critical Element 5.4)

Request: Virginia will allow the reading component of the English language proficiency (ELP) test required under Title I, and the plain language forms of the statewide mathematics assessments to be used as the accountability measure

under section 1111(b)(3) for LEP students' academic achievement during their first 1-3 years of enrollment in the U.S. Students who do not achieve a passing score on the mathematics assessment or the reading component of the ELP test would not be counted in the AYP pass rate calculation, but would be counted toward the 95 percent participation rate calculation. This change will allow Virginia to continue implementing testing policies exempting newly arrived LEP students that are in state regulations and were in effect prior to NCLB.

Consistent with current policy, LEP students in grades 3 through 8 at the lower levels (Level 1 and Level 2) of English language proficiency will take the Standards of Learning assessments for English/reading and mathematics, with or without accommodations, or state-approved assessments linked to the Standards of Learning. LEP students cannot take assessments linked to the Standards of Learning for more than three consecutive years.

Rationale: Currently, USED requires that all students enrolled be included in state assessments, and that 95 percent of such students (overall and in each subgroup) participate for a school/division/state to demonstrate AYP. This includes LEP students, except for those LEP students in their first year of enrollment in a U.S. school, regardless of when they entered the country and their language proficiency. In some instances, however, it is not educationally valid or appropriate for newly enrolled LEP students with limited or no English proficiency to participate in English or mathematics state assessments. Additionally, since LEP students learn English at different rates, reporting their scores in AYP results may not be valid indicators of their performance in reading/language arts and mathematics for their first 1-3 years in U.S. schools.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ D. _____

Date: February 15, 2006

Topic: First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Grant Continuing Program Approval to the University of Mary Washington and Sweet Briar College

Presenter: Dr. Thomas A. Elliott, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Teacher Education, Licensure and Professional Practice

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522

E-Mail Address: Thomas A. Elliott@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by
 State or federal law or regulation
 Board of Education regulation
 Other: _____

Action requested at this meeting: Waive first review and approve request for accreditation.

Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action
date _____
action _____

Background Information:

The Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education require colleges and universities that offer programs for the preparation of professional educators to obtain continuing program approval from the Board of Education. In Virginia, the review and approval of programs is viewed as the shared responsibility of institutions of higher education, school divisions, and the Department of Education. Final approval rests with the Board of Education.

The Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education define the standards that must be met and the review procedures that must be followed to obtain and maintain board approval. The regulations currently provide three options for the review of teacher education programs: 1) the state review process for which the college or university must meet the standards established by Board of Education

regulations; 2) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) process for which the college or university must meet the NCATE standards and the board's teaching area requirements; 3) the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) process for which the college or university must produce an *Inquiry Brief* and supporting evidence that its program prepares competent, caring, qualified professional educators. In all three, the institution hosts an on-site visit by a team of trained reviewers who develop a report of findings in which a recommendation is made with regard to the status of the program as approval for continued full accreditation, approval with stipulations, or program denial.

Summary of Major Elements of the State Review Process:

During spring 2005, seven Virginia colleges and universities were scheduled for on-site program reviews. Of the seven, one was reviewed using the NCATE process and six were reviewed under the Board of Education process. *The Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education* set forth 20 standards in the following four categories:

- I. Program Design;
- II. Faculty;
- III. Candidates; and
- IV. Program Operation/Accountability.

The review team makes a recommendation of met or not met for each of the 20 standards. In addition, the team makes a recommendation of approved, approved with stipulations, or denied for the teacher preparation program as a whole; lastly, one of these three recommendations is made for each endorsement program offered by the institution. At its November 21, 2005, meeting the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) recommended that the Board of Education grant full approval to teacher preparation programs at the University of Mary Washington (UMW) and Sweet Briar College. Below are summaries of the review team reports for both institutions.

University of Mary Washington

The review of the University of Mary Washington undergraduate and graduate programs for teacher preparation was conducted March 13-16, 2005, in accordance with the standards and procedures outlined in the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education*. This was the first review conducted under these regulations. Dr. Randy Cromwell served as chair of the on-site review team.

The team recommendation for the University of Mary Washington's teacher preparation program is fully approved. As defined in the approved program regulations, a recommendation of approved is made when the professional education program and the endorsement areas are considered satisfactory. The review team cited all 20 standards as being met. The following weakness was cited under Standard 10 which relates to the admission of candidates. Although UMW has made extensive efforts to recruit qualified teachers, there was no evidence of a measurable plan for recruiting, admitting, or retaining candidates of diverse backgrounds in the graduate programs.

**2003-2004 Praxis I: Reading, Writing, Mathematics Assessments
for Program Completers**

University of Mary Washington	PPST READING	CBT READING	COMPUTER- IZEE PPST READING	PPST WRITING	CBT WRITING	COMPUTER- IZEE PPST WRITING	PPST MATHEMATICS	CBT MATHEMATICS	COMPUTER- IZED EPPST MATHEMATICS	AGGREGATE-- BASIC SKILLS
Number Taking Assessment	58	2	4	58	2	4	57	2	5	64
Number Passing Assessment	56	2	4	58	2	4	54	2	5	64
Institutional Pass Rate	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%

2003-2004 Praxis II Assessments for Program Completers

University of Mary Washington	Number of Students	Test Area	Number Passing	Pass Rate
	39	Elem. Content.	39	100%
	5	Eng. Lang. Lit.	5	100%
	3	Mathematics: Content	3	100%
	2	Social Studies: Content	2	100%
	2	Music: Content	2	100%
	1	Art: Content	1	100%
	3	Spanish: Content	3	100%
	1	Biology: Content	1	100%

Sweet Briar College

The review of the Sweet Briar College teacher preparation program was conducted April 17-20, 2005, in accordance with the standards and procedures outlined in the Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education. This was the first review conducted under these regulations. Dr. Jayne Sullivan of Virginia Wesleyan College served as chair of the on-site review team.

The team recommendation for Sweet Briar College’s teacher preparation program is fully approved. As defined in the approved program regulations, a recommendation of approved is made when the professional education program and the endorsement areas are considered satisfactory. All applicable standards were met.

2003-2004 Praxis I: Reading, Writing, Mathematics Assessments for Program Completers

Sweet Briar College	PPST READING	CBT READING	COMPUTER- IZEE PPST READING	PPST WRITING	CBT WRITING	COMPUTER- IZEE PPST WRITING	PPST MATHEMATICS	CBT MATHEMATICS	COMPUTER- IZED EPST MATHEMATICS	AGGREGATE-- BASIC SKILLS
Number Taking Assessment		1	4		1	4		1	4	5
Number Passing Assessment		1	4		1	4		1	4	5
Institutional Pass Rate		100%	100%		100%	100%		100%	100%	100%

2003-2004 Praxis II Assessments for Program Completers

Sweet Briar College	Number of Students	Test Area	Number Passing	Pass Rate
	2	Elementary: Content	2	100%
	1	Music Content	1	100%
	1	Eng. Lang. Lit. Comp	1	100%

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education waive first review and approve the ABTEL recommendation to grant continuing programs approval to the University of Mary Washington and Sweet Briar College.

Impact on Resources:

Expenses incurred during on site review of teacher education programs are funded by the hosting institution.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Teacher preparation programs reviewed under the state approval process are conducted on a seven year cycle. Programs that meet standards for full approval will be reviewed again on the established cycle.

C. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law.

On March 23, 2005, the Virginia Board of Education approved the establishment of a *Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments*. The committee was charged with the responsibility of examining the use of teacher licensure assessments in Virginia and other states and make recommendations to the Board of Education. The committee's work included, but was not limited to, an examination of appropriate sections of the *Code* including regulations governing licensure of teachers; the federal requirements regarding teacher quality; the use of teacher licensure assessments in other states; and options for using various teacher licensure assessments in the preparation and licensing of teachers.

The *Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments* was established and included representation from the Board of Education, Virginia General Assembly, Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Virginia Education Association, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, institutions of higher education with approved teacher education programs, school division superintendents, school principals, and school division human resources directors.

The committee held four meetings on the following dates: March 31, 2005, April 13, 2005, April 22, 2005, and May 10, 2005. During the meetings, the committee received presentations on national and state perspectives on teacher education and licensure assessments and engaged in discussions with presenters. The presenters from other states included Jane P. Norwood, Vice-Chair, North Carolina Board of Education; Dr. Carol Gilbert, Executive Director for Educator Preparation and Quality, Massachusetts Department of Education; Dr. Marilyn Troyer, Associate Superintendent for the Teaching Profession, Ohio Department of Education; and Dr. Louise A. Tanney, Coordinator of Teacher and Principal Assessment, Division of Certification and Accreditation, Maryland State Department of Education. In addition, the following individuals presented national perspectives on assessments: Dr. Charles Coble, Vice-President, Policy Studies and Programs, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado; Kate Walsh, President of the National Council on Teacher Quality, Washington, DC; Dr. Jane Hannaway, Education Policy Urban Institute for Economic and Social Policy Research, Washington, DC; and Dr. Randy Thompson, Vice-President of the American Board for Certification of Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), Washington, D.C. Opportunities for public comment also were provided during two of the four committee meetings.

During the May 10, 2005, meeting the committee unanimously approved the following recommendation and implementation requirements to be submitted to the Board of Education for review and action:

The *Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments* recommended that the Board of Education prescribe the following professional teacher's examinations for initial licensure in Virginia: (1) Literacy and Communication Skills Assessment; (2) Praxis II (content assessment); and (3) if applicable, the Virginia Reading Assessment.

On June 22, 2005, the Board of Education approved the recommendation of *The Special Committee of the Board of Education to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessments*. An award was granted to National Evaluation Systems, Inc., to develop the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment. The VCLA is composed of two areas—reading and writing. Each area is assessed by a separate subtest—a reading subtest and a writing subtest. The reading subtest contains multiple-choice items. The writing subtest contains multiple-choice items and two writing assignments—a written summary and a written composition. Areas tested include the comprehension and analysis of readings; development of ideas in essay form on specific topics; outlining and summarizing; interpretation of tables and graphs; and mastery of vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The first test administration was held statewide on January 7, 2006.

Summary of Major Elements:

A Validation and Standard-Setting Study was conducted on January 20, 2006. The study, facilitated by staff from the National Evaluation Systems, Inc., was composed primarily of teachers as well as central office school division and higher education representation.

On February 6, 2006, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, received a presentation on the Validation and Standard-Setting Studies from Dr. John Mattar, Senior Area Director, Assessment Service Department, National Evaluation Systems, Inc. The advisory board passed a motion recommending the following cut scores for the VCLA. An individual may meet the requirement by meeting the individual scaled scores on the reading and writing subtests or meeting the composite score.

Reading: 235 scaled score

Writing: 235 scaled score

Composite: 470 scaled score

The members of the advisory board further recommended that the cut scores be re-examined based on data from test takers in two years.

The advisory board made the recommendation based on several factors, including that the VCLA is a new test, and the test data from the January 7 administration may not be representative of the population who will be required to take the test. In addition, colleges and universities may need to adjust their curricula to focus on the objectives of the test.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education receive for first review the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to establish cut scores for the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA).

Impact on Resources: Test takers will pay the testing fees.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: Final review of the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to establish cut scores for the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA) will be presented to the Board of Education on March 22, 2006.

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: F.

Date: February 15, 2006

Topic: First Review of the Proposed Procedure for Appointment of a School Division Superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education Pursuant to Sections 22.1-60 and 22.1-61 of the Code of Virginia

Presenter: Dr. Thomas A. Elliott, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education, Licensure, and Professional Practice

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522

E-Mail Address: Thomas.Elliott@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by

State or federal law or regulation

Board of Education regulation

Other: _____

Action requested at this meeting Action requested at future meeting: 3/22/06 (date)

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action

date _____

action _____

Background Information:

The *Code of Virginia* provides the following requirements in the appointment of a school division superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education:

§ 22.1-60. Appointment and term of superintendent; certain contractual matters.

- A. The division superintendent of schools shall be appointed by the school board of the division from the entire list of eligibles certified by the State Board. All contract terms for superintendents shall expire on June 30. The division superintendent shall serve for an initial term of not less than two years nor more than four years. At the expiration of the initial term, the division superintendent shall be eligible to hold office for the term specified by the employing school board, not to exceed four years.

§ 22.1-60. Appointment and term of superintendent; certain contractual matters (continued)

The division superintendent shall be appointed by the school board within 180 days after a vacancy occurs. In the event a school board appoints a division superintendent in accordance with the provisions of this section and the appointee seeks and is granted release from such appointment prior to assuming office, the school board shall be granted a 60-day period from the time of release within which to make another appointment.

A school board that has not appointed a superintendent within 120 days of a vacancy shall submit a written report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction demonstrating its timely efforts to make an appointment.

- B. No school board shall renegotiate a superintendent's contract during the period following the election or appointment of new members and the date such members are qualified and assume office.
- C. Whenever a superintendent's contract is being renegotiated, all members of the school board shall be notified at least 30 days in advance of any meeting at which a vote is planned on the renegotiated contract unless the members agree unanimously to take the vote without the 30 days notice. Each member's vote on the renegotiated contract shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

(Code 1950, §§ 22-32, 22-33; 1954, c. 638; 1958, c. 44; 1970, c. 155; 1971, Ex. Sess., c. 225; 1972, c. 434; 1980, c. 559; 1983, c. 145; 1989, c. 550; 1992, c. 164; 1996, c. 759; 2002, cc. 165, 374; 2003, c. 866.)

§ 22.1-61. When Board to appoint superintendent.

In the event that a school board fails to appoint a division superintendent within the time prescribed by § [22.1-60](#), the State Board shall appoint such division superintendent.

(Code 1950, § 22-33; 1954, c. 638; 1972, c. 434; 1980, c. 559.)

Summary of Major Elements:

Attached are the proposed procedures for appointment of a school division superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education pursuant to the *Code of Virginia*.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept for first review the proposed procedures for the appointment of a school division superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education.

Impact on Resources: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: The item will be presented for final review on March 22, 2006.

Virginia Board of Education
Commonwealth of Virginia
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, Virginia 23218-2120

**Proposed Procedure for Appointment of a
School Division Superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education**

In the event that a school board fails to appoint a division superintendent within the time prescribed by Sections 22.1-60 and 22-1-61 of the *Code of Virginia*, the Virginia Board of Education shall appoint the division superintendent. The proposed procedures for the appointment of such division superintendent by the Virginia Board of Education shall be as follows:

1. An individual appointed as a division superintendent must hold a valid division superintendent license issued by the Virginia Board of Education prior to the appointment.
2. The Virginia Board of Education shall appoint the division superintendent if the school board has not appointed the division superintendent within 180 (calendar) days after a vacancy occurs. However, in the event a school board appoints a division superintendent in accordance with the provisions of Section 22.1-60 of the *Code of Virginia* and the appointee seeks and is granted release from such appointment prior to assuming office, the school board shall be granted a 60-day period (calendar days) from the time of release within which to make another appointment.
3. A school board that has not appointed a superintendent within 120 (calendar) days of a vacancy shall submit a written report, containing at least a status report with a timeline for making the appointment prior to 180 (calendar) days, to the Superintendent of Public Instruction demonstrating its timely efforts to make an appointment.
4. The school board immediately shall notify the Virginia Board of Education, in writing, of its failure to appoint a division superintendent within the time prescribed by Section 22.1-60 of the *Code of Virginia*. Within 30 days after the time prescribed by Section 22.1-60 of the *Code of Virginia* for the local school board to appoint the division superintendent, the school board must submit in writing its preferred candidates, not to exceed three, for the division superintendent position. The Virginia Board of Education may consider these candidates and other eligible individuals. The Virginia Board of Education may authorize the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to conduct the search for a division superintendent.
5. The Virginia Board of Education shall appoint a division superintendent, and the contract for the superintendent shall be negotiated by the school board.
6. The Board of Education shall appoint the school division superintendent for an initial term of not less than two years or more than four years (contract periods).

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ G. _____

Date: February 15, 2006

Topic: Final Review of a Proposal to Revise the Accreditation Guidelines to Clarify the Pass Rates Required for the New Reading and Mathematics Tests at Grades 4, 6, and 7 in the 2006-2007 Accreditation Ratings

Presenter: Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent for Assessment and Reporting

Telephone Number: 804-225-2102 **E-Mail Address:** Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by

State or federal law or regulation

Board of Education regulation

Other: Previous Board Resolution _____

Action requested at this meeting

Action requested at future meeting:

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action

date: January 11, 2006

action: First Review of a Proposal to Revise the Accreditation Guidelines to Clarify the Pass Rates Required for the New Reading and Mathematics Tests at Grades 4, 6, and 7 in the 2006-2007 Accreditation Ratings

Background Information:

In the 2005-2006 school year new tests in reading and mathematics are being administered in grades 4, 6, and 7 to meet the requirements of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. As the current *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* do not specifically address the calculation of accreditation ratings using these tests, clarification as to the pass rates that are required for full accreditation is needed.

The *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* require each public school to be accredited based primarily on the performance of students on the Standards of Learning tests or additional tests approved by the Virginia Board of Education.

(8 VAC 20-131-280.C.1) Each school shall be accredited based, primarily, on achievement of the criteria established in 8 VAC 20-131-30 as specified below:

1. All students enrolled in a grade or course in which a SOL test is administered shall take each applicable SOL test unless exempted from participating in all or part of the testing program by one of the following:
 - a. IEP Team;
 - b. LEP committee;
 - c. Use of additional tests for verified credit as outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-110.B.;
 - d. In accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-30. B.

(8 VAC 20-131-280.C.2) In a manner prescribed by the Board, the evaluation of the performance of schools shall take into consideration the percentage of eligible students who achieve a passing score on the prescribed SOL tests....

The *Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* differentiate the pass rates required for full accreditation for the grade 3 and grade 5 English tests as 75% and the grade 3 history/social science and science tests as 50%. The pass rate required for full accreditation for all other content areas is 70%.

(8 VAC 20-131-300 Section C) A school will be rated Fully Accredited when its eligible students meet the pass rate of 70% in each of the four content areas except, effective with ratings earned in the 2003-2004 academic year and beyond, the pass rates required shall be 75% in third and fifth grade English and 50% in third grade science and history/social science. In schools housing grades kindergarten through grade five, the English and mathematics pass rates for accreditation purposes shall be calculated for these grades as single pass rates by combining the scores of all grades three and five SOL tests administered in English and by combining the scores of all grades three and five SOL tests administered in mathematics.

Summary of Major Elements:

The Board of Education is asked to approve revisions to the *Guidelines Governing Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* that 1) clarify that the scores of students who take reading and mathematics tests in grades 4, 6, and 7 are to be included in the accreditation rating of the school in which they took the test, and 2) specify the pass rates that are to be applied to accreditation ratings including results from these tests.

Based on the statement in the *Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (8 VAC 20-131-300.C.) that “a school will be rated Fully Accredited when its eligible students meet the pass rate of 70%...,” the pass rates required for the reading and mathematics tests in grades 4, 6, and 7 for full accreditation would be 70%. Alternatively, in schools that include students who have taken a third- or fifth-grade reading test as well as those who have taken a reading test in grades 4, 6, or 7, the scores of all English tests taken in the school may be combined and the resulting pass rate tested against the 75% benchmark. The proposed additions to the accreditation guidelines, which are attached, would apply only to the 2006-2007 accreditation ratings based on

the test results from the 2005-2006 school year.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education adopt the proposed clarification in calculating the 2006-2007 accreditation ratings. The pass rates required for the reading and mathematics tests in grades 4, 6, and 7 for full accreditation will be 70%. Alternatively, in schools that include students who have taken a third-or fifth-grade reading test as well as those who have taken a reading test in grades 4, 6, or 7, the scores of all English tests taken in the school may be combined and the resulting pass rate tested against the 75% benchmark.

Impact on Resources:

The resources needed to modify the computer programs used to calculate accreditation ratings may be absorbed by existing resources at this time.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

NA

Proposed Additions to the *Guidelines Governing Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*

Standard 8 VAC 20-131-300. Application of the standards.

Section C. Accreditation ratings defined.

1. Fully accredited.

a. A school will be rated Fully Accredited when its eligible students meet the pass rate of 70% in each of the four content areas except, effective with ratings earned in the 2003-2004 academic year and beyond, the pass rates required shall be 75% in third- and fifth-grade English and 50% in third grade science and history/social science. In schools housing grades kindergarten through grade five, the English and mathematics pass rates for accreditation purposes shall be calculated for these grades as single pass rates by combining the scores of all grades three and five SOL tests administered in English and by combining the scores of all grades three and five SOL tests administered in mathematics.

Guidelines:

Scores from the reading and mathematics tests administered in grades 4, 6, and 7 will be included in the accreditation ratings of schools administering these tests. The pass rates required for these tests for full accreditation will be 70%. Alternatively, full accreditation may be achieved by combining the scores for the reading tests in grades 4, 6, 7, 8, and end-of-course with the scores for the reading tests at grades 3 and 5 and the writing tests at grades 5, 8, or high school if the resulting combined pass rate meets or exceeds the 75% pass rate required for third- and fifth-grade English.