

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

January 14, 2002

The Board of Education and Board of Vocational Education met for the regular business meeting in Conference Rooms C&D at the James Monroe State Office Building, Richmond, Virginia, with the following members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Mr. Mark C. Christie

Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson
Mrs. Susan L. Genovese
Mr. Scott Goodman
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Schroder asked for a moment of silence and led in the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to approve the November 27, 2001, minutes of the Board of Education. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed previously to all members of the Board for review.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The following item was deleted from the agenda: *Item K, Report from the Board of Education's Standing Committee on the Standards of Quality*. Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans
- Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List

The Department of Education's recommendation that funding for two projects in the amount of \$1,110,629 be deferred and placed on the First Priority Waiting List was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

First Priority Waiting List

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Patrick County	Stuart Elementary	\$110,629.00
Patrick County	Patrick High	1,000,000.00
	TOTAL	\$1,110,629.00

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans

The Department of Education's recommendation to approve two new applications in the amount of \$1,110,629 subject to review and approval by the office of the Attorney General pursuant to Section 22.1-156, *Code of Virginia*, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Patrick County	Stuart Elementary	\$110,629.00
Patrick County	Patrick High	1,000,000.00
	TOTAL	\$1,110,629.00

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

The Department of Education's recommendation to approve the financial report on the status of the Literary Fund as of October 31, 2001 was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

RESOLUTIONS

A Resolution of Appreciation was presented to the following members of the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program Steering Committee:

Trish Angle, Manchester High School
Sally Hudson, Robert E. Lee Elementary School
Judy Rowe, Christiansburg Primary School
Carl Anderson, Greensville High School
Kathleen Wills, Arlington County Public Schools

Thomas Smith, Fluvanna County Public Schools
Elin Doval
Judy Sorrell, Shenandoah Valley Regional Program
Clint Bennett
Alice Waddell, Natural Bridge Elementary School
Emily Riddick, Edwards Wilson Center
Maria Raynes, T/TAC Office for Region 5
Pam Higginbotham, Eastern Combined School
Barbara Tucker, Rural Point Elementary School
Catherine Nolte, Henrico County Public Schools
Robert Mitchell, Virginia Beach City Public Schools
Kitty Mann
Karen Tompkins
Virginia Santiago, Fairfax County Public Schools, Area 2
Leslie Daniel, Virginia Tech T/TAC
Fred Orlove, VIDD/VCU
Cam Harris
Steve Stafford, University of Kentucky
Paula Burdette, University of Kentucky

Steering Committee Staff:

Dr. Patricia Burgess, Department of Education
Sharon Siler, Department of Education
Dr. Gordon Trump, Department of Education
Nathan Sparks, Department of Education
David Crossley, Department of Education
Doug Cox, Department of Education

February 2002 Board Meeting Rescheduled

Mr. Schroder announced that the February Board meeting has been rescheduled for February 5th instead of the 28th as originally planned. The meeting location will be announced at a later date.

Board Committee to Review Federal Regulations

At Mr. Schroder's request, the following Board members volunteered to serve on a committee to review federal regulations: Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Davidson, Ms. Noble, and Mrs. Genovese. Mr. Christie will chair the committee.

Board of Education Standards of Quality Standing Committee

Mr. Schroder announced that the Board of Education Standards of Quality Standing Committee will meet at the conclusion of today's Board meeting. Mr. Goodman is the chair for this committee.

Office of the Secretary of Education

Mr. Schroder introduced Ms. Sarah Finley, the new Deputy Secretary of Education. On behalf of the Secretary of Education, Ms. Finley said they are looking

forward to working with the Board and Department staff to furthering the quality of education for the children in Virginia.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

First Review of Board of Education Report to the Governor and General Assembly on Public Education

Dr. Cynthia Cave, director of policy at the Department of Education, presented the Board of Education's report concerning Board actions taken over the past four years to strengthen public education in Virginia.

Dr. Cave said that this report presents a compendium of the actions that the Board has taken to address issues and needs in public education from 1998 to 2001. The text of the report includes information about: (1) refining learning objectives; (2) refining assessment of school quality and accountability; (3) defining and measuring student achievement; (4) building instructional capacity; (5) building leadership capacity; (6) expanding options in career and technical education; (7) helping schools and students; and (8) providing for varied populations of students. Major actions by the board are included in each category.

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to waive first review and adopt the proposed text, prepare it in final form, and transmit it to the Governor and to members of the General Assembly. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8VAC 20-21-10 et.seq.)

Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent of teacher education and professional licensure at the Department of Education, presented this item. The *Code of Virginia* requires that the Board of Education prescribe the requirements for licensing. The Board of Education adopted *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* that became effective July 1, 1998. Since the adoption of these regulations, several revisions were proposed, including amendments and reenactments to the *Code of Virginia* that require changes to the licensure regulations.

On September 28, 2000, the Board of Education authorized the Department of Education to begin the regulatory procedures as specified in the Virginia's Administrative Process Act (APA). On April 25, 2001, the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) was approved. The "Statement of Administrative Impact and Projected Costs of Implementation" was disseminated statewide via Informational Superintendent's Memorandum Number 151, dated October 12, 2001. The Board of Education held a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* on Monday, October 22, 2001, beginning at 2:30 p.m. The public hearing was held in Healy Auditorium at the Virginia School for Deaf and Blind in Staunton, Virginia. No individuals commented at the public hearing. In

addition, no written comments regarding the amendments to the licensure regulations were received prior to the December 7, 2001, timeline.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel*. The motion was seconded by Ms. Noble and carried unanimously.

Final Review of the Proposed Regulations Establishing Standards for State-Funded Remedial Programs (8 VAC 20-660-10 et. Seq)

Dr. James S. Heywood, director of elementary instruction at the Department of Education, presented this item.

In July 1999, the Board of Education approved emergency regulations for remedial summer school and SOL remediation programs. These emergency regulations expired on July 1, 2000. House Bill 975, approved on April 8, 2000, amended Section 22.1-199.2 of the *Code of Virginia* requiring the board to promulgate regulations for state-funded remedial programs by August 1, 2000. In June 2000, the Board approved the proposed regulations to begin the next step in the Administrative Process Act (APA) procedures. The proposed regulations establish standards and reporting requirements for state-funded remediation programs. As required, these regulations also establish a formula for determining the level of funding necessary to assist school divisions in providing transportation services to students required to attend state-funded remediation programs.

Chapter 1073, 2000 Acts of Assembly (the 2000-2002 Appropriation Act), allows school divisions to use state payments provided for Standards of Quality remediation, Standards of Learning remediation, and summer school remediation as block grants without restrictions or reporting requirements except those that are necessary for determining funding for the programs. This means that the proposed regulations will be suspended for three state-funded remedial programs—Standards of Quality remediation, Standards of Learning remediation, and remedial summer school—until June 30, 2002.

In April 2001, after approval from the Secretary of Education's office was received, the Board of Education approved the proposed regulations and set a date for a public hearing for June 20, 2001. On September 26, 2001, following receipt of comments from constituents, at the public hearing and during the public comment period, the regulations were revised and the Board of Education approved an extension of the public comment period through November 21, 2001. Comments have been received and summarized by department staff.

Dr. Heywood said that the regulations require that each school division: (1) develop a remedial plan designed to strengthen and improve the academic achievement of eligible students, and submit the plan each year for approval by the Board of Education; (2) maintain individual student records for students enrolled in state-funded remedial programs; (3) annually evaluate data related to remedial program effectiveness and

modify the plan, as appropriate; and (4) report certain data regarding student achievement and program design of state-funded remedial programs.

The regulations also establish minimum standards for state-funded programs including staff qualifications, program length, and a student-to-teacher ratio for remedial summer school. The General Assembly requested a formula to determine the appropriate level of funding for transportation for students assigned to state-funded remedial programs. These regulations provide a proposed formula; however, the current appropriation act does not provide any additional funding for transportation costs associated with remedial program.

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to adopt the regulations establishing Standards for State-Funded Remedial Programs. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

Presentation by Representatives of Citizens Advocating for Special Education (CASE)

Ms. Michelle Petrini, representing Citizens Advocating for Special Education (CASE), presented this item. CASE was formed in 1999 by four “Moms”, all of whom have children receiving special education services in Fairfax County. The other members of CASE are: Lisa Costantini, Robey Manno, and Patti Rubel. The group enlisted the help of Delegate Jay O’Brien and were succeeded in getting legislation passed which would look at the need for Modified SOL tests (HJ302). This legislation is still in committee. CASE has grown from that small group of four, to a larger group that includes teachers, administrators, professionals, advocates, and community leaders from all around the state of Virginia.

Ms. Petrini said that CASE supports Virginia’s efforts towards educational reform and believes the Standards of Learning Program can be an effective tool for Virginia’s reform movement. Ms. Petrini said CASE’s three areas of concern are Standards of Learning, SOL assessments, and accountability. Specifically, CASE requested that two special education representatives be placed on each of the SOL test content review committees. In discussing this recommendation, the Board agreed to request that the Superintendent make every effort to ensure that at least one special education representative is named to each of the SOL content review committees.

Mr. Schroder also gave Ms. Maureen Hollowell an opportunity to express her views on this issue. After further discussion with Ms. Petrini and Ms. Hollowell, Mr. Schroder asked the superintendent to appoint representatives to work with members of CASE. Mr. Schroder also indicated that he would be willing to meet again with the CASE representative and invited Mrs. Petrini to call to set a convenient time.

First Review of the Board of Education Committee's Recommended Response to the Report of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission on Elementary and Secondary School Funding

On December 17, 2001, the Board of Education met as a committee of the whole to discuss its response to the report of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) issued in November and entitled: *Review of Elementary and Secondary School Funding*. JLARC completed an analysis of state funding of the Standards of Quality (SOQ) and local school division educational expenditures. Included in the study report are references and observations concerning the Board of Education's role and responsibilities related to the Standards of quality, according to the Constitution of Virginia and the Code of Virginia.

Mr. Schroder gave Board members an opportunity to review the substitute draft copy of his response to the Chairman of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission. Mr. Schroder said the proposed response includes statements and information about the Board of Education's planned actions to initiate a formal process for review of the SOQ; the board's endorsements of funding changes; the board's actions to address the needs of public education; and observations about SOQ funding issues. After reviewing the document, the Board agreed unanimously to adopt Mr. Schroder's substitute draft as a response to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission.

Mr. Christie noted that the motion he made at the Standards of Quality Committee Meeting on December 17, 2001, to recommend to the General Assembly that the K-3 early reading initiative be made a part of the SOQ formula, was deleted from the document. Mr. Christie made a motion to reinsert it into the document. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. After a short discussion with the Superintendent and Board members, Mr. Christie withdrew his motion. After further discussion, the motion was made to adopt the document and it carried unanimously.

First Review of a Recommendation from the Accountability Advisory Committee Relating to the Awarding of Verified Credit

Dr. Gary L. Jones and Dr. Mark A. Edwards, co-chairs of the Accountability Advisory Committee were unable to attend the meeting. Due to their absence, Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent for accountability at the Department of Education, presented this item. Mr. Finley noted that Board members received an informal report from the co-chairs of the Accountability Advisory Committee and the chair of the subcommittee that developed the proposal in November and asked that it make a formal presentation in January after adoption by the full Accountability Advisory Committee.

The Board of Education's Accountability Advisory Committee appointed a subcommittee to review a number of bills that were submitted to the 2001 General Assembly relating to multiple criteria for graduation and school accreditation. The subcommittee completed its work and provided the following information to the full

committee. The full committee, in turn, developed the recommendation included herein for submission to the Board of Education for approval:

The work of this subcommittee was intended to assist the committee in advising the Board of Education on responding to legislation from the 2001 session of the General Assembly; specifically:

HB 2122 (Darner) which requested the Board to establish guidelines for additional criteria for awarding verified credit when a student in the transition years passed the course but failed the corresponding SOL test for verified credit; and

HB 2394 (Dillard) which requested the Board to establish a formula for combining the test score and course grade when a student in the transition years failed within the 375-399 range.

HB 2831 (Reid) which required the state Board to establish guidelines for local school boards to provide for additional credit to determine the award of verified credit which ensure consistency and fairness in the selection and administration of the additional criteria.

The subcommittee also considered recommendations of the Virginia Education Coalition that, in the areas of history/social studies and science, a student in the transition years earn a verified credit if he/she scores within the range of 375-399 and earns a teacher-assigned grade of 'C' or better in the class.

The following findings and recommendations, while not identical to any of these specific proposals, reflect the intention to minimize the adverse impact on students earning the standards diploma in the transition years:

- ♦ The subcommittee found that multiple criteria currently exist for student accountability, in the form of internal and external measures.

Internal Measures – Teacher-given grades in the course, based on numerous criteria which vary from teacher to teacher and include quizzes, tests, homework, classroom participation, research papers, projects.

External Measures – For validating content mastery in a consistent, objective way; include SOL tests, substitute tests, vocational certification.

- ♦ The subcommittee further found that these criteria may be sufficient when all students have had adequate opportunity to learn a curriculum fully aligned to the Standards of Learning. However, for transition students – first-time 9th grades in 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03 – additional latitude is required. These students were in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades when the first Standards of Learning assessments were field-tested and thus did not have the full benefit

of current Standards of Learning-driven instruction in the elementary grades. In addition, members of the Accountability Advisory Committee who work in public schools acknowledged the wealth of materials developed and disseminated by the Department of Education and the increased emphasis on teacher training since the standards were adopted in 1995. The recommendation is not one relating to multiple criteria; rather, it is one that suggests that an alternative means of awarding verified credit be approved.

- ◆ The subcommittee recognizes that the adoption of any proposal affecting the awarding of verified credit, either by the Board or the General Assembly directing the Board, will require a revision to 8 VAC 20-131-110 of the accrediting standards that defines verified credit and how it is awarded. Direction from the General Assembly would allow the Board to enact emergency regulations (amendments) to effect the change. Otherwise, the Board would be required to follow the normal Administrative Process Act (APA) requirements that could take up to a year to complete.

Recommendation for an Alternative Means of Awarding Verified Credit

- ◆ Permit division superintendents, under policies to be developed at the local level, to award students in the transition years (first-time 9th graders in 2000-01, 01-02, and 02-03) the student-selected (i.e. other than the two required in English) verified credits toward a standard diploma when:
 - ✓ the student passes the course; and
 - ✓ the student fails the test initially, participates in remediation, retests and fails the retest within the 375-399 range on the corresponding SOL tests (NOTE: This is not a lowering of the score required to pass the test. Students will not be given a pass proficient in their student records. This is the range of scores that would make a student eligible for emergency retesting when such retesting becomes available; and
 - ✓ the following conditions are met:

Division effort – The school division has provided the necessary opportunities to learn, especially in areas supported by state funding:

- ✓ The superintendent documents alignment of the curriculum to the Standards of Learning in tested areas, consistent with SOA provisions for pre-accreditation eligibility (VAC 20-131-290 of the standards).
- ✓ Opportunities for appropriate remediation were made available.
- ✓ Opportunities to retest were made available.
- ✓ Students and parents were notified of the student's need for, and the school's provision for, remediation and retesting.

Student effort – The student has made the necessary personal efforts to be successful in class and to attain a score on the assessment that falls within the latitude recommended here.

- ✓ The student attends class regularly or can document exceptional circumstances, as defined and documented by the school division.
- ✓ The student has taken advantage of opportunities for remediation made available by the school, as defined and documented by the school division.

Mrs. Genovese made the following motion: That the Board support legislation authorizing it to develop additional factors and guidelines for awarding verified credit for students in the ninth grade classes of 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003, that such means be retroactive to ensure that it applies to all eligible students, and that it excludes both 11th grade English SOL tests. Mrs. Rogers seconded the motion. Mrs. Atkinson amended the motion to insert language to enable the changes to be made outside of the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Mr. Schroder made a motion that the Board be required to fulfill this function by July 1, 2002. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

After further discussion, Mrs. Genovese, having voted on the prevailing side, asked Board members to reconsider their vote and made an amended motion for the Board to fulfill this function by August 1, 2002, instead of July 1, 2002. Mrs. Atkinson seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Recognition of Secretary of Education

Mr. Schroder congratulated and welcomed Dr. Belle W. Wheelan, the newly appointed secretary of education. Dr. Wheelan said that she is looking forward to working with the Board on current issues. Dr. Wheelan said she has had the opportunity to work with many of the superintendents across the commonwealth since her arrival in Virginia in 1987 and is looking forward to working with them again.

First Review of Revised Mathematics Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework

Dr. Patricia Wright, assistant superintendent for instruction at the Department of Education, presented this item. In September 2000, the Board of Education established a schedule for reviewing and revising of all Standards of Learning. The Mathematics Standards of Learning were designated to be reviewed and revised by the end of the 2001-2002 academic year. The Board of Education adopted the revised Mathematics Standards of Learning in October 2001.

When the Standards of Learning for mathematics were revised, it became necessary to revise the Mathematics Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework, formerly known as the Teacher Resource Guide, for those standards. The steering committee for the revision of the standards, along with other educators who had worked

on the original Teacher Resource Guide, served on the committee that reviewed and revised the guide to reflect the 2001 standards.

The Mathematics Standards of Learning, amplified by the Curriculum Framework, define the content knowledge and skills that are measured by the Standards of Learning tests. The Curriculum Framework provides additional guidance to school divisions and teachers as they develop an instructional program appropriate for their students. It assists teachers as they plan their lessons by framing essential understandings, defining essential content knowledge, and describing the intellectual skills students need to master.

Dr. Wright explained that the revision of the Teacher Resource Guide (Curriculum Framework) requires a period for public comments, which includes public hearings. After public hearings are held, the proposed Curriculum Framework for the revised Mathematics Standards of Learning will be presented to the Board for final approval and adoption. Public hearings will be held on February 11, 2002, in Wytheville at the Wytheville Community College and in Henrico County at Highland Springs High School.

Mr. Christie noted, for future reference, how early in the K-5 curriculum the use of calculators is encouraged. After further discussion, Mrs. Genovese made a motion that the Board accept for first review the proposed draft of the Mathematics Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework and approve the Curriculum Framework for the purpose of public comment through public hearing. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Report on Three-Year School Improvement Plans and October 1 Status Reports for Schools Rated "Accredited with Warning" for the 2000-01 School Year

Dr. Cheryl Magill, director of accountability at the Department of Education, presented this item. Each school rated "Accredited with Warning" must develop and implement a three-year school improvement plan based upon the results of the academic review conducted at the school [8 VAC 20-131-310.F. of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA)]. Board of Education guidelines adopted February 15, 2001, describe the process for submitting plans and provide a sample format that schools could use when developing their plans.

Each school rated "Accredited with Warning" must report annually on the status of the implementation of its three-year school improvement plan. The status report is to be submitted to the Division of Accountability by October 1 of each year the plan is in effect (8 VAC 20-131-310.H. of the SOA).

The Board of Education's guidelines adopted February 15, 2001 state that the Division of Accountability is to report to the Board in January of each year on the status of school improvement plans and status reports.

Dr. Magill said that all schools rated “Accredited with Warning” for the 2000-01 school year submitted three-year school improvement plans to the Division of Accountability in accordance with Board of Education regulations and guidelines. Each plan was reviewed to ensure that it covered a three-year period, that it had been approved by the local school board, and that its strategies were correlated to the components required by 8 VAC 20-131-310.F and 8 VAC 20-131-310.G of the SOA.

Mr. Schroder requested a Board member volunteer to meet with the Superintendent and staff to work on this issue. Mrs. Genovese volunteered to be the designated Board member to work on this issue and report to the Board. The Board accepted the report.

Presentation by Brenda Welburn, Executive Director of the National Association of State Board of Education (NASBE)

Mrs. Brenda Welburn, executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), presented this issue. Mrs. Welburn gave a brief overview which included who NASBE is organizationally, how NASBE is governed, how NASBE is funded, how positions are determined, and what services NASBE provides to state Boards of Education. Mrs. Welburn said NASBE is an education association, but unlike any other education association in the nation, 20 people come to work every day concerned about state Boards of Education, the work that state Board members do, and the quality of lay education governance. The purpose of NASBE is to strengthen state leadership in educational policy and promote lay governance and public support of education.

Mrs. Welburn said NASBE has a philosophy built around equity and excellence and around the lay citizens involved in the governance of education. NASBE’s strategic plan governs the work of the association. NASBE’s mission statement is to provide services to state boards of education and is the principal organization for policymakers involved in the field of education. Mrs. Welburn said the governor, state legislature, and other bodies involved in education policymaking have a host of items on their agenda, but a state Board of Education has one agenda and that is the quality of education for all students in the state.

Mrs. Welburn said a Board of Directors governs NASBE, which includes a president, vice president, and an immediate past president and secretary-treasurer. There are four regions around the country, which include two area directors that represent state boards on the Board of Directors, a new member representative, and ex-officio members. The work of the Board is governed by committee structure that includes a finance and audit committee, resolutions committee, governmental affairs committee, bylaws committee, and nominating and awards committee.

Mrs. Welburn said the following states are not members of NASBE: Arkansas, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota,

Tennessee, Virginia, Wyoming, and Washington. All other states are members of NASBE.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following person spoke during public comment:

Vickie Messick

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Dr. DeMary said Virginia was one of 15 states to receive a grant from the Wallace Reader's Digest Fund, which is currently administered through a consortium of organizations. The grant will give Virginia the opportunity to impact state policy and permit localities to apply for local grants. Fairfax County was the school division in Virginia that received the grant of \$1million dollars a year for up to five years. Dr. DeMary said she will give the Board frequent updates on this issue.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. Noble made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* '2.2-400.A.1, specifically to discuss personnel matters related to licensure. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously. The Board adjourned for the Executive Session at 12:20 p.m.

Ms. Noble made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 12:40 p.m.

Ms. Noble made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the executive session to which this certification motion applies, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the executive session were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Mrs. Davidson – Yes
Mr. Schroder – Yes
Ms. Noble – Yes
Mrs. Rogers – Yes
Mrs. Genovese – Yes
Mr. Goodman – Yes

Mrs. Noble made the following motions:

Case # 1 – That the Board accept the panel’s recommendation not to approve the continuation of a license. Mrs. Davidson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Case #2 – That the Board accept the panel’s recommendation to issue the teaching license. Mr. Goodman seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Case #3 – That the Board accept the panel’s recommendation not to suspend the license. Mr. Goodman seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Case #4 – That the Board accept the panel’s recommendation to revoke the license. Mrs. Atkinson seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Case # 5 – The Board accept the panel’s recommendation to revoke the license. Mrs. Genovese seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Vocational Education, Mr. Schroder adjourned the meeting at 12:40 p.m.

President

Secretary