

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

July 23, 2003

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met in Conference Rooms D and E at the James Monroe State Office Building, Richmond, Virginia with the following members present:

Mr. Thomas M. Jackson, Jr.  
Mrs. Susan L. Genovese  
Mr. Mark E. Emblidge  
Mr. M. Scott Goodman

Mr. David L. Johnson  
Mr. Thomas G. Johnson, Jr.  
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers  
Dr. Ella P. Ward

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary,  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mrs. Genovese, vice-president, called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mrs. Genovese asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 25, 2003, meeting of the Board. Dr. Ward seconded the motion that carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

**ELECTION OF THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Mrs. Genovese asked for nominations for president. Mr. Goodman nominated Mr. Jackson for the office of president. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously. Mrs. Genovese called for the roll call vote for Mr. Jackson for the office of president. The Board roll call:

Mr. D. Johnson – Yes  
Dr. Ward – Yes  
Mr. Emblidge – Yes  
Mrs. Genovese – Yes

Mrs. Rogers – Yes  
Mr. Goodman – Yes  
Mr. Jackson – Yes

After the vote, Mr. Jackson, the newly elected president, presided at the meeting.

Mr. Jackson thanked Governor Mark Warner for giving him the opportunity to serve on the Board of Education, and he also thanked his fellow Board members for giving him the great honor of serving as president.

### ***NEW BOARD MEMBERS***

Mr. Jackson welcomed new Board members, Mr. David Johnson, of Richmond, and Mr. Thomas Johnson, of Norfolk, to the Board of Education.

### ***CONSENT AGENDA***

Mr. Emblidge made a motion to accept the following consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

- First Review of the Notice of Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to Promulgate Regulations Governing the Implementation of Regular Scoliosis Screenings in the Public Schools
- Final Review of Report on Electronic Meetings Held by the Board of Education: 2002-03

#### ***First Review of the Notice of Regulation Action (NOIRA) to Promulgate Regulations Governing the Implementation of Regular Scoliosis Screenings in the Public Schools***

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education authorize the Department of Education staff to proceed with NOIRA for the promulgation of regulations governing scoliosis screening in Virginia's public schools, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

#### ***Final Review of Report on Electronic Meetings Held by the Board of Education: 2002-03***

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education approve the Report on Electronic Meetings held by the Board of Education: 2002-03, was approved by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

### ***ACTION ITEMS***

#### ***Final Review of Proposed Emergency Regulations Governing the General Achievement Diploma***

Dr. Patricia Wright, assistant superintendent of instruction, presented this item. Dr. Wright said that during the 2003 session, the General Assembly approved House Bill 1464 that amends §§22.1-253.13.4 and 22.1-254.2 of the Code of Virginia requiring the Board of Education to establish a General Achievement Diploma.

The Board of Education regulations on awarding a high school diploma (8 VAC 20-200-10) states: "The awarding of a high school diploma shall be based upon statute, regulations of the Board of Education, and those requirements which may be prescribed

by the local school board. Other forms of recognition shall be awarded at the discretion of the local school board.”

The General Achievement Diploma is intended to provide a diploma option for high school dropouts and individuals who exit high school without a diploma. This diploma is intended for individuals who are at least 18 years of age and not enrolled in public school or not otherwise meeting the compulsory school attendance requirements set forth in the Code of Virginia. It is not intended to be a first option for high school students. Diploma candidates may be individuals who are of the age to enroll in a public school whether they choose to enroll or not or individuals who because of their age, are not eligible to enroll in a public school.

The proposed requirements for the General Achievement Diploma include prescribed standard units of credit and a passing score on the General Educational Development (GED) examination. Standard credits required for the General Achievement Diploma may be earned in a variety of educational settings: a public school; a community college or other institution of higher education; an adult high school program; or correspondence, distance learning, and online courses.

On May 28, 2003, the Board of Education accepted for first review the proposed diploma requirements and authorized the department to distribute them for public comment. On June 13, 2003, Superintendent 's Memo No.104 announced the proposed emergency regulations and invited public comment through July 15, 2003.

Mr. Emblidge made a motion to adopt the Emergency Regulations governing the General Achievement Diploma. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

The text of the emergency regulations is as follows:

***Proposed Emergency Regulations  
Governing the General Achievement Diploma  
(As required by House Bill 1464 as passed by the General Assembly)***

Requirements for the General Achievement Diploma:

1. The General Achievement Diploma is intended to provide a diploma option for high school dropouts and individuals who exit high school without a diploma. It should not be a first option for high school students.
2. Individuals who are at least 18 years of age and not enrolled in public school or not otherwise meeting the compulsory school attendance requirements set forth in the Code of Virginia §22.1-254 shall be eligible to earn the General Achievement Diploma. Diploma candidates may be individuals who are of the age 1 to enroll in a public school whether they choose to enroll or not; or individuals who because of their age are not eligible to enroll in a public school.
3. The required number of standard units of credit may be earned by enrolling in a public school if the individual meets the age requirements, a community college or other institution of higher education, an adult high school program, or correspondence, distance learning, and online courses.
4. Diploma candidates shall participate in GED preparation.
5. Credit and assessment requirements for graduation with a General Achievement Diploma:

<b>Discipline Area</b>	<b>Standard Units of Credit Required</b>	<b>Assessment Required</b>
English	4	
Mathematics 2	3	
Science 3	2	
History and Social Sciences 4	2	
Electives 5	9	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Achieve a passing score on the GED examination</b>

- 1 A person of school age is one who has not reached twenty years of age on or before August 1 of the school year (§ 22.1--1.) or any individual through twenty-one years of age who is eligible for mandated services in a program of special education designed to educate and train children with disabilities (§ 22.1--213).
- 2 Courses completed to satisfy this requirement shall include content in mathematics courses that incorporate or exceed the content of courses approved by the Board to satisfy any other Board-recognized diploma.
- 3 Courses completed to satisfy this requirement shall include content in science courses that incorporate or exceed the content of courses approved by the Board to satisfy any other Board-recognized diploma.
- 4 Courses completed to satisfy this requirement shall include one unit of credit in Virginia and U.S. History and one unit of credit in Virginia and U.S. Government in courses that incorporate or exceed the content of courses approved by the Board to satisfy any other Board-recognized diploma.
- 5 Courses shall include at least two sequential electives in an area of concentration or specialization, which may include career and technical education and training.

**Final Review of Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to Promulgate Permanent Regulations Governing the General Achievement Diploma**

The motion was made by Mrs. Rogers to accept for final review the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to promulgate permanent Regulations Governing the General Achievement Diploma and authorize the continuation of the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

**First Review of the Agreement for Interdepartmental Regulation of Children's Residential Facilities**

Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent of educational accountability, presented this item. Mr. Finley said that the Interdepartmental Regulation Program is a joint effort of the Departments of Education (DOE); Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ); Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services (DMHMRSAS); and Department of Social Services (DSS) to cooperatively regulate most of Virginia's public and private sector children's residential facilities. The program is designed to carry out the departments' regulatory responsibilities more effectively and

efficiently than the fragmented efforts that preceded the interdepartmental program's development.

The *Report of the Subcommittee on the Placement of Children* [House Document Number 16 (1977)] criticized the regulatory efforts of the departments as being uncoordinated and duplicative. The subcommittee recommended one joint evaluation of each facility and uniform regulations among agencies. In response to this report, the departments entered an agreement pledging cooperation in the development of an interdepartmental regulatory program.

The four departments and representatives of residential facilities developed a set of "core" standards for use in regulating residential facilities. The "core" standards establish the minimum level of regulation that is necessary to provide protection and treatment/programming to vulnerable children in out-of-home care. The original *Core Standards for Interdepartmental Licensure and Certification of Residential Facilities for Children* became effective July 1, 1981. Those standards were repealed July 1, 2000, and replaced by the current 22 VAC 42-10-10 et. seq., *Standards for Interdepartmental Regulation of Children's Residential Facilities*. Revised standards will be submitted to the participating boards for consideration late in the fall of 2003.

Mr. Finley explained that the interagency office does not actually conduct licensing visits, but assigns a lead regulatory agency to conduct all licensing activities. The lead regulatory agency is assigned according to the primary focus of the residential program, the services to be provided, the qualifications of staff, and the population to be served. Currently, 260 facilities are licensed through the interdepartmental regulatory process. Of those, the Department of Education is a regulatory authority for 67. All of the 67 facilities the board licenses operate schools or educational programs.

Mr. Finley added that the agreement outlines the structure of the interdepartmental regulatory mechanism and the responsibilities of the agencies participating in the interdepartmental licensure program. The Coordinating Committee adopted the agreement on June 24, 2003, for submission to the members' respective boards. The agreement will supersede the agreement that was effective March 29, 1996. It becomes effective when signed by the appropriate officials.

The motion was made by Mr. Goodman to waive first review and authorize the president of the Board and the superintendent to sign the agreement. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

***Final Review of the Consolidated State Application Submission Due September 1, 2003, Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001***

Dr. Wright presented this item. Dr. Wright said that in May 2002, the Board of Education approved Virginia's Consolidated State Application under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), Public Law 107-110, for submission to the U.S. Department of Education (USED).

The consolidated application process requires multiple submissions and responses to information requests. Since the initial May 2002 submission of the state's consolidated application, which was subsequently approved by the USED, Virginia has submitted a Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook and baseline data and state performance targets for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) indicators.

In January 2003, the Board of Education approved the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, which outlines how Virginia is meeting or plans to meet the NCLB accountability requirements. Federal guidance, at the time, indicated that final state policies must be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education by May 1, 2003. At its April 2003 meeting, the Board of Education approved the revisions to the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook and approved the May 1, 2003, submission of AYP-related baseline data and state performance targets.

The U.S. Department of Education approved Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, as amended on June 9, 2003. The NCLB accountability plan that Virginia had proposed for 2003-2004 and beyond was approved with minor changes and clarifications. The June 9 amendments relate to testing policies in effect for 2002-2003 and the formula for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) in 2002-2003 for certain students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities. Virginia agreed to these amendments under protest and only because USED mandated them.

Dr. Wright reported that preliminary guidance from the U.S. Department of Education indicates that state policies regarding certain non-AYP related performance goals and targets must be submitted to USED by September 1, 2003. These state performance targets are related to English language proficiency for limited English proficient (LEP) students, highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals, persistently dangerous schools, and graduation rate.

Dr. Wright said the draft state performance targets relate to the following goals that all states had to adopt in their May 2002 Consolidated State Application:

- ✓ Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient (LEP) students will become proficient in English and reach high standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- ✓ Performance Goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- ✓ Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.
- ✓ Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to accept for final review and approve the draft of state performance targets for the Consolidated State Application submission due

September 1, 2003, under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Nominations for the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted for the September 1, 2003, to June 30, 2006, Term**

Dr. Barbara McGonagill, specialist, governor's schools and gifted education, presented this item. Dr. McGonagill said the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted was established by the Board of Education in 1982 to provide the Board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction with recommendations regarding the educational needs of gifted students in kindergarten through grade 12.

The committee is composed of 24 members who serve rotating three-year terms. Members include parents; designees from professional organizations for the gifted, counselors, superintendents, and teachers; persons from business and industry; a director and an alumna/us of a Governor's School; administrators and teachers of the gifted from school divisions; representatives from higher education; and three at-large members.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to accept the appointment of the following individuals to the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted for the September 1, 2003, through June 30, 2006 term of service. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

<b>Representing</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Position</b>
Gifted Education Coordinators	Ruth Grillo	TAG Specialist, Accomack County Public Schools
Institutions of Higher Education	Marjorie Hall-Haley	Associate Professor, Graduate Education, George Mason University
Local Advisory Committees	Elizabeth Mebane	N/A
Local Parent Associations	Lowell Frye	Professor, Rhetoric and Humanities, Hampden-Sydney College
Teachers of the Gifted	Patricia Lynch	Gifted Resource Teacher, Fredericksburg City Public Schools
Virginia Association of School Superintendents	Frank Morgan	Superintendent, Goochland County Public Schools
Virginia Education Association	Cris Chilton	Teacher, Henrico County Public Schools
Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals	Thomas Shortt	Executive Director, Virginia Association of Elementary Schools \

**Final Review of a Proposal to Discontinue the Current Teacher Preparation Program and Establish a New Teacher Preparation Program at Christopher Newport University**

Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher education and professional licensure, presented this item. Dr. Elliott said Christopher Newport University (CNU) has been approved by the Board of Education to offer programs for the preparation of school personnel since 1980. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the CNU Board of Visitors voted to discontinue certain professional preparation programs, including undergraduate teacher preparation.

In April of 2003, the Department of Education received a proposal from CNU to establish a new five-year teacher preparation program. The proposed program will allow students to graduate with a bachelor's degree in the liberal arts and a master's degree in teaching. The new proposed program will also provide options for a stand-alone master's degree program, a program for students who do not attend CNU for their bachelor's degree, and a program for students with a bachelor's degree seeking only licensure to teach.

The proposed program, developed in partnership with the Newport News public schools, does not reinstate the education department. Rather, teachers and administrators from Newport News and CNU faculty in the department of liberal arts will administer the program. At the May 21, 2003, meeting of the Newport News school board, a partnership agreement between CNU and the Newport News public schools was adopted.

The new proposed program will offer endorsements in the following 13 areas: Elementary PreK-6; Art PreK-12; Biology; Computer Science; English; French PreK-12; History and Social Science; Mathematics; Music– Instrumental; Music - Vocal/Choral; Physics; Spanish PreK-12; and Arts PreK-12. All endorsements will be available at the three levels described in the proposal as follows:

1. Five-year Master of Arts in Teaching.  
This program will be the primary CNU teacher preparation program. Students will complete four years of study in the liberal arts, culminating in a bachelor's degree, and a fifth year of professional preparation that includes student teaching jointly administered by the liberal arts faculty and school officials in the Newport News Public Schools. At the successful conclusion of the fifth year, students will receive the MAT degree and be eligible for licensure.
2. Two-year Master's Degree.  
Students who hold a bachelor's degree have the option of a two-year graduate program that culminates in the master's degree and full licensure eligibility. This option will be open to all students with an undergraduate degree. The PreK-6 program may require additional semester hours depending upon courses completed in the undergraduate degree. The secondary and PreK-12 programs require a degree or the equivalent in the teaching area. These



programs require approximately 36 graduate hours and may require additional undergraduate hours.

3. Post-baccalaureate Licensure Option.

Students who have a bachelor's degree may also complete requirements for licensure in any of the 13 specific endorsement areas. This program consists of approximately 30 hours of combined graduate and undergraduate courses. Students in the program will work as teaching assistants and school-based substitute teachers in the Newport News schools and will be candidates for employment as teachers in Newport News upon completion.

Dr. Elliott closed his presentation by reporting that the Department of Education has received notification that the current approved program will be discontinued in the spring of 2004. Christopher Newport University would like to begin the new program the fall of 2003.

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to discontinue the current teacher preparation program at Christopher Newport University. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to approve a new two-year pilot program with an on-site review to be conducted prior to the end of the two-year period with final program approval contingent upon the results of the two-year pilot program. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

**First Review of Addition to the Board-Approved List of Supplemental Educational Services Providers Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Mrs. Brenda Spencer, Office of Program Administration and Accountability, presented this item. Mrs. Spencer said that the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires Title I schools that do not meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for three consecutive years in the same area to offer a choice of supplemental educational services to parents of eligible children. Virginia may have schools that must offer supplemental educational services at the beginning of the 2003-2004 school year. Currently, several school divisions are offering supplemental educational services in lieu of their ability to offer public school choice or because of long-term school improvement identification of certain schools under the previous law.

Mrs. Spencer explained that the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* requires states to identify and maintain a list of supplemental educational services providers. Supplemental educational services are tutoring and academic enrichment services that are provided in addition to daily instruction. A supplemental educational service provider can be a non-profit entity, a for-profit agency, or another school division. The services must be of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children in mastering the English and Mathematics Standards of Learning and in earning proficiency on Standards of Learning tests. NCLB requires that

states maintain an approved list of supplemental educational services providers across the state and by school division.

On July 25, 2002, the Board of Education adopted the NCLB criteria for the approval of supplemental educational services providers. The criteria specified that providers meet the following requirements:

- Have the ability to provide parents and the local education agency (LEA) with information on the progress of children in a format and language that parents can understand;
- Ensure that the instruction provided and the content used are consistent with the instruction and content used by the LEA and are aligned with state student academic achievement standards;
- Meet all federal, state, and local health and safety and civil rights laws; and
- Ensure that all instruction and content are neutral and non-ideological.

The law also specifies that the services must be furnished by a financially sound provider with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. The department has received applications in response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) from potential supplemental educational services providers. The Board of Education, at its September 2002 meeting, approved the initial list of recommended supplemental educational services providers, and recommended seven additional companies at its February and May 2003 meetings.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to waive first review and add the recommended supplemental educational services provider to the approved list. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

**First Review of Process to Add Supplementary Education Schools Accredited to the Commission on International and Trans-Regional Accreditation, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), to the Board-Approved List of Supplemental Educational Services Providers Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Mr. Finley presented this item. Mr. Finley said the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires Title I schools that do not meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for three consecutive years in the same area to offer a choice of supplemental educational services to parents of eligible children.

On April 15, 2003, Dr. Stephen M. Baker, executive director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), requested that the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction consider a process by which the Supplementary Education Schools accredited by SACS could become Virginia-recommended supplemental educational services providers under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Since that time, the Office of Program Administration and Accountability has undertaken a comparison of the supplementary education school accreditation criteria developed by SACS and the supplemental educational services provider criteria outlined in the legislation and adopted by the Board of Education. Findings indicate a significant match between the two sets of criteria.

The Board accepted for first review the process of adopting future Supplementary Education Schools that are accredited by SACS as approved supplemental educational services providers under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*.

The Board requested to be informed at least quarterly of the service providers added to the list as a result of this process.

### **First Review of Standards of Quality Base Budget Revisions**

Mr. Dan Timberlake, assistant superintendent of finance, presented this item. Mr. Timberlake said the Standards of Quality budget is re-benchmarked for the next biennium in the summer of each odd-numbered year. This re-benchmarking is part of the biennial budget development process that involves the Board of Education, the Governor, and the General Assembly. The re-benchmarked budget represents the cost of continuing the existing Standards of Quality programs with updates in the input data used to determine the cost of the programs.

The SOQ are established by the Constitution of Virginia. The specific requirements of the SOQ are prescribed in statute. Funding for the SOQ is determined primarily by the instructional staffing ratios established in the SOQ as well as recognized support costs that are funded on a prevailing cost basis.

Mr. Timberlake said the cost projections represent changes in funding based on standard technical revisions made to SOQ accounts for each year of the 2004-2006 biennium. These cost projections do not reflect any changes in policy or technical methodology. The budget figures presented in this item represent the cost of continuing the current SOQ programs in the 2004-2006 biennium with the required revisions and updates to input data using the existing funding methodologies.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to waive first review and adopt the proposed base budget revisions that continue current SOQ programs in the 2004-2006 biennium, as re-benchmarked on standard technical revisions without changes in funding policy. The motion further directed staff to update and revise SOQ costs as additional technical revisions are completed consistent with the current funding methodology and policy adopted by the Board and directed the department to submit this re-benchmarked budget (as amended) for the SOQ to the Governor together with the policy changes to the SOQ that were adopted by the Board in June. The policy changes should be re-estimated using the same data and assumptions used in the re-benchmarked SOQ budget. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

### **Report on National Board Certified Teachers in Virginia**

Dr. Elliott presented this report. National Board Certification is an extensive year-long assessment of actual teaching practice based upon high and rigorous standards established by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Founded in 1987, NBPTS offers certificates in 24 fields that are applicable to more than 95 percent of the eligible teaching population. There are currently 23,937 National Board

Certified Teachers in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and overseas. Virginia ranks eleventh among states in the total number of National Board Certified Teachers.

Dr. Elliott said there are 415 teachers who have earned National Board Certification while teaching in Virginia. The Department of Education manages a subsidy grant program with state and federal funds to provide financial assistance to National Board candidates and has engaged many initiatives over the past five years to support the National Board Certification process.

In addition, since 1999 the Virginia General Assembly has provided funding for an incentive bonus to National Board Certified teachers. To the extent that funds are available, an initial award is set at \$5,000 with a subsequent annual award of \$2,500 for the life of the certificate (10 years). A total of \$1,709,500 has been awarded to eligible National Board Certified teachers who earned certification through 2001. Under the incentive guidelines established by the Board of Education, an individual who earns National Board Certification receives the bonus the following year. For example, those eligible teachers who earned National Board Certification in November 2002 will receive bonuses in December 2003.

The Board received the report on National Board Certified teachers in Virginia.

#### **Annual Report from the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted**

Ms. Gail Hubbard, chair, Virginia Committee for the Education of the Gifted and Dr. McGonagill presented this item. Mrs. Hubbard said the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted was established by the Board of Education in 1982 to provide the Board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction with recommendations regarding the educational needs of gifted students, kindergarten through grade 12. The advisory committee meets four times per year at a variety of sites throughout the commonwealth.

Mrs. Hubbard said the report explains the committee's development of a reference guide to assist school divisions as they draft their 2005-2010 or 2006-2011 local plans for the education of the gifted. The reference guide's first two sections, identification and professional development, have been developed and are ready for dissemination. The remaining sections of the reference guide cover program development and parent and community involvement and will be studied during the 2003-2005 cycle. The annual report also includes updated membership information, as well as other documents that relate to the Virginia Governor's School program and the work of the committee.

The Board received the Twenty-First Annual Report submitted by the Virginia Advisory Committee for the Education of the Gifted.

#### **First Review of Proposed Revisions to Academic Review Processes**

Dr. Cheri Magill, director of accreditation, presented this item. Dr. Magill said for the school years ending in 2000 through 2003, the Regulations Establishing Standards

for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) required a school to be “Accredited with Warning (in specified academic area or areas)” if its pass rate performance on any Standards of Learning test is 20 or more percentage points below any of the provisional accreditation benchmarks established by the Board (8 VAC 20-131-300.C.4). Any school rated “Accredited with Warning” must undergo an academic review in accordance with guidelines adopted by the Board (8 VAC 20-131-340.A).

Dr. Magill said academic reviews were conducted in 79 schools “Accredited with Warning” during the 2002-03 school year, including 8 schools associated with the Department of Correctional Education. Review teams determined areas of strength and areas for improvement and detailed essential actions that the schools were required to complete. Review teams noted what appeared to be any areas of noncompliance with the SOA, and accreditation staff investigated these areas further.

Each year, the Board reviews and approves processes added to the Academic Review. Last year, the Board approved additions to the areas of review based upon the number of years a school was warned, extensions to the numbers and nature of visits to schools, and the option to conduct a review at the central office level.

Earlier guidelines approved by the Board on November 30, 2000, make provisions for local school boards to request approval of a locally developed review in lieu of having a review conducted by the Department of Education. No school divisions conducted their own reviews in 2002-2003.

Dr. Magill said areas of review and the nature of the visits to schools will not change for the 2003-2004 school year. Reports of findings will continue to be distributed to the office of accreditation, the warned school, the division superintendent, and the local school board.

The academic review process will be slightly revised to increase the focus on school improvement planning and to increase its prescriptive nature by making all of the following areas of review available, regardless of the number of years the school has been warned: curriculum alignment; use of data to make instructional and planning decisions; use of instructional time and school scheduling practices; professional development opportunities; school improvement planning; instructional model/program implementation (for schools warned in English and/or mathematics); systems and processes supporting academic achievement; and organizational culture.

For schools that are rated “Accredited with Warning” and participating in PASS Models II, III or IV, office of accreditation staff will meet with the office of school improvement staff and PASS coaches or auditors to determine the degree to which the academic review process might be further modified to meet the specific needs of each of these schools.

Rather than being considered an option, an academic review will be conducted at the central office level for school divisions having a significant number or percentage of schools or types of schools rated “Accredited with Warning”. The review will focus on

systems, processes and practices that support schools in the following areas: aligning curriculum; obtaining and using data; making effective use of instructional time; identifying and providing professional development activities focused on improving student achievement; developing and implementing school improvement plans; selecting and implementing instructional models/programs (for schools warned in English and/or mathematics); and promoting a school culture that focuses on improving student achievement.

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposed revisions to academic reviews. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

### ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

The following person spoke during public comment.

Mrs. Anne Luther

### ***DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES***

There was no discussion on current issues.

### ***EXECUTIVE SESSION***

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* 2.2400.A.1, specifically to discuss personnel matters related to licensure. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously. The Board adjourned for the Executive Session at 12:20 p.m.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Johnson and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

Mrs. Genovese 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:

Mr. D. Johnson – Yes  
Dr. Ward – Yes  
Mr. Emblidge – Yes  
Mr. Jackson – Yes

Mrs. Genovese – Yes  
Mrs. Rogers – Yes  
Mr. Goodman – Yes  
Mr. T. Johnson – Yes

Mrs. Genovese made the following motions:

Case #1 – The Board recommended the case to be continued until the April 2004 Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Case #2 – The Board recommended the issuance of a license. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Case #3 – The Board recommended revocation of license. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Case #4 – The Board recommended the continuation of license. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

Case #5 – The Board recommended that no action be taken against the license holder. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Jackson adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

---

President

---

Secretary