March 24, 2004

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

Mr. Thomas M. Jackson, President  Mr. David L. Johnson
Mrs. Isis M. Castro    Mr. Thomas G. Johnson, Jr.
Mr. Mark E. Emblidge   Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mr. M. Scott Goodman   Dr. Ella P. Ward

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Jackson, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Jackson asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF OFFICE CEREMONY


APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2004, meeting of the Board. Dr. Jones seconded the motion that carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION/RECOGNITIONS

A Leadership in Arts Instruction Award was presented to Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., superintendent of Chesterfield County Public Schools, and Dr. Dale Kalkofen, assistant superintendent of Chesterfield County Public Schools.
PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

Bev Lammay
Michael Farley

ACTION ITEMS

Final Review of Proposed Regulations Governing Private Day Schools for Children with Disabilities

Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent for educational accountability presented this item. Mr. Finley said that the private day schools for students with disabilities are currently regulated by the Regulations Governing the Operation of Proprietary Schools and Issuing of Agent Permits that also cover private career schools and correspondence schools. The new regulations, which were developed in part as a result of suggestions from the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB), replace the current complex and intertwined regulations. Legislation considered by the 2004 General Assembly would move the regulation of proprietary career schools and correspondence schools to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV).

Mr. Finley introduced Mrs. Carolyn Hodgins, specialist for private special education day schools. Mrs. Hodgins presented the following substantial changes that were made to the proposed regulations:

1. Fees are eliminated to conform to an action of the General Assembly to eliminate collection of fees from private day schools for students with disabilities.
2. On-site visits currently required by regulation every two years will be aligned with the Code of Virginia which allows the issuing of licenses for up to three years. The regulations will require visits every three years and allow unannounced visits during the three-year time period.
3. Language is added that requires criminal background checks including fingerprinting of full- or part-time, permanent or temporary employees of schools whose accreditation is recognized by the Board of Education.
4. Language was added to ensure that schools have policies and procedures for behavior management that protect the safety and well-being of students at all times.
5. Language was added to conform to the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) to require the private day schools to be maintained in a manner ensuring compliance with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and regulations of the Board pertaining to facilities. Also added is the establishment of procedures to deal with emergencies including hostage situations, bomb threats, power outages, fires, and inclement weather.
6. Medication management, including the transportation and dispensing of medications is addressed.
7. Schools serving privately placed students are required to offer access to a tuition insurance plan if they financially obligate students for more than quarterly increments of the annual tuition.
8. Provisions were added to conform to the current Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia.

Mrs. Hodgins presented the following changes in the proposed regulations made as a result of public comment:

1. Clarified the definition of a behavior management program and the application of a formal behavior management technique.
2. Removed the requirement for physical examination reports that are current to within three years to hold the day schools to the same standard required of public schools.
3. Replaced the word “trained” with “certified” as it relates to CPR to avoid confusion.
4. Deleted the requirement for a person “certified” in CPR and first aid to be available to students on field trips and added the requirement that appropriate safety measures that take in account the age range and disabling conditions of students served at the school be taken on school-sponsored activities as well as the originally proposed transportation to and from school.
5. Deleted superfluous language regarding teacher licensure to ensure the staff meets current Licensure Regulations for School Personnel.
6. Deleted the word “current” regarding x-ray or other tuberculin test to mirror the requirements for public school personnel.
7. Moved the requirement that the school’s handbook be approved prior to publication to the application section of the regulations.

Dr. Jones made a motion to approve the proposed regulations for submission to the next phase of the Administrative Process Act to become effective following the final review period. Mr. Goodman seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Involving Opening Prior to Labor Day from the Alexandria City School Board

Mr. Finley also presented this item. Mr. Finley said that the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia permit local school Boards to seek approval to implement experimental or innovative programs that are not consistent with accreditation standards or other regulations promulgated by the Board and allow waivers of some Board regulations.

Mr. Finley introduced Mrs. Rebecca Perry, division superintendent of Alexandria City public schools. Mrs. Perry said that the Alexandria City School Board is requesting approval of a modified school calendar for the Samuel Tucker Elementary School. The
school serves high percentages of minority students and English language learners. The traditional school calendar impedes these students’ academic success.

Mrs. Perry said that the modified school calendar at Samuel Tucker Elementary School is a year-round calendar modeled after schedules previously approved by the Board for schools in as many as 10 other school divisions over the past two or three years. Those schedules provide 210 days of instruction as follows: 183 regular days of instruction and three two-week intersessions throughout the year that provide up to 30 additional days of instruction to help some students improve their performance on Standards of Learning tests and provide optional enrichment opportunities for others.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to waive first review and approve the innovative program involving opening prior to Labor Day at Samuel Tucker Elementary School in the city of Alexandria. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Request for Approval of an Experimental or Innovative Program Involving Opening Prior to Labor Day from the Virginia Beach City School Board

Mr. Finley also presented this item. Mr. Finley said the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, permit local school boards to seek approval to implement experimental or innovative programs that are not consistent with accreditation standards or other regulations promulgated by the Board and allow waivers of some Board regulations.

Mr. Finley introduced Mrs. Betsy Taylor, assistant superintendent of elementary education, and Mrs. Martha Tompkins, department of accountability, of the Virginia Beach City public schools. Mrs. Taylor said that the city of Virginia Beach is seeking approval to open Point O’View Elementary School prior to Labor Day for the 2004-2005 school year. The school division’s calendar for this school will mirror the calendar of four other elementary schools currently approved for year-round calendars in Virginia Beach. The calendar will include a total of 208 instructional days (including 25 intercession days which are optional for students for remedial or enrichment activities).

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and approve the innovative program involving opening prior to Labor Day at Point O’View Elementary School, Virginia Beach City Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of Revised Division-Level Academic Review Process

Dr. Cheri Magill, director of accreditation, presented this item. Dr. Magill said the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) require a school to be “Accredited with Warning” if its pass rate performance on any SOL test does not meet required benchmarks to qualify for any other accreditation rating. Dr. Magill said that any school rated “Accredited with Warning” must undergo an academic review in accordance with guidelines adopted by the Board.
Dr. Magill said that during the initial visit, the purpose and procedures of the division-level academic review will be explained, and assignments will be given to the superintendent and central office staff in preparation for the on-site review. An introductory meeting with the local school board will preface the on-site review. During the on-site review data will be collected to determine the degree of compliance with sections of the SOQ, and a report will detail essential actions the school division must use to develop and implement a corrective action plan. Follow-up visits will monitor the progress of the division in developing and implementing the corrective action plan.

Mr. Thomas Johnson suggested that some thought should be given to the criteria on how schools are selected for academic review. After a brief discussion, the Board requested staff to look at this issue before final review is presented to the Board and share this information with Mr. Johnson.

The Board received the revised division-level academic review process for first review. The Board will conduct a final review of the process at its meeting in April.

First Review of Letter to USED Requesting an Exception to the 1% Cap on the Number of Students with Disabilities whose Proficient Scores on the Alternate Assessment may be Counted Toward Calculating AYP

This item was presented by Mr. Doug Cox, assistant superintendent for special education and student services, and Mrs. Shelly-Loving Ryder, assistant superintendent for assessment and reporting.

Mr. Cox said that the U.S. Department of Education (USED), on December 9, 2003, issued regulations limiting the number of students with disabilities whose proficient score on state assessments based on alternate achievement standards could be counted in calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. In Virginia, this is the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP). The limit is one percent of the students tested at the applicable grade levels. The regulations also include a provision for states to request an exception to this cap.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented the draft text of a letter from the Board to USED that requests an exception to the one percent cap. She said Virginia is requesting that the cap be extended to 3.5 percent for a three-year period. This time period is consistent with Virginia’s transition to annual testing and will provide sufficient time for Virginia to develop an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards for students with disabilities.

Mr. Thomas Johnson made a motion to waive first review and approve the letter for submission to USED and authorize the president and the superintendent to negotiate with USED on the final agreed-upon cap. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously.
After a brief discussion that clarified the fact that there are no children who are excluded from testing, Mr. David Johnson said, “It seems to me that what we are doing with the law is penalizing children with disabilities, in an effort to keep adults without disabilities from violating the law, and that seems to me to be so wrong-headed that it causes me to have a great deal of concern.” The Board President agreed and requested that this statement be recorded in the minutes for future reference.

**Final Review of Virginia’s Special Education Annual Performance Report**

Mr. Cox also presented this item. Mr. Cox said the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), is requiring each state education agency (SEA) to submit an annual performance report (APR) for special education. This report is based on 2002-2003 data and is to be submitted by March 21, 2004. The APR is a compilation of three previous reports that states were required to submit: the biennial performance report, the self-assessment report under the federal monitoring procedures, and the state improvement plan.

Mr. Cox said the APR is divided into five cluster areas: (1) general supervision; (2) early childhood transition; (3) parent involvement; (4) free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment; and (5) secondary transition. For each cluster area the report must include a goal and performance indicators, baseline data from the 2002-2003 year; targets for the 2002-2003 year with the explanation of progress or slippage; projected targets and future activities with timelines for the following year.

Dr. Jones made a motion to accept the Special Education Annual Progress Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas Johnson and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Virginia’s Definition of Alternate Route to Highly Qualified Teachers**

This item was deferred until the April Board meeting.

**Final Review of Recommendation from the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure Regarding the Establishment of a Qualifying Score on the SAT as a Substitute Test for Praxis I**

Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher education and professional licensure, presented this item. Dr. Elliott said that the 1980 session of the General Assembly mandated that the Board of Education identify and recommend an assessment for beginning teachers. In July 1980, the Board of Education instituted a requirement that all beginning teachers applying for initial licensure submit scores for the National Teacher Examinations (NTE). In 1981 the Board authorized validation and standard-setting studies for the NTE to determine passing scores for initial licensure of entry-level teachers.

Dr. Elliott said that the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure met on March 15, 2004, and considered additional information provided by the Educational
Testing Service regarding the acceptance of SAT® scores prior to April 1, 1995, to be used as a substitute for Praxis I.

Mr. Kevin Larkin, measurement statistician, Research and Development Division, Center for Statistical Analysis at the Educational Testing Service, who co-authored the “Report of Virginia PPST Exemption Study: Exemption Based on SAT Scores,” provided the Research Summary on “The Effects of SAT® Scale Recentering on Percentiles” that includes SAT® conversion tables. The recentered verbal score of 530 (test taken after April 1, 1995) is equivalent to an original verbal score of 450 (test taken before April 1, 1995). The recentered mathematics score of 530 (test taken after April 1, 1995) is equivalent to an original mathematics score of 510 (test taken before April 1, 1995).

Dr. Elliott said that Mr. Larkin indicated that based on the conversion charts, an SAT total score of 1000 on the SAT taken prior to April 1, 1995, could reasonably be equivalent to the total score of 1100 on the SAT taken after April 1, 1995. The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure unanimously recommended on March 15, 2004, to revise its recommendation to the Board of Education based on the information received from the Educational Testing Service.

Dr. Jones made a motion to approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s revised recommendations that a score of 1100 on the SAT, taken after April 1, 1995, with at least a 530 on the verbal and a 530 on the mathematics test or a score of 1000 on the SAT, taken prior to April 1, 1995, with at least a 450 on the verbal and a 510 on the mathematics tests may be used as a substitute for Praxis I. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommended Cut Scores for the Literacy and Numeracy Assessments Required for the Modified Standard Diploma

Mr. Cox and Mrs. Loving Ryder presented this item. Mr. Cox said that the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools (SOA) adopted by the Board of Education on July 28, 2000, describe the Modified Standard Diploma as intended for certain students at the secondary level who have a disability and are unlikely to meet the credit requirements for a Standard Diploma. Eligibility and participation in the Modified Standard Diploma program shall be determined by the student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) team and the student, where appropriate, at any point after the student’s eighth-grade year. The Standards of Accreditation also require that “beginning with the ninth-grade class of 2000-2001, students pursing the Modified Standard Diploma shall pass literacy and numeracy competency assessments prescribed by the Board.”

Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the Guidelines for Implementing Certain Provisions of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, adopted by the Board on November 30, 2000, identified the Grade 8 Standards of Learning assessments in reading and mathematics as the literacy and numeracy assessments for the Modified Standard Diploma. While the Board of Education adopted
cut scores for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced on the Grade 8 reading and mathematics tests in 1998, at that time the use of these assessments as verification measures of numeracy and literacy for the Modified Standard Diploma had not been determined. The standard-setting committees did not consider this purpose.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that comments from school divisions, the Superintendent’s Advisory Council, and the Special Education Advisory Committee, coupled with data on the performance of students pursuing the Modified Standard Diploma on the Grade 8 reading and mathematics tests, suggest that the cut scores on the tests may need to be adjusted for the purposes of verifying literacy and numeracy skills for the Modified Standard Diploma.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder emphasized the following: (1) Any adjusted cut scores adopted by the Board will apply only to special education students pursuing the Modified Standard Diploma and using the test as verifiers of literacy and numeracy. It will not affect the required passing score on the Grade 8 reading and mathematics tests. That will remain at a scale score of 400; and (2) Any adjusted cut score adopted by the Board could be applied retroactively for students who have previously attempted the Grade 8 reading and mathematics tests to meet the requirements of the Modified Standard Diploma.

The Board waived first review and adopted the following adjusted cut scores for the Grade 8 Standards of Learning tests in English: reading and mathematics to be used as measures of the literacy and numeracy requirements of the Modified Standard Diploma.

Mr. Goodman made a motion to adopt the cut score of 299 for Grade 8 reading literacy requirements for the Modified Standard Diploma. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Dr. Ward made a motion to adopt the cut score of 360 for the Grade 8 mathematics numeracy requirements for the Modified Standard Diploma. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously.

First Review of Proposed Revisions to Virginia’s Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Dr. Patricia Wright, assistant superintendent for instruction, presented this item. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), requires all state education agencies to submit for approval to the United States Department of Education individual program applications or a consolidated state application.

In May 2002, the Board submitted and received USED approval for its initial Consolidated State Application under the NCLB law. In October 2003, the Virginia Department of Education received notification of its consolidated grant awards under NCLB from the USED, based on USED staff reviews of the September 1 submission. In
response to requests made by USED, revisions were made to the Limited English Proficient (LEP) performance indicator 2.1 to the September 1, 2003, submission, including reference to the development of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) as an option for school divisions to use as an instrument to measure the English language proficiency of LEP students.

Dr. Wright summarized the following revisions to several critical elements in the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook: (1) identification and application of the “other academic indicator” (in addition to performance and participation on the reading and mathematics tests) that is used to make AYP determinations; (2) how states determine if a school, school division, and the state have made AYP; (3) how Title I schools and school divisions may review or appeal AYP decisions; and (4) testing and AYP calculation policies for limited English proficient students. Dr. Wright said that USED has set a deadline of April 1, 2004, for states to request changes in the accountability workbook policies.

Mr. Emblidge made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposed revisions to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook and corresponding changes in the September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application Submission under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The motion was seconded by Mr. Goodman and carried unanimously.

First Review of Revisions to the “Small n School” Process Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Dr. Wright also presented this item. In Virginia, “small n schools” have been defined as those that have fewer than 50 students in a grade or course for which there are statewide assessments. The U.S. Department of Education approved Virginia’s use of 50 as the minimum number of students for which Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) can be reliably determined using the criteria required by the law.

Dr. Wright said that in September 2003 the Board approved an alternate process to determine AYP for these schools. This process allows schools to submit a body of evidence to the Department of Education for consideration as a substitute for a single year of data from the Standards of Learning assessments in reading and/or mathematics. Among the choices is the use of student pass rates on the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests in English and/or mathematics for the last three years. This option is automatically exercised for schools that fail to submit a body of evidence.

Mr. Emblidge made a motion to approve for first review the proposed revisions to the “small n school” adequate yearly progress review process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Goodman and carried unanimously.
First Review of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test as a Substitute Test of Literacy for Limited English Proficient Students with Disabilities who are Pursuing the Modified Standard Diploma

Mr. Cox and Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented this item. Mr. Cox said that at its meeting on February 26, 2003, the Board amended the guidelines governing the literacy and numeracy assessments for the Modified Standard Diploma to permit, among other provisions, the use of substitute tests. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the new guidelines specify the following:

Beginning with the 9th grade class of 2000-2001, those students who pursue the Modified Standard Diploma shall be required to pass the 8th grade Standards of Learning (SOL) tests in both English (Reading, Literature, and Research) and mathematics to meet the literacy and numeracy requirements for this diploma. Students who are in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades in the school year 2000-2001 shall pass the Literacy Passport Tests (LPT) prescribed by the Board to meet the literacy and numeracy requirements for this diploma. Students may substitute a higher-level Standards of Learning test (i.e., end-of-course English [reading], Algebra I, Algebra II, or Geometry) for the 8th grade Standards of Learning (SOL) tests in English (Reading, Literature, and Research) and mathematics or other substitute tests approved by the Board. In addition, students pursuing the Modified Standard Diploma shall have opportunities for an expedited retest on the 8th grade tests in the same manner as prescribed in these guidelines for students earning verified credit.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and adopt the Stanford English Language Proficiency Assessment as a substitute test of literacy for Limited English Proficient students with disabilities who are pursuing the Modified Standard Diploma. The motion was seconded by Mr. Goodman and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommended Cut Scores for History Standards of Learning Tests Based on the 2001 History Standards

Mrs. Loving-Ryder and Mr. Cox also presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that in 2003-2004 new Standards of Learning tests measuring the 2001 history content standards are being administered. Because of the changes in the content measured by these tests, the Virginia Board of Education must adopt new passing scores.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that committees of educators were convened to recommend to the Board minimum "cut" scores for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for the new tests. The Board adopted new cut scores for the end-of-course history tests at its November 2003 meeting. Committees for the remaining history tests: grade 3 history, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1877, U.S. History from 1877, Civics & Economics, and the grade 8 cumulative history test met in late February.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented the information about the range of cut scores recommended by the committees for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and
pass/advanced for each of the remaining history tests. The Board reviewed the information and adopted the following cut scores for each of the six tests:

**Grade 3 History**

Mr. Goodman made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 27 for the pass/proficient and 35 for the pass/advanced cut score for Grade 3 history Standards of Learning tests. Dr. Jones seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Virginia Studies**

Mr. Goodman made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 25 for the pass/proficient and 35 for the pass/advanced cut score for the Virginia Studies Standards of Learning tests. Dr. Jones seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**U. S. History to 1877**

Mr. Thomas Johnson made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 25 for the pass/proficient and 35 for the pass/advanced cut score for the U. S. History to 1877 Standards of Learning tests. Mr. Goodman seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**U. S. History II: 1877 to Present**

Mr. Thomas Johnson made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 23 for the pass/proficient and 34 for the pass/advanced cut score for U. S. History II: 1877 to Present Standards of Learning tests. Dr. Ward seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Civics and Economics**

Mr. Goodman made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 21 for the pass/proficient and 34 for the pass/advanced cut score for the Civics and Economics Standards of Learning tests. Dr. Ward seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Grade 8 History (Cumulative)**

Mr. Thomas Johnson made a motion to adopt the median cut score of 26 for the pass/proficient and 43 for the pass/advanced cut score for the Grade 8 history (Cumulative) Standards of Learning test. Dr. Ward seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Statewide Performance Report Summary for Career and Technical Education**

Mr. Robert Almond, director of career and technical education, presented this item. Mr. Almond said that the Board approved the Virginia System of Performance
Standards and Measures as a part of the 2000-2004 State Plan for Career and Technical Education (CTE). The federal Perkins act requires that the results on the negotiated state adjusted levels of performance for both secondary and postsecondary CTE are communicated to the State Board and other audiences. Each school division and the Virginia Community College System will receive an annual report of performance.

Mr. Almond said that the Virginia system addresses the following: 1) academic achievement; 2) occupational competence; 3) (a) access and success for special populations as defined by the Perkins Act; (b) nontraditional career preparation; 4) successful transition to careers and/or further education; and 5) employer/employee satisfaction with high school preparation.

The Board accepted the report as presented, which will be maintained as part of the Board of Education’s meeting records, and be communicated to the audiences required by the Perkins legislation.

**Report on the Mid-Atlantic Regional Teachers Project Creating the Meritorious New Teacher Candidate Designation**

Dr. Elliott presented this item. Dr. Elliott said that the Mid-Atlantic Region Teacher Project (MARTP) is a regional consortium initiated in 2000 by the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) at the Temple University, in cooperation with the Council for Basic Education (CBE) and the Maryland State Department of Education.

As its first project, MARTP undertook a teacher supply and demand data gap analysis. The goal of the project was to collect data on various indices that define the regional teacher supply and demand profile. Seven geographic partners, all key players in the Mid-Atlantic educational enterprise, comprise the MARTP project team. Participating entities are Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New Jersey. An analysis of the data collected from the participants clearly defined several strategies to enhance the teaching and the teaching environment among the consortium members. A key strategy was the creation and implementation of a Meritorious New Teacher Candidate designation for graduates of approved teacher education programs.

Dr. Elliott said that the new teacher candidate designation was created to provide the following:

1. A symbol of excellence to be noted on the initial license of exceptionally well-prepared and high-performing new teachers;
2. Awarding the first designation to MARTP graduates from approved teacher preparation programs in the spring of 2004; and
3. New teachers who have met the rigorous criteria for this designation will be fully certified to teach in any of the cooperating states.
Dr. Elliott said that the teacher candidates who earn this designation will have demonstrated exemplary levels of performance at every stage of preparation. A committee with broad representation from schools of education, state departments of education, school districts, research organizations, and a teachers’ association agreed on the selection criteria. They chose only those criteria that show a strong correlation with gains in student learning. These criteria fall into three important categories: performance in the professional education program, evidence of content knowledge, and evidence of verbal skills.

The Board received the report on the MARTP Meritorious New Teacher Candidate Project.

**DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES**

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel on March 23, 2004. Present were: Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Emblidge, Mr. Goodman, Mr. David Johnson, Mr. Thomas Johnson, Dr. Jones, and Dr. Ward. A brief discussion took place about general Board business. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Jackson adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

__________________________________
President

__________________________________
Secretary