

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

April 20, 2005

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at Virginia Crossings Conference Center, Richmond, with the following members present:

Mr. Thomas A. Jackson, President	Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mr. Mark E. Emblidge, Vice President	Mr. Andrew J. Rotherham
Mrs. Isis M. Castro	Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw
Mr. David L. Johnson	Dr. Ella P. Ward
Mr. Thomas G. Johnson, Jr.	
	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.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Mrs. Castro made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 23, 2005, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all member of the Board of Education.

***PUBLIC COMMENT***

The following persons spoke during public comment: Kathy Lehman, Rachel Bavister, Alice Frick., and Fred Yates

***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS***

***Report of Recommendations from the Board of Education's 2004-2005 Student Advisory Committee***

Mrs. Castro and Mrs. Saslaw, sponsors of the Student Advisory Committee, introduced the following committee members:

Ashley Beaudin, James Wood High School, Frederick County

Patricia Castillo, Denbigh High School, Newport News  
Liz Chassey, Prince Edward Middle School, Prince Edward County  
Jonte' Craighead, The Gereau Center, Franklin County  
Ginny Fuller, Monacan High School, Chesterfield County  
Richard Ingebresten, Battlefield Middle School, Spotsylvania County  
Lori Lippman, Albert Hill Middle School, Richmond City  
Kati Logan, Luray High School, Page County  
Katelyn Mendoza, Monticello High School, Albemarle County  
Molly Rubin, Kempsville High School, Virginia Beach City  
Jessica Schatz, Courtland High School, Spotsylvania County  
Thomas Webb, Graham High School, Tazewell County

During the past year, the Student Advisory Committee discussed the following topics in detail, conducted research, and discussed the issues with fellow students. The Student Advisory Committee presented the following reports, which summarize the committee's concerns and recommendations:

**Issue: Raising Awareness of Psychological Health and Violence among Students in Virginia Schools**

Background

With increasing evidence of stress, depression, suicide, and violent behavior in Virginia's public school system, the issue has reached a point where it must be bluntly addressed. Stress, depression, and suicide have been a direct result of many large, often overlooked factors such as steadily increasing workloads and social demands. Violence in public schools often stems from social friction, a need for attention, pressures from workloads, and approval from peers and authorities. More than 344,000 cases of discipline, crime, and violence occurred in Virginia schools during the 2002-2003 school year. Large city schools are often the focal point for research and fact-finding to help determine the overall scope of depression and violence. However, appropriate attention has not been given to finding a realistic solution to the problem within Virginia's largest cities. Additionally, rural communities have recently been experiencing higher percentages of depression, suicide, and violence while research methods and realistic solutions have been overlooked in these areas as well.





Position of the Student Advisory Committee

The Student Advisory Committee feels that steps must be taken in a prompt fashion to help combat the issue of failing psychological health and increased violence. Accurate systems must be developed to create both immediate and long-term success in solving the problems students face. Another topic of concern is the lack of accurate methods of reporting that would be consistent throughout the state. If the state requires individual school districts to uniformly implement a more effective way of reporting incidents of violence, crime, and depression, then the state will be able to accurately analyze, with greater accuracy the success of programs established by each district. The

focus of these programs should include building: character, mental strength, work ethic, motivation, and determination.

### Recommendations

The Student Advisory Committee recommends that the Virginia Board of Education:

-  Implement a statewide reporting program, such as the PRIDE Survey.
-  Use the results of the reporting program to analyze the needs of each district.
-  Expand advertisements of available resources for individual districts from the state for character education programs that have been proven effective. For example:
  - The “Roanoke Coalition” – Community businesses and families in Roanoke, Virginia, that actively participate in local school functions by providing money and services to help students expand their opportunities for education and advancement.
  - The Resilient Child – A program that implements self-esteem, motivation, moral, and work-ethic habits into schooling at a young age to develop habits that allow students to be mentally healthy in higher levels of education and to further their ability to learn.
  - Character Counts - Character education program emphasizing the six pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.
  - Community of Caring – Grant program sponsored by Eunice Kennedy and Sargeant Shriver that helps students establish organizations within the school environment to raise the attitude of the community and encourage people to care about each other and help maintain an atmosphere conducive to education and success.
-  Seek more funds for school personnel (teachers, counselors, social workers, psychologists, and administrators) for materials and the training of adults and students for the purpose of preventing and combating violence and psychological problems.

### **Issue: Creating opportunities to renew and teach creatively towards testing.**

#### Background

The Standards of Quality passed by the General Assembly on teacher quality and educational leadership state that “teacher evaluations shall include regular observation and evidence that instruction is aligned with the school’s curriculum. Evaluations shall include identification of areas of individual strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for appropriate professional activities.” By following the standards the General Assembly has established, we are forced to evaluate the quality of our teachers in all aspects. It is often said that the embers of a successful student are kindled by the passion of a driven teacher. Thus, it is the integrity, compassion, and leadership of these teachers that will surely yield positive results in their pupils. The best way to examine

teacher quality is through their in-class testing methods. Testing evaluates the ability of students to learn and grow. Thus, it is clear how vital it is to establish these skills thoroughly.

#### Position of the Student Advisory Committee

Test preparation must be a year-long process, not based on seasonal periods. However, the key to such preparation is to prepare students in a way that they forget they are going through methods of test preparation, and instead focus on the interesting and even enjoyable manner in which they are being taught. As we all know, absorption of knowledge is more beneficial to a student than memorizing information verbatim.

#### Formal Recommendation of the Student Advisory Committee

There are numerous approaches to this issue. Since every situation is different, one specific recommendation may not work for everyone. For this reason, we offer the following recommendations:

- The integration of AP tests with normal class tests to teach students how to take the AP test, while also fulfilling the testing needs of the class itself.
- Better preparation for SATs and ACTs. We believe in starting this preparation in middle school and continuing it through high school.
- Holding seminars for teachers so that they may learn new teaching strategies and renew their passion for teaching.
- An ongoing screening process that evaluates a teacher's continuing qualifications as well as the ability to connect with students with qualities such as: integrity; compassion; respect; honesty; fairness; open-mindedness; subject matter expertise; communication; patience; imagination; leadership; and listening skills.
- Online resources for teachers that provide creative methods for teaching.

### **Issue: Promoting Curriculum Diversity through Education in the Fine Arts**

#### Background

It is widely acknowledged that the fine arts enhance students' abilities to improve skills in all areas of learning. According to the *Fine Arts Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools*, "knowledge and skills that students acquire through the fine arts instruction include the ability to think critically, solve problems creatively, make informed judgments, work cooperatively with groups, appreciate different cultures, imagine, and create." While it is comforting to know that fine arts are important to the state, there are no specific requirements in middle or high school to ensure that students earn credit in the fine arts, which include visual art, music, dance, and theater. Currently, high school students need only take one credit of a fine or practical art to graduate. In middle school, fine arts can be completely avoided because these classes are simply offered, not required. However, under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), fine arts are listed as core subjects. No distinction is made between math and theater. As the state works to implement the changes listed in the NCLB, the fine arts area is in need of special attention and modification.

### Position of the Student Advisory Committee

The positive effects of education in the fine arts are indisputable. The Student Advisory Committee wishes to ensure that these benefits are preserved and provided to all students across the state. Statistics show that students who have taken fine arts for more than five years on average score 100 points higher on the SAT. A direct correlation exists between arts-based learning and enhanced student achievement. In today's competitive society, colleges are looking for well-rounded students. Businesses are looking for innovative, free thinkers who are team players. Education in the fine arts creates individuals who possess many of these characteristics. The arts integrate basic neurological functions to maintain stable psychological health. A current focus of the Virginia Board of Education, as well as of the federal government, is increasing graduation rates among "at risk" students. Fine arts have proven to narrow the achievement gap among different socioeconomic student groups. It is our hope that the following suggestions will contribute to the state's continued dedication to excellence in education.

### Recommendations

To put our position into action, we recommend that the Board of Education:

- Require middle school students to pass one year or two semesters of fine arts in order to continue to high school.
- Require high school students to take one year of a fine art and one year of a practical art to graduate.
- Continue the standards currently in place in the elementary school level in the fine arts.

Mr. Jackson thanked the staff from Policy and Communications for working with the students. They were: Anne Wescott, Michelle Parker, and Melissa Velazquez. He asked Dr. DeMary to bring to the Board of Education recommendations for implementing the recommendations.

Mr. Jackson and Dr. DeMary presented Certificates of Appreciation to each advisory committee member.

### **First Review of Approval of Local Division Remedial Plans**

Mrs. Kathleen Smith, associate director for school improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Smith said that as required by 8 VAC 20-630-20, school divisions are required to develop a remediation plan designed to strengthen and improve the academic achievement of eligible students.

Language contained in Item 146.B.13, Chapter 4, 2004 Acts of Assembly, Special Session I, states that school divisions may choose to use state payments provided for the Standards of Quality remediation and Standards of Learning remediation as a block grant for remediation purposes, without restrictions or reporting requirements, other than reporting necessary as a basis for determining funding for the program.

For the 2004-2005 fiscal year, school divisions choosing to use Standards of Quality remediation funds and Standards of Learning remediation funds (derived solely from monies carried forward from the 2003-2004 fiscal year) as block grants are not subject to restrictions or reporting requirements. Mrs. Smith said that data for the 2004-2005 fiscal year will not be reported for these two programs because all school divisions are participating in the block grant program.

Funds for summer remedial programs were excluded from this language. School divisions are required to submit a remedial plan for summer remedial programs for fiscal year 2005, including programs planned for 2005-2006 for year-round schools. Local school divisions have submitted remedial plans for fiscal year 2005-2006 to the department for approval.

Mrs. Smith said that Department of Education staff have reviewed remediation plans from 130 school divisions and determined that all of the plans meet the requirements of 8 VAC 20-630. Two divisions, Loudoun County and Frederick County, have said they will not offer a state-funded remedial summer program. Following the 2006 Standards of Learning assessments, these divisions will report data to the department as specified in 8 VAC 20-630-50.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and approve the report on the approval of local school division remedial plans as required in 8 VAC 20-630-20. Dr. Ward seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Proposed Criteria for Virginia Board of Education Review of Private Educational Management Companies**

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, presented this item. Dr. Wallinger noted that at its March 23, 2005, meeting, the Board of Education received for first review a set of proposed criteria to be used to evaluate private educational management companies. In response to feedback provided by the Board, a criterion on effectiveness was added to ensure that the private educational management companies could provide evidence of their ability to turn a school around.

Dr. Wallinger said that an additional indicator has also been added to the section on finance and organization to address the ability of the private educational management company to build capacity so that once the company exits, the school and school division can sustain the administrative and instructional progress that has been made. As some of Virginia's schools move into year three of school improvement, which requires corrective action, the Board desires to offer additional options to schools to comply with NCLB.

Dr. Wallinger said that the proposed criteria would ensure a minimum level of assurance that a company is able to provide such services effectively. The companies would operate under a contract with the school division, and any performance measures and stated outcomes would be agreed on between the school division and the

management company. In addition to providing options for corrective action, a private educational management company may also allow a school division to provide additional alternatives for public school choice.

Mr. Emblidge made a motion to accept for final review the proposed criteria for review of private educational management companies to provide services to Virginia schools. Mrs. Castro seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously. The Department of Education will make the criteria available to school divisions interested in employing the services of a private educational management company as well as incorporate them into a proposed process to review such companies.

**First Review of Procedures for Board of Education Review of Private Educational Management Companies**

Dr. Wallinger also presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that the Board of Education is committed to assisting schools and school divisions that have failed to make adequate progress toward student achievement goals. The Department of Education will receive proposals from private education management companies for review in order to offer a minimum level of assurance that the companies are able to provide services as described in the proposed Virginia Board of Education criteria. The companies would operate under a memorandum of agreement with the school divisions, and any performance measure and stated outcomes would be agreed on between the local school division and the management company.

Dr. Wallinger pointed out that a private educational management company must submit information to the Virginia Department of Education for review, according to criteria set by the Board. Staff members at the Department of Education will conduct the review. It will be based on responses to the following criteria: financial and organizational capacity, effectiveness, instructional capacity, personnel capacity, professional development capacity, and communication capacity.

Dr. Ward made a motion that criteria will be applied by staff and posted to the Virginia Department of Education Web site and no procedure is necessary. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Alignment of Board of Education "Highly Qualified" Policies to Requirements for Special Education Teachers Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004**

Mr. Doug Cox, assistant superintendent for special education and student services, presented this item. Mr. Cox said that on November 19, 2004, Congress passed Public Law 108-446, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA). One significant element of the new statute is the term "highly qualified" as applied to special education teachers. IDEIA links its definition of "highly qualified" to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) definition but modifies it as it applies to special

education teachers. A teacher who is highly qualified under IDEIA is considered highly qualified for purposes of NCLB. Mr. Cox said that the new law requires that all special education teachers who teach core academic subjects to students with disabilities meet “highly qualified” requirements either as elementary teachers or subject-area teachers.

Dr. Jones made a motion to adopt the requirements, as presented, for highly qualified special education teachers and revisions to the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) to include special education teachers. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

### **First Review of a Request for Increased Requirement from a Local School Board**

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, and Dr. N. Wayne Tripp, superintendent of Salem City public schools, presented this item.

Mr. Tripp said that in July 2000, the school board of the city of Salem received grandfathered approval to require all students to complete one-half unit of credit in computer literacy/computer studies as a condition of graduation. The requirement was in place prior to the adoption of new accrediting standards in the summer of 2000 and guidelines for adding additional local requirement for graduation in November 2000. The school board submitted a request to modify the additional requirement to require all students to complete a one-half unit of credit course in personal finance and basic economics. Mr. Tripp said that the school board believes the previous requirement of a course in computer literacy/computer skills is no longer necessary as those concepts are now taught at the elementary level or that students acquire the skills from personal experience.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and approve the request from Salem city public schools to modify the additional requirement to require all students to complete a one-half unit of credit course in personal finance and basic economics. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Johnson and carried unanimously.

### **Informational Briefing by Kia Brown on “SchoolMatters” a Web-Based National Education Data Service**

Ms. Kia Brown, Virginia’s liaison for Standard & Poor’s School Evaluation Services, presented this item. Ms. Brown said that in response to an expressed need by the education community for an impartial, transparent analysis of the nation’s educational data, Standard & Poor created a business unit, School Evaluation Services, and developed its unique Return on Resources framework to synthesize student performance, financial information, and community and school demographics to help explain school and school district performance.

Ms. Brown stated that with funding from the Broad Foundation and the Bill and Belinda Gates Foundation, S&P, in collaboration with the Council of Chief State School



Officers (CCSSO), Achieve Inc., and the CELT Corporation, developed an analytical data tool available to all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico through an interactive Web site know as SchoolMatters.

Ms. Brown said this online resource was designed to assist educators, policymakers, parents, and the public in using data to see how schools are performing and to provide user-friendly tools to analyze the data based on specified indicators. Ms. Brown said that utilizing data from a number of sources, including the U.S. Census Bureau, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the DOE, SchoolMatters would offer school-, division-, and state-level data. Ms. Brown demonstrated several functions of the website to the Board.

Mr. Jackson thanked Ms. Brown for her presentation.

**Statewide Career and Technical Education Performance Report Summary for the Virginia Community College System, as a Sub-recipient of Perkins Funds from the Department of Education**

Ms. Elizabeth Russell, director of career and technical education, and Mrs. Elizabeth Creamer, director of postsecondary Perkins-Tech Prep, Virginia Community College System, presented this item.

Ms. Russell said that on March 23, 2005, the Board of Education accepted the Virginia System of Performance Standards and Measures for Virginia's Secondary Schools as part of the 2000-2004 State Plan for Career and Technical Education (CET). The Virginia Community College System receives its Perkins Funds as a sub-recipient of the Virginia Department of Education. The federal Perkins Act requires that the results on the negotiated state-adjusted levels of performance for postsecondary CTE be communicated to the Virginia Board of Education and other audiences. Each institution in the Virginia Community College System will receive an annual report of performance.

Mrs. Creamer presented to the Board the statewide Career and Technical Education performance report summary for the Virginia Community College System, as a sub-recipient of Perkins Funds from the Department of Education.

After a brief discussion, the Board accepted the report as presented. The report will be maintained as a part of the Board of Education's meeting records and will be communicated to the audiences required by the Perkins legislation.

**Update of the Virginia Schools for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton and Staunton**

Dr. Karen Trump, director for state operated programs, presented this item. Dr. Trump said that the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind at Staunton and the Virginia School for the Deaf, Blind, and Multi-disabled at Hampton have a combined enrollment

of 222 students. Each school is situated on separate, 70-plus acre, multi-building campuses with growing deferred maintenance needs.

As a result of declining enrollment, increased maintenance costs, and other issues impacting the efficiency of each school, the consolidation of the two state schools for the deaf and the blind has been studied repeatedly since 1979. In 2003, a consolidation task force, convened at the direction of the General Assembly, recommended that a new school be built at a location to be determined by the Board of Education. As a result of the task force's recommendations, a subsequent feasibility study, directed by the General Assembly, was conducted in 2004. The feasibility study proposed the parameters for construction of a new school at a new site.

Dr. Trump said that the 2005 General Assembly adopted language through the budget bill (House Bill 1500) directing that the two schools be consolidated into one school. Including subsequent amendments proposed by the Governor, the final budget language is as follows:

- ✓ "D.1. In order to provide improved services through up-to-date facilities as well as to achieve long-term cost savings, notwithstanding other provisions of the Code of Virginia, the Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind at Staunton and the Virginia School for the Deaf, Blind, and Multi-disabled at Hampton shall be consolidated into one school upon completion of any renovations, additions, or new facility construction at a site as determined by the State Board of Education with assistance from the Department of General Services.
- ✓ 2.a. The State Board of Education, assisted by the Department of General Services, shall consider, among other options, Public-Private Education Act (PPEA) proposals to plan and design the consolidation of the Virginia School for the Deaf and the Blind at Staunton and the Virginia School for the Deaf, Blind and Multi-disabled at Hampton into a single campus and the transfer of students, programs, and services to a single campus, the location of which shall be incorporated into a PPEA proposal or a conventional capital construction project proposal that will be accepted, reviewed and adopted by the State Board of Education no later than July 31, 2005.
- ✓ b. In the event that the State Board of Education selects a PPEA proposal, the Department of General Services is authorized to enter into an agreement for construction of the new school at a total cost not to exceed \$61.5 million.
- ✓ 3. The Departments of Education and General Services shall provide an update on the final location selected by the State Board of Education and on the planning and construction process to the Governor and the Chairmen of the House Committees on Education and Appropriations and the Senate

Committees on Finance and Education and Health by October 1, 2005. At a minimum, the report shall address:

- ✓ a. Revised cost estimates and proposed timelines for construction of the new facility for consolidating services for the students served by Virginia's two schools at Staunton and Hampton;
- ✓ b. In cooperation with the Department of Planning and Budget, revised projected operating budgets for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, including any one-time transition costs;
- ✓ c. The status of proposed mechanisms to assist school divisions with programs for children transferring into local school divisions rather than continuing enrollment at the new school location;
- ✓ d. Detailed cost estimates of possible program enhancements, including specialized technology, expanding services to include deaf children with emotional disabilities; and
- ✓ e. Potential alternative uses of the existing campuses in Hampton and Staunton.

The Board accepted the report. The Department of Education will provide periodic updates to the Board. At a future meeting, the Board will be presented options and/or proposals for moving forward with the consolidation. The appropriation act language requires the Board to make the first decision regarding the method for proceeding with consolidation no later than July 31, 2005. The Department of Education must provide a report on this project to the Governor and the General Assembly no later than October 1, 2005.

Mr. Jackson said that this is a difficult decision because it will determine the future of a lot of people. Mr. Jackson said that the students are the Board's first priority.

**Report on Status of Proposed Waivers/Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Required in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Dr. Pat Wright, deputy superintendent, presented this item. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires all state educational agencies (SEA) to submit for approval to the United States Department of Education (USED) individual program applications or a consolidated state application. A major component of the consolidated application is Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook that describes a single statewide accountability system for the commonwealth. The accountability workbook that describes the policies and procedures that were used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) ratings for the 2003-2004 school year are described in the amended workbook dated May 26, 2004.

Virginia's proposed waiver requests are categorized into five major areas: (1) 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 when safe harbor is not invoked, (2) How states determine if a school or school division makes AYP and enters improvement status, (3) use of test scores from multiple administrations, (4) Testing and AYP calculation policies for limited English proficient students, and (5) Testing and AYP calculation policies for students with disabilities.

On February 1, 2005, USED sent a letter to President Jackson indicating the "graduation rate" amendment to be acceptable and the "new minimum n" amendment to be acceptable with modifications. Both of these requests were considered USED policy interpretations and did not require a waiver of regulation or statute. The letter stated USED would get back with Virginia on the remaining amendment/waiver requests as soon as it reached a decision on their acceptability.

On April 7, 2005, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings promised additional flexibility for states that adhere to what she described as the four key principles of the law:

- Ensuring students are learning: Raising overall achievement and closing the achievement gap;
- Making the school system accountable: Including all students in all schools and districts in the state; ensuring all students are part of a state's accountability system and are tested in reading and math in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school by the 2005-06 school year; providing data on student achievement by subgroup;
- Ensuring information is accessible and parents have options: Informing parents in a timely manner about the quality of their child's school and their school choice options, identifying schools and districts that need to improve, developing a dynamic list of after-school tutors, encouraging public school choice and the creation of charter schools, and creating easily accessible and understandable school and district report cards; and
- Improving teacher quality: Providing parents and the public with accurate information on the quality of their local teaching force, implementing a rigorous system for ensuring teachers are highly qualified and making aggressive efforts to ensure all children are taught by highly qualified teachers.

Secretary Spellings announced that the first example of this new approach for implementing NCLB would be to permit states to use modified assessments for students with disabilities "who need more time and instruction to make substantial progress toward grade-level achievement." Scores from these modified assessments would be limited to 2 percent of all tested students. This 2 percent would be in addition to the 1 percent cap on allowed passing scores on alternative assessments taken by students

with significant cognitive disabilities. This new provision will be released in a notice of proposed rulemaking later this spring and therefore would not be available to states until 2005-2006, at the earliest. The Virginia Department of Education is waiting for details of the process USED will develop and follow to identify states that qualify.

. After a brief discussion, Mr. David Johnson made a motion for the Department to develop a proposed starting point for submission to USDOE. Dr. Ward seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

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

On the evening of April 19, 2005, the Board met for dinner at the Virginia Crossings Conference with the following members present: Mr. Jackson, Mr. Emblidge, Mrs. Castro, Mr. David Johnson, Mr. Thomas Johnson, Mr. Rotherham, Mrs. Saslaw, and Dr. Ward. A brief discussion took place and no votes were taken. The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

### ***EXECUTIVE SESSION***

Dr. Jones made a motion to go into executive session under Virginia Code 2.2-3711.A, specifically to discuss personnel matters related to licensure. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and it carried unanimously. The Board adjourned for the executive session at 12:30 p.m.

Dr. Jones made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 12:50 p.m.

Dr. Jones 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 Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mr. David Johnson – Yes  
Dr. Ward – Yes  
Mr. Emblidge – Yes  
Dr. Jones – Yes  
Mr. Jackson – Yes

Mr. Thomas Johnson – Yes  
Mrs. Castro – Yes  
Mrs. Saslaw – Yes  
Mr. Rotherham – Yes

Dr. Jones made the following motions:

Case #1 – That the Board issue the license. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Case #2 – That upon receipt of final document to appear before panel again. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

### ***DISCUSSION OF TOPICS AND ISSUES RELATED TO BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULATIONS***

#### ***Standards of Accreditation: Informational Briefing and Discussion of Related Topics***

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott reviewed the current provisions contained in the Standards of Accreditation and led a discussion of issues related to the provisions of the standards.

The Board intends to amend the accreditation standards and was requested to review the contents of the current standards and to discuss issues that will need to be addressed during the revision process.

The current regulations were adopted by the Board of Education on July 29, 2000, and became effective September 28, 2000. Since that time, public schools in Virginia have implemented more rigorous requirements for accountability both at the school level and the student level. Now that most Virginia schools are fully accredited and the first high school class required to earn verified units of credit has graduated from high school, it is time for a comprehensive review of the regulations to determine if there are changes that might be needed.

Mrs. Wescott indicated that staff will bring proposed revisions to Board at its May or June meeting.

#### ***Informational Briefing and Discussion: Teacher Licensure Regulations***

Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher education and professional licensure, presented this item.

Dr. Elliott led a discussion of issues related to teacher licensure regulations. The last comprehensive review of the Regulations Governing the Licensure of School Personnel was conducted in the mid 1990's with regulations becoming effective July 1, 1998. The regulations need to be revised based on federal and state legislation as well as to address recommendations to clarify and change requirements for licensure.

In January 2005, the Board of Education approved a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for revising the teacher licensure regulations. Since the NOIRA was announced, the Board of Education has established the Special Committee to Study and Make Recommendations Relative to Teacher Licensure Assessment. The committee is expected to make recommendations in the near future. Therefore, the Board is requested to review the committee's recommendations prior to discussing the assessment requirements contained in the licensure regulations.

***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Career and Technical Education, Mr. Jackson adjourned the meeting at 3 p.m. Mr. Jackson announced that the Board would reconvene at 9 a.m. the following morning.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

April 21, 2005

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education meeting continued at Virginia Crossings Conference Center, Richmond, with the following members present:

Mr. Thomas A. Jackson, President	Mr. Andrew J. Rotherham
Mr. Mark E. Emblidge, Vice President	Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw
Mrs. Isis M. Castro	Dr. Ella P. Ward
Mr. David L. Johnson	
Mr. Thomas G. Johnson, Jr.	Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary Superintendent of Public Instruction

The meeting resumed at 9 a.m.

**Informational Briefing and Discussion: Approved Program Regulations**

Dr. Elliott led this discussion. Dr. Elliott said that the *Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education* is a two-part document providing 20 standards that govern the review of the professional education unit, indicators of achievement of each standard, and a manual of procedures for the implementation of the standards and the review of endorsement programs.

Dr. Elliott said that teacher education regulations drive licensure, and the license should be an end product of the preparation program. Dr. Elliott said that the Board may be shifting the competencies that are currently outlined for the 40-plus teacher endorsement areas from licensure and into approved programs because colleges and universities that are designing programs should be focusing on the program design and not the end product of the license.

Dr. Elliott said the Board is requested to discuss two areas that the current regulations do not clearly address: (1) the actual alignment that should exist between preparation programs with K-12 needs; and (2) the need for more data in reports brought back to the Board on approved programs.

Dr. Elliott next discussed what currently exists in the regulations. Two hallmarks significant in the preparation of professionals are approved programs and accreditation. Approved programs are those predetermined objectives, competencies, and expectations developed by the Board, and as long as the colleges/universities design programs that



reflect those objectives, competencies, and expectations, their graduates will get a license to practice promulgated by the Board.

Dr. Elliott said that Virginia's program approval and accreditation options consist of the following:

- Option 1 – Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Education (NCATE)
- Option 2 – Board of Education Program approval/accreditation
- Option 3 – Teacher education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

The Board discussed the relationship between accreditation and program approval. The process now provides that if the college/university gets accredited by the state, NCATE, or TEAC, the college/university is approved. The Board discussed the possibility of separating this process.

Mrs. Saslaw asked if the evaluation will include following the success of teachers beyond college. Dr. Elliott said that funding from the Governor's Teacher Education Enhance Grant has made it possible for Teacher Education and Professional Licensure to provide demographics on teachers in the state. A grant has also been provided to SCHEV, which will follow the graduate into the work field.

Dr. Elliott said there are four approved program/accreditation standards: (1) education program design, (2) candidates in education programs, (3) faculty in education programs, and (4) operation and accountability of education programs.

Mr. Rotherham asked what is the minimum GPA required to enter the teacher preparation program. Dr. Elliott said that currently the required minimum GPA is 2.5. Dr. Elliott said this reflects the national requirements to enter teacher preparation programs.

### **Board of Education's Six-Year Plan: 2003-2008: Accomplishments to Date**

Mrs. Ann Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications talked with the Board about what is in the law about the Six-Year Plan. Mrs. Wescott said that the language mirrors what local school boards are expected to have for their comprehensive plan. The 2005 amendments to the Standards of Quality are as follows:

#### **§ 22.1-253.13:6. Standard 6. Planning and Public Involvement.**

A. The Board of Education shall adopt statewide comprehensive, unified, long-range plan based on data collection, analysis, and evaluation. Such plan shall be developed with statewide participation. The Board shall review the plan biennially and adopt any necessary revisions. The Board shall post such the plan on the Department of Education's Website if practicable, and, in any case, shall make a hard copy of such plan available for public inspection and copying.

This plan shall include the objectives of public education in Virginia, including strategies for improving student achievement then maintaining high levels of student achievement; an assessment of the extent to which these objectives are being achieved, a forecast of enrollment changes, and an assessment of the needs of public education in the Commonwealth. In the annual report required by § 22.1-18, the Board shall include an analysis of the extent to which these Standards of Quality have been achieved and the objectives of the statewide six-year comprehensive plan have been met. The Board shall also develop, consistent with, or as a part of, its six-year comprehensive plan, a detailed comprehensive, long-range plan to integrate educational technology into the Standards of Learning and the curricula of the public schools in Virginia, including career and technical education programs. The Board shall review and approve the comprehensive plan for educational technology and may require the revision of such plan, as it deems necessary...

**Updating the Plan: Discussion Facilitated by Ms. Brenda Welburn, Executive Director, National Association of State Board of Education**

Mrs. Wescott introduced Ms. Brenda Welburn, executive director, national association of state board of education, presented this item. Mrs. Welburn opened the meeting by having Board members introduce themselves.

Mrs. Welburn said that the meeting objective is to review and update the priorities of the Virginia Board of Education under the 2003-2006 six-year plan.

Following are issues Ms. Welburn discussed with the Board:

**Critical education issues in education**

- Achievement gap
- Chronically low-performing divisions and schools
- Organization and support for struggling schools and teachers
- Teacher salaries
- Needs of minority and ESL students
- Dysfunctional school boards
- Early childhood education
- Serving students in the middle
- Teacher preparation/licensure
- Revamping high school programs
- Attracting and pertaining teachers/administrators
- Children with most needs
- Dropouts – take longer than four years
- Expanded student service and communities
- Alternative path toward school improvement
- Needs of schools

Emerging Issues

- Attaining AYP
- Technical assistance to divisions and schools that don't make AYP
- Demand for greater customization from parent
- Maintaining services and support for high achieving students
- School Accreditation
- Career pathways

Board Priorities

1. The Board will strengthen Virginia's public schools by providing challenging academic standards for all students. During the discussion, the Board added the following: cut scores
2. The Board of Education will enhance the foundation program and the quality standards for public education in Virginia. During discussion, the Board added the following: SOQ for school readiness
3. The Board of Education will continue efforts to enhance the training, recruitment, and retention of highly qualified teachers and administrators. During discussion, the Board added the following: educational support personnel, expand leadership positions, LP schools, and state policy review on counselors.
4. The Board of Education will support accountability and continuous improvement in all schools. During the discussion, the Board added the following: new priority for low performing schools, and revamping academic review process.
5. The Board of Education will assist teachers to improve the reading skills of all students, especially those at the early grades. During the discussion, the Board added the following: cut score for reading test for teachers and middle and secondary reading
6. The Board of Education will provide leadership for implementing the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act smoothly and with minimal disruption to local school divisions.

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Jackson thanked Ms. Welburn and Dr. Roberts and the Department of Education staff for the work they did in planning the Board's Retreat.

***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Career and Technical Education, Mr. Jackson adjourned the meeting at 2:17 p.m.

---

President

---

Secretary