

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

November 29, 2006

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, Richmond, with the following members present:

Dr. Mark E. Emblidge, President
Dr. Ella P. Ward, Vice President
Dr. Thomas M. Brewster
Mrs. Isis M. Castro
Mr. David L. Johnson

Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mr. Kelvin L. Moore
Mr. Andrew J. Rotherham
Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr. Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Dr. Emblidge, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Emblidge asked Mrs. Castro to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 25, 2006, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITIONS

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to the following:

- Dr. Carolyn Kreiter-Foronda, Poet Laureate of Virginia: 2006-2008.
- Virginia's 2007 Regional Teachers of the Year and 2007 Virginia Teacher of the Year:
 - Region I, James E. Triesler, Clover Hill High School, Chesterfield County Public Schools;
 - Region II, Elizabeth T. Harris, Great Bridge High School, Chesapeake City Public Schools;

- Region III, Lori M Chaney, Winding Creek Elementary School, Stafford County Public Schools;
- Region IV, William W. Willis, Jr., Gar-Field High School, Prince William County Public Schools;
- Region V, Janice H. Suddith, Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School, Lynchburg City Public Schools;
- Region VI, Marsha L. Lopez, Franklin County High School, Franklin County Public Schools;
- Region VII, Susan W. Evans, and 2007 Virginia Teacher of the Year, Rural Retreat High School, Wythe County Public School, and;
- Region VIII, Margaret W. Lumpkin, Greenville Elementary School, Greenville County Public School.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment: Angela Ciolfi, Cindy Hetzel, and Dr. Sylinda Gilchrist.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

First Review of Releasing Lee County Public Schools from the Division-Level Process

Mrs. Kathleen Smith, director of the office of school improvement, introduced Mr. Rod Griffith, secondary supervisor for Lee County Public Schools, and Mrs. Wandaleen Adams, reading and technology coordinator for Lee County Public Schools.

Mrs. Smith said that on April 15, 2004, the Board of Education and the Lee County School Board entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to voluntarily participate in a division-level review conducted by the Department of Education. On July 12, 2004, the Lee County School Board adopted a corrective action plan that addressed the essential actions indicated in the report of findings of the division-level review.

Mrs. Smith said that as a result, in the 2006-2007 school year, all of the schools in Lee County Public Schools are fully accredited. All schools have made AYP, as did the division as a whole. In addition, Elk Knob Elementary School was recently named as one of the seven nominees to the No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools for 2007.

Dr. Cannaday said that what Lee County has done is an important story to share with others who sometimes do not feel hopeful that schools can be improved. Dr. Cannaday said that in March 2007, Department of Education staff will go to Lee County to interview teachers, administrators, parents, and students so that their perspective may be recorded shared with others in the future.

Dr. Brewster said that the Board is extremely proud of Lee County. Mr. Rotherham urged Lee County officials to document what they have done and make themselves available for their colleagues around the state.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and release the Lee County School Board from the Memorandum of Agreement for the division-level review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Standards of Quality

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that Constitution of Virginia requires the Board of Education to determine and prescribe Standards of Quality for the public schools in Virginia. The *Code of Virginia* requires the Board of Education to review the Standards of Quality every two years. The *Code* also requires that the Board's annual report to the Governor and General Assembly include any recommendations for revisions to the Standards of Quality.

Mrs. Wescott said that the Board began its 2006 review of the Standards of Quality at its April 27, 2006, planning session. On May 23, 2006, the Standards of Quality Committee held a forum to hear comments from educational organizations on potential changes to the Standards of Quality. The Standards of Quality Committee met on June 27, 2006, and July 25, 2006, to hear staff presentations and to consider possible recommendations.

Mrs. Wescott said that the major recommendations are to provide for the following: (1) one full-time principal in every elementary school; (2) one full-time assistant principal per 400 students; (3) reading specialist for every 1,000 students in K-12; (4) reduction in speech and language pathologists' caseload from 68 to 60; (5) one mathematics specialist for every 1,000 students in K-8; (6) one data manager test coordinator for every 1,000 students in K-12; and (7) instructional positions for students who are blind or vision impaired.

Dr. Emblidge recognized Dr. Jones for chairing the SOQ Committee. Dr. Jones thanked staff for their work. Mrs. Castro said that the SOQ should not be the sole source for the Board to identify standards of quality for schools in Virginia. Mrs. Castro also requested an impact study on the analysis of statewide data relating to the requirements for obtaining a high school diploma for students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and asked the Board not to forget the silent voices of LEP students the next time the Board reviews the SOQ.

Dr. Jones made a motion to approve the revised Standards of Quality. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. The recommendations will be submitted to the 2007 General Assembly for its consideration.

First Review of Report to the Governor and General Assembly on the High School Graduation Rate Formula

Mr. Lan Neugent, assistant superintendent for technology and human resources, presented this item. Mr. Neugent said that House Bill 19 (2006) amended § 22.1-253.13:4 of the *Code of Virginia*, relating to calculation of high school graduation rates. The *Code* requires the Board of Education to ensure the uniform assessment of high school graduation rates; to collect, analyze, and report high school graduation and dropout data using a formula prescribed by the Board; and to report on the formula to be used. The *Code* also requires the Board to consider the 2005 Report of the National Governors Association (NGA) Task Force on State High School Graduation Data in developing the formula.

Mr. Neugent said that to meet the requirements of House Bill 19, the Virginia Board of Education's Committee on Graduation and Dropouts studied seven widely-discussed graduation rate formulas, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each. These characteristics included: (1) recognition of the five Virginia diplomas recognition of retention practices; (2) allowing for students who take longer than four years to graduate; (3) consideration of student mobility and declining student populations; and (4) accuracy of the rate when disaggregated to the division, school, and subgroup level.

Mr. Neugent said that of the seven rates studied, six were estimates, and one, the NGA rate, was an actual measure based on individual student progress over time. The NGA formula addresses several weaknesses found in the six estimated rates. It recognizes the five Virginia diplomas. Thus, Advanced, Standard, Modified Standard, Special, and General Achievement diplomas are included. The General Equivalency Diploma and certificates of program completion are not included. Further, the NGA formula excludes students who have been retained in the ninth grade; allows Special Education students and students with Limited English proficiency more time to graduate; does not penalize schools with declining enrollments; and takes student mobility into consideration by accounting for students that transfer in and out of schools, the division; and the state.

Mr. Neugent said that in the fall of 2008, the records of first time freshman in 2004-2005 can be linked to their records four years later to determine their graduation or completion status. Therefore, the NGA On-Time High School Graduation rate will be reported by Virginia for the first time in the fall of 2008 for students who entered the ninth grade four years earlier.

Mrs. Castro expressed her concern with how existing students are verified and if they are coded accurately as mentioned by one of the speakers during public comment. Dr. Jones urged the Board to keep track of students who are expelled or transferred to alternative schools. Dr. Jones said that the students from these schools who graduate on time should be included in these statistics.

Following the discussion, Mr. Rotherham and Dr. Ward thanked Mr. Neugent and Dr. Patricia Wright, Chief Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, for their work on this project.

Dr. Rotherham made a motion to waive first review and approve the NGA On-Time Graduation rate formula and accept the report as presented for conveyance to the General Assembly and Governor by December 1, 2006. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of Preliminary Report to the Governor and General Assembly on Statewide Data Collection and Analysis Relating to the Requirements for Obtaining a High School Diploma for Students with Limited English Proficiency (SB683)

Ms. Roberta Schlicher, director of the office of program administration and accountability, introduced Dr. Deborah Jonas, regional educational laboratory of the CNA Corporation.

Ms. Schlicher said that Senate Bill 683 required the Virginia Board of Education and the Virginia Department of Education to collect and analyze statewide data on students with limited English proficiency (LEP). The bill required the Board and the department to make recommendations relating to the requirements for obtaining a high school diploma for students with limited English proficiency.

Dr. Jonas gave a brief overview of the preliminary report on the analysis of statewide data relating to the requirements for obtaining a high school diploma for students with limited English proficiency. The results of the study show the following:

- Virginia's LEP students in grades 9-12 are diverse, speaking over 130 languages, and representing more than 140 countries.
- The majority (55 percent) of LEP high school students are economically disadvantaged.
- Although the largest concentration of LEP students in grades 9-12 is in northern Virginia, these students are geographically distributed throughout the Commonwealth.
- School divisions reported a wide variety of strategies to support LEP students' achievement. These strategies are generally consistent with principles cited in the research literature as being effective in supporting LEP student academic achievement.
- School divisions also reported barriers to LEP students' graduation. These included resource limitations, academic challenges, social challenges, and consideration for students' age and time in Virginia public schools.
- LEP high school students had similar scores to non-LEP students on the Algebra I and Algebra II Standards of Learning (SOL) end-of-course tests. Scores on the remaining SOL assessments were lower than for non-LEP students, with the largest gap in the science SOL assessments.

- There was a strong relationship between LEP students' scores on the English SOL assessments and their scores on all other SOL assessments. The results of a multiple regression analysis suggest that the skills required to succeed on the English 11 SOL assessments are also important for success on the other ten SOL end-of-course tests used in grades 9-12.
- Additional data to complete the study will be incorporated into a final report scheduled for completion in January 2007. The final report will include recommendations for statewide initiatives for LEP high school students.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and approve the preliminary report to the Governor and General Assembly on the Analysis of Statewide Data Relating to the Requirements for Obtaining a High School Diploma for Students with Limited English Proficiency (SB 683). The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. The report will be submitted to the General Assembly on or before December 1, 2006. Phase II of the report will be presented to the Board for first review in January 2007.

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

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, and Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for assessment and reporting, presented this item.

Dr. Wallinger said that the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), requires all state educational agencies (SEA) to submit for approval to the United States Department of Education (USED) individual program applications or a consolidated state application.

Dr. Wallinger said that at the October Board of Education meeting, certain amendments affecting the calculation of AYP for the 2007-2008 school year were approved. Based on five years of implementing NCLB, the Virginia Department of Education has identified additional policy changes that will minimize unintended consequences in implementation of AYP policies.

Virginia's proposed amendments fall under five areas: 1) reversing the order of the public school choice and supplemental educational services sanctions; 2) extending flexibility in AYP calculations for students with disabilities; 3) identifying targets for graduation rate for certain years; 4) modifying testing and AYP calculation policies for limited English proficient (LEP) students; and 5) expansion of options for the other academic indicator.

Dr. Jones made a motion to accept for first review the proposed amendments to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan as permitted in Section 9401 of the federal law. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of Revisions of Industry, Professional, or Trade Association Certification Examinations and Occupational Competency Assessments to Meet the Requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the Student-Selected Verified Credit

Dr. Wallinger also presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that the list of industry, professional, trade association certifications, or occupational competency assessments meets the Board's requirements as noted in 8 VAC 20-131-50.I.3, 8 VAC 20-131-50.I.4, 8 VAC 20-131-110, and 8 VAC 20-131-50.B.4 for the Career and Technical Education Seal, the Seal of Advanced Mathematics and Technology, and student-selected verified credit.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and approve the revised list of industry certification examinations, occupational competency assessments, and licenses to meet the requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the student-selected verified credit. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

As a result of the additions and deletions to this list, there are:

- 187 credentials eligible for student-selected verified credit;
- 187 credentials eligible for the Career and Technical Education Seal; and
- 57 credentials eligible for the Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seal.

First Review of the Board of Education's 2006 Annual Report on Electronic Meetings

Dr. Margaret Roberts, executive assistant to the Board of Education, presented this item. Dr. Roberts reported that § 2.2-3708.E of the *Code of Virginia* requires that public bodies holding electronic meetings submit an annual report detailing their experience with any electronic meetings to the Freedom of Information Advisory Council and the Joint Commission on Technology and Science by December 15 of each year. Dr. Roberts indicated that during the 2006 calendar year, the Board of Education did not conduct any business meetings or committee meetings using electronic communications.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to waive first review and adopt the 2006 Annual Report on Electronic Meetings. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

Final Review of the Board of Education's 2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia

Dr. Roberts also presented this item. Dr. Roberts said that Section 22.1-18 of the *Code of Virginia* sets forth the requirement that the Board of Education shall submit an annual report on the condition and needs of the public schools in Virginia. The Board of Education has submitted an annual report each year since 1971, when the requirement was initially adopted by the General Assembly. The *Code* requires that the annual report

contain the following information: a report on the condition and needs of the public schools as determined by the Board of Education; a listing of the school divisions and the specific schools that report noncompliance with any part of the Standards of Quality (SOQ); the full text of the current SOQ; a justification for amendments; the effective date of the current SOQ; and a listing of any amendments, if any, to the SOQ being prescribed by the Board of Education. At the October 2006 meeting, the Board received a preliminary draft for review and comments. Changes requested by Board members were incorporated into the final draft.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adopt the 2006 Annual Report on the Condition and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia and authorize staff to: 1) incorporate into the text of the report any revisions to the Standards of Quality adopted by the Board on November 29, 2006; 2) make any additional technical or editorial changes to the text as may be necessary prior to its distribution; and 3) distribute the report to the Governor and the members of the General Assembly as required by the *Code of Virginia*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommended Cut Scores for Mathematics and Reading for the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA)

Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) was developed initially to assess the achievement of students with disabilities who are unable to demonstrate their attainment of the Standards of Learning through multiple-choice tests. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that a compilation of student work called a Collection of Evidence that documents the student's achievement of the Standards of Learning represented in the test blueprint is prepared for students participating in VGLA. At the October meeting, the Virginia Board of Education voted to expand the VGLA in reading to include limited English proficient students at levels 1 and 2 of English language proficiency.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the VGLA was first administered in 2004-2005. For 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, the scores required to earn achievement ratings of pass/proficient and pass/advanced on the VGLA were based on the cut scores adopted by the Virginia Board of Education for the associated Standards of Learning tests. However, the peer review guidance provided to Virginia by the United States Department of Education stated that this procedure was not an acceptable method of determining the cut scores for the tests used for NCLB and that a separate standard setting process for the reading and mathematics components of VGLA should be conducted. In November 2006, committees of Virginia educators were convened to recommend to the Board of Education the scores that should represent the achievement levels of fail/basic, pass/proficient and pass/advanced performance for students in grades 3 through 8 who are submitting Collections of Evidence for the VGLA in the areas of reading and mathematics.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and adopt the following cut scores for the achievement levels of fail/basic, pass/proficient, and pass/advanced for the VGLA in the area of mathematics for students in grades 3 through 8. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rotherham and carried unanimously.

VGLA Mathematics

GRADE	BASIC	PROFICIENT	ADVANCED
3	85	125	178
4	73	121	181
5	71	124	172
6	72	122	174
7	65	116	167
8	75	120	175

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and adopt the following cut scores for the achievement levels of fail/basic, pass/proficient, and pass/advanced for the VGLA in the area of reading for students in grades 3 through 8. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

VGLA Reading

Grade	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3	55	91	125
4	52	87	122
5	65	100	145
6	65	110	158
7	75	115	162
8	73	118	163

First Review of Locally-Developed or Selected English Language Proficiency Assessments to Satisfy the No Child Left Behind Requirement

Dr. Robert Triscari, director of assessment development, presented this item. Dr. Triscari said that Title I, Part A, of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires local school divisions to administer an annual assessment for all kindergarten through twelfth-grade limited English proficient (LEP) students. The English language proficiency assessment must measure the oral language, reading, and writing skills of all LEP students in a school division. As stipulated in the non-regulatory Title III, Part A, Guidance on Standards, Assessment, and Accountability, if a state decides to allow school divisions to use multiple measures to assess English language proficiency, the state must:

- set technical criteria for the assessments;
- ensure that any assessments used are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
- review and approve each assessment; and
- ensure that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes, and can be disaggregated by English language proficiency levels and grade levels.

Dr. Brewster made a motion to waive first review and approve the recommended locally developed and/or selected instruments to measure the English language proficiency of LEP students. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore and carried unanimously.

**Locally Developed and/or Selected English Language Proficiency Assessment Instruments
for Use During the 2006-2007 School Year**

School Division	English Language Proficiency Assessment	Grade Level(s)	Skills Assessed (Title I/Title III Requirement)	Recommended for Board Approval
Arlington County Public Schools	ESOL/HILT Oral Assessment	K-12	Speaking and Listening	Yes
Arlington County Public Schools	Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) Test	3-12	Reading	Yes
Arlington County Public Schools	ESOL/HILT Writing Assessment	3-12	Writing	Yes
Danville City Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes
Orange County Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes
Prince William County Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes
Roanoke City Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes
Suffolk County Public Schools	Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	2-12	Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Yes

Report on the Memorandum of Understanding for Petersburg Public Schools in Accordance with the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) 8 VAC 20-131-315 et seq.

Mrs. Kathleen Smith presented this item. Representatives from Petersburg included Mr. Lloyd Hamlin, superintendent of Petersburg Public Schools, and Mr. Fred Wilson, school board chairman.

Mrs. Smith said that in 2004, recognizing the need for technical assistance, the Petersburg School Board requested a division level review and assistance from the Virginia Department of Education. Petersburg Public Schools and the Virginia Board of Education signed an initial Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) detailing the review process on April 21, 2004. Petersburg Public Schools has been in division-level review status since 2004, and has reported to the Board regularly on the status of implementing the corrective action plan and the terms of the initial MOU. The Department of Education has provided

ongoing technical assistance and monitored the implementation of the division's corrective action plan.

Mrs. Smith said that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for division-level academic review purposes has been combined with the required MOU for "accreditation denied" schools because Petersburg Public Schools is in division-level academic review status. In addition, non-compliance issues with Standards of Quality (SOQ) and Standards of Accreditation (SOA) persist, and a majority of schools have a status of Accredited with Warning or Accreditation Denied.

On October 25, 2006, the Board of Education delegated the review and approval process for the specific terms of the MOU to the President of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction in accordance with SOA guidelines. This MOU was shared with the Petersburg School Board on November 1, 2006. The Petersburg school board held a public hearing on the MOU on November 13, 2006, and approved the terms and conditions.

The Virginia Board of Education and the Department of Education assigned a chief academic officer (CAO), for 2006-2007, to work with the division superintendent to coordinate and monitor the implementation of daily activities associated with the MOU and corrective action plans. The CAO will coordinate the Department of Education's technical assistance in support of the MOU and corrective action plans for those schools denied accreditation.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept the report on the Memorandum of Understanding for Petersburg Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Report on Evaluation of Year-Round School Programs

Mrs. Michelle Vucci, director of policy, presented this item. Mrs. Vucci said that Section 22.1-79.1 of the *Code of Virginia* prohibits local school boards from adopting school calendars that require schools to open prior to Labor Day unless a waiver is granted by the Board for "good cause." The conditions under which the Board may grant such waivers are outlined in the *Code*. Part 3 of § 22.1-79.1 permits the Board to approve a waiver from the requirements of this *Code* provision if the division secures approval of an experimental or innovative program for an instructional program offered on a year-round basis by the school division in one or more of its elementary, middle, or high schools. The waiver is restricted to those individual schools housing the program.

Mrs. Vucci said that year-round schools operate on what is commonly known as a 45-15 schedule where there are 45 instructional days followed by a 15-day break. During the 15-day break, the schools offer intersessions during which both remedial instruction and enrichment courses are offered. Most of the schools with year-round calendars share one or more of the following characteristics: high populations of minority or limited

English proficient students, high percentages of students on free or reduced lunch, or histories of low performance on state assessments.

In 2000, the Board of Education adopted a resolution directing that requests for continuing approval of an experimental or innovative program requiring schools to open prior to Labor Day shall be accompanied by an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program that includes, at a minimum, evidence of improvement in student academic achievement on appropriate assessments administered by the school division. The Board's resolution also requests the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide an annual report to the Board concerning the status of waivers granted.

In order to receive consistent information from all school divisions and to appropriately assess the effectiveness of the programs, school divisions were notified that the Board of Education had requested that each school division include the following components in its evaluation report: Student Achievement, Student Behavior and Attendance, Staff/Teacher Participation, and Parent/Community Involvement. Additionally, divisions were advised that the report must include a description of the steps taken to achieve or maintain school accreditation.

In past years, the content of this report was based on the information provided by school divisions in their evaluations of their year-round programs. Since the form and substance of the evaluation reports was not prescribed, the content of the reports varied widely and it was difficult to draw any general conclusions about the year-round programs in Virginia's public schools. This is the first year where the content of the evaluation report was specified, making it possible for the Department of Education to compile and analyze information in a uniform format.

Six school divisions submitted applications for approval of year-round programs in 30 schools for the 2006-2007 school year. Of the 30 schools, 25 are elementary schools, three are middle schools, and two are high schools.

Dr. Brewster made a motion to accept the report on evaluation of year-round school programs. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel on May 23, 2006. Present were Dr. Emblidge, Dr. Brewster, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Johnson, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Rotherham, Mrs. Saslaw, 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 the Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Emblidge adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.

Secretary

President