

**Meeting of the State Superintendent's Leadership Advisory Council  
Friday, November 2, 2001**

Present: Superintendents' Group – Dorothea M. Shannon, Timothy R. Jenney, Harry M. Ward, Thomas H. DeBolt, Lowell T. Lemons, Ira R. Trollinger, Robert C. McCracken, Margaret V. Blackmon, Edward L. Kelly, Stewart D. Roberson, and Walter A. McFarlane, superintendent, Department of Correctional Education, and Alfred R. Butler, executive director, and Andy Stamp, assistant executive director, VASS.

Department of Education – Jo Lynne DeMary, M. Kenneth Magill, Lan Neugent, Anne Wescott, Charles W. Finley, and Harry L. Smith.

Dr. DeMary opened the meeting by asking if the superintendents had any concerns they wished to discuss. Dr. Butler asked if the superintendent had any information about the 2002-2004 biennium budget for public education. Dr. DeMary said she had not received any information about the budget. She mentioned the study being conducted by the Joint Audit and Legislative Review Commission (JLARC) that is anticipated to be released this month and she promised to keep superintendents informed about the report.

Dr. DeMary also told the Advisory Council members that the Department of Education receives reminders from the U. S. Department of Education prior to the date on which information requested is to be received by that agency. She asked if school divisions would be interested in having the state Department of Education set up a similar procedure for reminding them electronically before the date on which information requested by the department is due. She suggested posting reminders on the agency's Web site. After superintendents said the reminders would be helpful, Dr. DeMary said the department will try the procedure and see if it is successful.

Another topic of interest involved retakes of end-of-course Standards of Learning tests by students who have passed a course, not including remediation recovery. Dr. DeMary said the Board of Education had agreed that the scores of students who retake the tests and pass them count toward a school's accreditation; if students do not pass the retakes their scores will not be counted. She said she believed the board's action responds to superintendents' concerns and should be an incentive for students and public schools.

Report Committee Update – Dr. Roberson, chair of the committee told the council that the committee had met and discussed requirements affecting the School Report Card. He also stated that the committee recognizes the need for the report card, but it recommended that it be suspended until it can be revised to permit the release of up-to-

date information. Dr. Roberson was unable to meet with the Board of Education on October 22, and the committee's report was presented by Dr. Wayne Tripp, superintendent of Salem City public schools. After receiving the report, the board

discussed issues relating to the report card and appointed a subcommittee of its members to review the report card and methods for distributing it. The subcommittee's report to the board is anticipated on November 27.

SOL Technology Update – Mr. Neugent commended school divisions for the work being done on the Web-based SOL technology initiative, and he presented a status report on the project for online testing of students. He said software is being developed to “stress test” the school network for technical certification, and he explained details of the test delivery program scheduled for 2002-2003. He also stated that network filtering is available for reimbursement using the 13 to 1 equipment-to-software ratio established in the reimbursement guidelines.

Mr. Neugent also reported on plans for the Statewide Regional Video Conference Network connecting the Department of Education and the superintendents' eight region study groups. The network, which is planned to be in operation for a broadcast on February 5, 2002, will provide a method for the superintendent of public instruction and the agency's staff to engage in “face-to-face” meetings with school division personnel or with each other on a regional or statewide basis.

Academic Review Schedule – Mr. Finley reported on the academic review schedule by the Division of Accountability. Superintendents have been notified that 120 reviews will be undertaken; of these 25 are Phase I reviews, 76 are Phase II, and 19 are a combination of the two. Twenty-five percent of the Phase I schools were warned in English, 51 percent in math, 33 percent in history, and 23 percent in science. He said 39 percent of the Phase II schools were warned in English, 68 percent in math, 45 percent in history, and 51 percent in science.

All reviews are expected to be completed by February 2002. The Phase II reviews will be done by three or four people and will require three or four days to be completed. Mr. Finley said 76 percent of the reviews will be in Regions I and II and will mostly involve alternative schools.

He reminded the superintendents that schools accredited with warning were required to submit corrective action plans. Those plans, he said, are being reviewed and a report may be submitted to the Board of Education in December. He suggested that superintendents may want to begin to devote attention to their alternative school accreditation plans. He said the Board of Education is interested in three things related to alternative schools: Why should they not be held accountable for the current standards?; What is their mission?; What should they be accountable for?

Board of Education Agenda, November 27, 2001 – Anne Wescott reported on items that are expected to be presented to the Board of Education when it meets on November 27,

including the presentation by JLARC on its study of Standards of Quality funding. Dr. DeMary said the board on that date will also receive a report from VASS on highlights of its publication titled, “Blueprint for Virginia Education.”