

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

April 24, 2008

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 Dr. Brewster to lead in a moment of silence and Pledge of Allegiance.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2008, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

***RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITIONS***

- Dr. Patricia I. Wright, chief deputy superintendent of public instruction, Virginia Department of Education, was recognized by the Board for receiving the Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Education, Alumni of the Year Award.
- Mr. Douglas R. Graney, Social Studies Teacher at Herndon High School in Fairfax County Public Schools, is the recipient of the Virginia Education Association's 2007-2008 Award for Teaching Excellence. Mr. Graney is also the recipient of the Horace Mann National Education Association Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence.

***PUBLIC COMMENT***

The following persons spoke during public comment:

Drew Proffitt  
Amy Saltzman

***REPORT FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION'S COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL AND DIVISION ACCOUNTABILITY***

Mr. Johnson, chairperson, said that the following items have been brought before the School and Division Accountability Committee for discussion since November 28, 2007:

- Discussion of revisions to the Standards of Accreditation: Technical Diplomas and Graduation Rate Provisions including a panel consisting of members of the business community and LEA advisory board
- Updates from Petersburg Public Schools were presented in October 2007, January 2008, and April 2008
- Discussion of waiver requests and the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act
- Panel presentation on the SACS/CASI division accreditation program by three area superintendents
- Discussion of the requests for conditional accreditation for 30 schools in September 2007 and report on those schools in March 2008 by auditors assigned to the schools

Mr. Johnson said that currently, the School and Division Accountability Committee will continue to:

- Monitor the Petersburg and Sussex Public Schools as part of the division-level review
- Monitor the progress of the five schools in Petersburg Public Schools denied accreditation
- Monitor the progress of the 19 school divisions with 30 schools granted a rating of conditionally accredited
- Ensure that the academic review in the 98 schools accredited with warning in the 2007-2008 school year is completed as required by the Board of Education
- Ensure that services are provided to the 69 schools in school improvement as required by No Child Left Behind

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Dr. Brewster made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Dr. Ward seconded the motion and carried with unanimous vote.

- Final Review of Financial Report on Literacy Fund
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literacy Fund Loans
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literacy Fund Applications Approved for Release of Fund or Placement on a Waiting List

**Final Review of Financial Report on Literacy Fund**

The Department of Education’s recommendation to approve the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the Literacy Fund as of December 31, 2007, was approved with the Board’s vote on the consent agenda.

**Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literacy Fund Loans**

The Department of Education’s recommendation to approve ten applications totaling \$75,000,000 was approved with the Board’s vote on the consent agenda.

| <b>DIVISON</b>      | <b>SCHOOL</b>          | <b>AMOUNT</b>          |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Portsmouth City     | Simonsdale Elementary  | \$7,500,00.00          |
| Alleghany County    | Alleghany High         | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Tunstall High          | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Chatham High           | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Dan River High         | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Gretna High            | 7,500,000.00           |
| Lexington City      | Lylburn Downing Middle | 7,500,000.00           |
| Warren County       | Luray Avenue Middle    | 7,500,000.00           |
| Lynchburg City      | Sandusky Middle        | 7,500,000.00           |
| Northampton County  | Northampton High       | 7,500,000.00           |
|                     | <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>\$75,000,000.00</b> |

**Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literacy Fund Applications Approved for Release of Fund or Placement on a Waiting List**

The Department of Education’s recommendation to approve the actions described in the following two elements was approved with the Board’s vote on the consent agenda:

1. Two new projects, totaling \$15,000,000, are eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List.

| DIVISION          | SCHOOL                | AMOUNT                 |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Rockingham County | New Elementary School | \$7,500,000.00         |
| Rockingham County | New High School       | 7,500,000.00           |
|                   | <b>TOTAL</b>          | <b>\$15,000,000.00</b> |

2. Ten new projects, totaling \$75,000,000, have Literary Fund applications, which are approved as to form, but the plans have not yet been finalized. When the Department receives the plans, these projects will be eligible for placement on a waiting list. Until such time, these projects should remain on the Approved Application List.

| DIVISION            | SCHOOL                 | AMOUNT                 |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Portsmouth City     | Simonsdale Elementary  | \$7,500,000.00         |
| Alleghany County    | Alleghany High         | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Tunstall High          | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Chatham High           | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Dan River High         | 7,500,000.00           |
| Pittsylvania County | Gretna High            | 7,500,000.00           |
| Lexington City      | Lylburn Downing Middle | 7,500,000.00           |
| Warren County       | Luray Avenue Middle    | 7,500,000.00           |
| Lynchburg City      | Sandusky Middle        | 7,500,000.00           |
| Northampton County  | Northampton High       | 7,500,000.00           |
|                     | <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>\$75,000,000.00</b> |

### *Action/Discussion Items*

#### *First Review of the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to Amend and Consolidate Certain Board of Education Regulations*

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the *Regulations Governing School Boards Local*, 8 VAC 20-490-10 et seq., were adopted on or before September 1, 1980.

Mrs. Wescott said that this proposal is to adopt revised regulations governing local school boards under the title *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions* and to incorporate the applicable regulatory requirements from these other regulations so that local school boards and school divisions will have one regulation containing applicable regulatory requirements and will not have to look to several regulations for guidance.

Mrs. Wescott said that the Board approved a similar Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) in May 2007. However, legislation passed by the 2008 General Assembly will result in additional regulatory changes.

- HB 770 establishes technology as a major classification of school expenditures, which will result in an amendment to the *Classification of*

*Expenditures* (8 VAC 20-210-10). This regulation was not included in the original NOIRA but is included in the proposed NOIRA.

- HB 137 and SB 356 change the procurement provisions for textbooks purchased by school divisions, which will result in revisions to several sets of regulations governing textbooks, including *Regulations Governing Textbook Fund Management and Handling on Local Level* (8 VAC 20-270-10 et seq.), which was included in the original NOIRA but is not included in the proposed NOIRA. HB 137 and SB 356 are expected to result in changes to two additional sets of regulations, *Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption State Level* (8 VAC 20-220-10 et seq.) and *Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption Local Level* (8 VAC 20-230-10 et seq.). Staff suggests that the three sets of textbook regulations be updated and consolidated into one regulatory package to be brought before the Board later this year.

Mr. Rotherham made a motion to withdraw the May 2007 NOIRA, waive first review and approve the proposed NOIRA, and authorize the Department of Education staff to proceed with the requirements of the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

***First Review of Proposed Amendment to the Regulations Governing the Reduction of State Aid When the Length of the School Term is Below 180 Teaching Days or 990 Teaching Hours (8 VAC 20-521-10 seq.) Under the Fast Track Provisions of the Administrative Process Act***

Mrs. Anne Wescott also presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the Board of Education promulgated the *Regulations Governing Reduction of State Aid When the Length of the School Term Is Below 180 School Days*, 8 VAC 20-521, in response to § 22.1-98 of the *Code of Virginia*. They became effective on September 15, 2006.

Mrs. Wescott said that the regulations prescribe specific requirements for the number of teaching days or teaching hours that must be made up based on the number of days a school or school division has been closed, authorization for school divisions to make up missed teaching days by providing equivalent teaching hours, and a provision for the Board of Education to waive the requirement that school divisions provide additional teaching days or hours to compensate for school closings resulting from a declared state of emergency. Further, the regulations authorize the Superintendent of Public Instruction to approve reductions in the school term without a proportionate reduction in the amount paid by the Commonwealth from the Basic School Aid Fund.

The regulations require local school divisions to include in requests for waivers evidence of efforts that have been made by the school division to reschedule as many days as possible and to certify that every reasonable effort has been made to make up lost teaching days or hours before requesting a waiver of this requirement. They also require local school division superintendents to certify by April 15 of each school year that they

have read and complied with the provisions of the regulations and are implementing a plan for making up any missed time that has not been waived in accordance with these regulations.

Mrs. Wescott said that in order to add the required certification regarding compliance with the *Regulations Governing Reduction of State Aid When Length of School Term Below 180 Days or 990 Teaching Hours* to the SOQ certification, the April 15 reporting date in the current regulations must be changed.

The proposed amendment to these regulations is to revise the language in 8 VAC 20-521-60 that states “shall certify by April 15 of each school year” to “shall certify annually, at a time and in a form prescribed by the Virginia Department of Education.”

Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept the proposed amendment to the *Regulations Governing the Reduction of State Aid When the Length of the School Term is Below 180 Teaching Days or 990 Teaching Hours Under the Fast Track Provision of the Administrative Process Act*, for first review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

#### **Report from the Board of Education’s 2007-2008 Student Advisory Committee**

Mrs. Castro and Mrs. Saslaw are the Board sponsors of the Student Advisory Committee. Members of the 2007-2008 Student Advisory Committee were selected from more than 160 nominations received in November 2007 from public middle and high schools across the state. Each public middle school and high school was eligible to nominate one student for consideration. Statewide student organizations were also invited to submit nominees. The nominees completed an application packet that included letters of recommendation and essays.

Representatives of the Board of Education reviewed all applications and selected the new members according to Board of Education policy. The members of the committee are as follows:

*Anna Akers-Pecht*, The Governor’s School of Southside Virginia, Regional Program, Brunswick County

*Patrick Curtis*, William Fleming High School, Roanoke City Public Schools

*Christy Darling*, Atlee High School, Hanover County Public Schools

*Shannon Farrow*, Ni River Middle School, Spotsylvania County Public Schools

*Yon (Daniel) Jang*, River Bend Middle School, Loudoun County Public Schools

*Nitin Nainami*, Chickahominy Middle School, Hanover County Public Schools

*Corinna Pan*, Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology, Fairfax County Public Schools

*Sean Poppen*, Greenbrier Middle School, Chesapeake City Public Schools

*Andrew (Drew) Proffitt*, John S. Battle High School, Washington County Public Schools

*Brielle Spencer*, Heritage High School, Lynchburg City Public Schools  
*Sandra Suhling*, North Stafford High School, Stafford County Public Schools  
*Hannah Wagner*, Western Branch High School, Chesapeake City Public Schools

During the first meeting in December 2007, the members of the Student Advisory Committee discussed a broad spectrum of issues and concerns for students in public schools across the state. The students identified three priority issues for further study.

At the committee's second meeting on February 20, 2008, the members continued their discussions and formulated preliminary findings. At the February 21<sup>st</sup> Board of Education meeting, the members of the Student Advisory Committee presented a summary of the topics selected for in-depth study. During the committee meeting on April 23, 2008, the members discussed their findings, drafted final recommendations, and presented the following to the Board:

### **Issue of Discussion**

The improvement of the professional development and support programs to enhance the integration of technology into the curriculum

### **Background**

Over the past decade, technology has transformed the education process. Technology addresses a variety of student needs, and it helps bridge the achievement gap. While studies have shown that technology has a significant effect on teaching and learning, technology is simply a tool. The mere presence of technology in schools does not automatically improve education. If teachers are unaccustomed to using the latest equipment and programs, then the students do not reap the benefits of current technology. Without proper training and support, teachers who are uncomfortable with technology are unable to efficiently and effectively use it in the classroom.

### **Position of the Student Advisory Committee**

While many of Virginia's schools now have access to technology, the challenge of effective integration of technology into the curriculum remains. Today's world calls for the utilization of technological skills in all aspects of life. The Board of Education can take multiple steps to address technological proficiency that will also consider the needs of diverse school divisions.

### **Recommendations**

In accordance with the Board's Educational Technology Plan for Virginia, we recommend the following strategies:

- Provide more professional development to increase teachers' comfort levels with technology, as well as to keep them updated on the most current technology and uses of technology in the classroom.

- Compile and distribute statewide annual lists of available grants and opportunities for schools to acquire technology and training.
- Encourage the establishment of a mentor system to keep schools and educational staff aware of the latest technology programs and developments.

### **Issue of Discussion**

Building positive student-faculty relationships and communication to improve student achievement

### **Background**

Studies and our personal experiences have shown that student-teacher relationships are crucial to closing the achievement gap. According to Kathleen M. Smith of the Office of School Improvement, relationships are one of the three most important aspects of school life that can be improved to bring Virginia students up to the high standards of learning expected of them. Additionally, a survey conducted at one of our schools proved that a student's teacher is as important to their success in a class as their affinity for that subject.

### **Position of the Student Advisory Committee**

The Student Advisory Committee believes that it is the duty of both teachers and students to communicate and develop relationships beyond the subject matter to broaden students' horizons. Improved teacher-student relationships create a healthier school environment and an atmosphere of trust, resulting in both higher achievement and higher morale.

### **Recommendations**

The Student Advisory Committee has compiled the following list of recommendations:

- Hold workshops or sessions for teachers that focus on how to:
  - communicate effectively
  - relate to different needs and respond to varied situations of students
  - cater to multiple learning styles
  - create an environment where the student feels comfortable approaching the teacher
  - express and demonstrate a vested interest in students as individuals
  - set and convey clear expectations to the student
  - create an atmosphere of trust
  - teach and implement mediation skills
- Find ways to teach students effective communication skills such as:
  - using an appropriate tone of voice
  - conveying their message clearly and politely to adults
  - listening actively
  - having the message understood
- Communicate to teachers and administration the need to be open and receptive to student thought through the following means:
  - Allow for open dialogue between student body representatives and faculty



- Foster open dialogue in the classroom
- Encourage schools to add a Life Skills class as an elective that would teach students how to:
  - conduct themselves during interviews
  - respond in different situations
  - use basic manners
- Recommend that schools establish a teacher advisory (TA) program that would meet with a group of students regularly.
  - The teacher advisory program would be the contact for personal student issues and character development; the TA would be a “secondary counselor.”

### **Issue of Discussion**

Enhancing the communication of opportunities to students through a student Web page on the Department of Education Web site.

### **Background**

We conducted surveys to measure the quality of communication of opportunities between schools and students. An overwhelming percentage of students were unaware of these opportunities such as awards, scholarships, and summer academic programs. This issue may be a result of multiple levels of communication due to the bureaucratic nature of local school division structures. Starting from the Department of Education, information can be lost as it trickles down through superintendents and principals until it finally reaches the most important recipients—the students.

### **Position of the Student Advisory Committee**

Through the following recommendations, we wish to eliminate the “middle men” and enable students to acquire information directly from the top of this information hierarchy.

### **Recommendations**

We recommend that the State Board of Education enact a four-pronged initiative:

- Create a student Web page on the Department of Education’s Web site. The Web page will provide important information about opportunities in scholarships, online education, summer academic programs, etc.
- Provide a Really Simple Syndication (RSS) feed to which the student can subscribe to receive e-mails about the updates made on Web page.
- Devise a communications plan to inform students about this resource. This plan could include a noticeable link to the Web page from school and district Web sites and the use of the Web page as encouraged by career counselors and librarians.
- Continue annual review of the student Web page by future Student Advisory Committees. Every year, the committee may give feedback to the Division of Policy and Communications in order to keep the Web site relevant.

Following the presentation of the committee's recommendations, each member of the Student Advisory Committee was presented with a Resolution of Appreciation from the Board of Education.

Mrs. Castro and Mrs. Saslaw recognized the parents and school personnel attending the meeting with the students. They also thanked Michelle Parker and Melissa Velazquez of the Policy and Communications staff at the Department of Education.

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

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director of the office of school improvement, presented this item. Dr. 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. Therefore, local school divisions have submitted remedial plans for summer 2008, to the department for approval by the Board of Education.

Dr. Smith said that department staff have reviewed remediation plans from 131 school divisions and determined that all of the plans meet the requirements of 8 VAC 20-630-20. One division, Frederick County, has indicated that they will not offer a remedial summer program.

Dr. Smith said that 8 VAC 20-630-50 requires school divisions to report to the department the pass rate on the Standards of Learning assessments for students who attend the 2008 summer remedial programs or, in the case of year-round schools, 2008-2009 intersession programs. Divisions will submit SOL data pertaining to the 2008 summer remedial program, or in the case of year-round schools, 2008-2009 intersession programs in September 2009.

Mr. Rotherham made a motion to waive first review and approve the report on local school division remedial plans. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

### **First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Covington City Public Schools**

Mrs. Anne Wescott and Mr. Edward Graham, superintendent of Covington City Public Schools, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, 8 VAC 20-131-290.D, 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. Graham said that the Covington City School Board is requesting approval of an innovative program for Edgemont Primary School and Jeter-Watson Intermediate

School. This would permit both schools to open prior to Labor Day in conjunction with Covington High School. Covington High School is eligible to receive a Pre-Labor Day waiver because it meets the requirements of § 22.1-79.1 as it has dependent programs shared with Alleghany County Public Schools.

Mr. Graham said that because Covington is a small school system in a rural area, the school division has difficulty recruiting teachers for specific content areas and finds it challenging to recruit minority and male teachers for the elementary school. To address this challenge, the school division has developed a program, Shadowing Career Opportunities for Prospective Educators (SCOPE), which is offered to juniors and seniors at the high school. Mr. Graham said that this program has two goals: (1) to encourage academically able students to consider teaching as a profession and (2) to increase the diversity of the school division teaching staff by encouraging males and minority students to become teachers.

Mr. Graham said that since its inception, the SCOPE program has increased by five times as many students as was in the initial program. In addition, 44 percent of the class is male, and several minority students are involved.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept the request for first review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rotherham and carried unanimously.

**First Review of the Proposal to Establish a Governor's Career and Technical Academy for Renewable Resources and Agricultural Sciences in Halifax County**

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, and Dr. Melanie Stanley, director of academies, Halifax County Public Schools, presented this item. Mr. Paul Stapleton, superintendent of Halifax County Public Schools, and Mr. Steve Anderson, chairman of the Halifax School Board, were in the audience.

Dr. Wallinger said that Virginia is one of six states to receive a grant from the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices to improve science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education. The development of Governor's Career and Technical Academies is one of the major initiatives of the grant.

Dr. Stanley said that the cornerstone of the Governor's Career and Technical Academy for Renewable Resources and Agricultural Sciences is the establishment of strong partnerships between Halifax County Public Schools (HCPS) and local businesses, industries, postsecondary institutions, local government agencies, and national corporations.

The Governor's Career and Technical Academy proposes to meet state and regional strategic growth needs through the Engineering and Technology and the Natural Resource Systems career pathways. The major focus of the academy is to address the management of forest lands, and the management and leadership of forest industry

businesses by inspiring students with the qualities of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

The programs and courses offered through the Governor's Career and Technical Academy for Renewable Resources and Agricultural Sciences will range from biological applications in agriculture, biotechnology, and forestry to the production of manufactured goods made from wood.

Dr. Cannaday suggested that Halifax County work with the Department of Education's (DOE) technology staff to put a clip on DOE's Web site for other school systems to view and learn from as Halifax goes through the process of developing the Governor's Career and Technical Academy.

Mrs. Saslaw said that presently she is participating on a study group on Career and Technical Education with the National School Board Association (NSBA) and asked Mr. Stapleton's permission to refer Halifax County to this group as a resource. Mr. Stapleton said they would be honored for Mrs. Saslaw to do this.

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposal to establish the Governor's Career and Technical Academy for Renewable Resources and Agricultural Sciences. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Dr. Emblidge thanked Dr. Wallinger and her staff, Jean Bankos of the Secretary of Education's Office, and Jennie Moline of the Governor's Office, for working with the Governor's Career and Technical Academies.

### **First Review of Virginia's Definition of School Readiness**

Dr. Wallinger presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that on January 16, 2006, Governor Kaine created the Start Strong Council to develop expanded access to quality pre-kindergarten for Virginia's four-year olds. The Governor's charge to the Council was to develop recommendations for cultivating public-private partnerships to provide for preschool service delivery in both public schools and private community settings; and to recommend strategies for governance to be shared across state and local lines through local councils made up of key child-serving agencies and organizations in each region or locality.

The first recommendation from the Start Strong Council was to adopt a common definition of school readiness that is accepted and supported by all early childhood programs in both the public and private sector in order to facilitate the development of a common approach to evaluate Pre-K program performance as well as the school readiness of Virginia's children. An additional component of the recommendation was the establishment of a School Readiness Task Force.

Virginia's definition of school readiness describes the concept of children's readiness for school at kindergarten entry in the context of ready families, schools, and communities. It describes the capabilities of children, their families, schools, and communities that will best promote student success in kindergarten and beyond. Each component – children, families, schools and communities – plays an essential role in the development of school readiness. No one component can stand on its own. In addition to the four components of the definition, research-based benchmarks are provided to assist with defining, assessing, and tracking school readiness.

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to waive first review and adopt Virginia's definition of school readiness. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously.

The definition of school readiness follows:

#### **Virginia's Definition of School Readiness**

"School readiness" describes the capabilities of children, their families, schools, and communities that will best promote student success in kindergarten and beyond. Each component – children, families, schools and communities – plays an essential role in the development of school readiness. No one component can stand on its own.

- **Ready Children.** A ready child is prepared socially, personally, physically, and intellectually within the developmental domains addressed in Virginia's six *Foundation Blocks for Early Learning*: literacy, mathematics, science, history and social science, physical and motor development, and personal and social development. Children develop holistically; growth and development in one area depends upon development in other areas.
- **Ready Families.** A ready family has adults who understand they are the most important people in the child's life and take responsibility for the child's school readiness through direct, frequent, and positive involvement and interest in the child. Adults recognize their role as the child's first and most important teacher, providing steady and supportive relationships, ensuring safe and consistent environments, promoting good health, and fostering curiosity, excitement about learning, determination, and self-control.
- **Ready Schools.** A ready school accepts all children and provides a seamless transition to a high-quality learning environment by engaging the whole community. A ready school welcomes all children with opportunities to enhance and build confidence in their skills, knowledge, and abilities. Children in ready schools are led by skilled teachers, who recognize, reinforce, and extend children's strengths and who are sensitive to cultural values and individual differences.
- **Ready Communities.** A ready community plays a crucial part in supporting families in their role as primary stewards of children's readiness. Ready communities, including businesses, faith-based organizations, early childhood service providers, community groups and local governments, work together to support children's school and long term success by providing families affordable access to information, services, high-quality child care, and early learning opportunities.

#### **Indicators of School Readiness**

In order to define, assess, and track school readiness, we must set objectives, research-based benchmarks for each component of school readiness and develop clear strategies for measuring progress towards these benchmarks.

**• Ready children...**

- communicate effectively with adults and children by:
  - labeling objects and feelings;
  - providing simple descriptions for events;
  - effectively conveying information, desires, and needs; and
  - using simple language and grammar to solve problems and to negotiate social interactions with adults and peers.
  
- display emerging literacy skills by:
  - showing interest in and interacting with books as they are read by adults;
  - answering questions;
  - learning to use new words and tell stories;
  - recognizing and producing speech sounds, such as rhymes, beginning sounds, and letter sounds;
  - identifying the letters of the alphabet;
  - learning about print concepts from books, signs, and household objects; and
  - engaging in drawing and pretend writing and writing their name, letters, and other printed symbols.
  
- show an interest and skill in mathematics by:
  - counting and using numbers to describe and compare;
  - recognizing and sorting simple shapes and describing their position;
  - identifying simple patterns;
  - making comparisons based on length, weight, time, temperature, and size; and
  - using objects in play, experimenting with materials, building blocks and puzzles.
  
- build early science skills by:
  - exploring and showing curiosity;
  - asking and answering questions about nature, why things happen and how things work;
  - identifying patterns and changes in daily life; and
  - making observations based on the five senses.
  
- learn about history and social studies by:
  - interacting with their family, peers, religious, and social communities;
  - recognizing ways in which people are alike and different; and
  - recognizing the relationships between people, places and time.
  
- enhance physical and motor development by:
  - learning to control their bodies;
  - strengthening their muscles;
  - practicing different movements;
  - participating in regular physical activity; and
  - practicing healthy living and appropriate daily care routines.
  
- exhibit personal and social skills and a sense of self-worth by:
  - feeling secure and valued in their relationships;
  - expressing their emotions and taking pride in their accomplishments; recognizing the consequences of their actions;
  - showing self-control; and
  - cooperating with others, using nonphysical ways to resolve conflicts.

**• Ready families**

- interact with their children, helping them to develop listening and communication skills and to express their feelings, needs, and wants. Adults:
  - read to and speak with children regularly and respectfully;
  - appreciate the child's view of the world;

- encourage exploration of the world in which they live;
  - are trustworthy and dependable; and
  - engage with children with joy, warmth, and comfort.
- encourage and act as the bridge to positive social relationships. Adults:
    - help children learn to cooperate with others;
    - help children follow simple directions and complete basic tasks;
    - foster friendships with other children;
    - teach children routines and how to respond to rules and structure;
    - help children learn how to handle disappointments; and
    - expose children to and help them describe different people, places, and things.
  - ensure their children are healthy by:
    - completing all appropriate eye, ear, dental and other medical screenings as well as immunizations.
- **Ready schools...**
- smooth the transition between home and school by:
    - communicating kindergarten standards and other school information to families through activities such as home visits, telephone calls, questionnaires, and kindergarten visitation days; and
    - forming effective relationships with parents and early childhood programs to share children's prekindergarten experiences and to assess their development.
  - support instruction and staff development by:
    - employing highly qualified teachers;
    - maintaining appropriate class sizes;
    - encouraging professional development; and
    - using best practices in the classroom.
  - support teachers as they assess the individual needs of children, design instruction based on these needs, and regularly monitor students' progress.
  - partner with communities by participating in activities such as:
    - recreational and enrichment programs;
    - family literacy activities;
    - before and after school care;
    - open houses; and
    - communication with other early childhood education programs in the community.
  - provide resources and services to address the diverse and individual needs of students including:
    - educational services;
    - health and mental health services; and
    - social services.
  - emphasize the importance of early childhood education by:
    - regularly reviewing the quality, appropriateness, and alignment of the curriculum across all grades and phases of development; and
    - regularly focusing on and supporting the quality of teachers' interactions with children at all grade levels.
- **Ready communities...**
- promote collaboration to reach the most vulnerable children and families through diverse channels of communication by:
    - supporting effective, innovative strategies; and
    - building a sustainable, comprehensive system that maximizes resources.

- ensure all children have access to high-quality early care and education programs.
- provide accessible and affordable family services related to physical health, mental health, and lifelong learning. These services include:
  - literacy, English language learning, parenting skills, and adult education;
  - home visiting programs;
  - basic health care and nutrition services, including prenatal care;
  - mental health counseling;
  - early identification and treatment for children with disabilities and other special needs;
  - drug and alcohol counseling;
  - family court services; and
  - child abuse prevention.
- promote public assets such as parks, libraries, recreational facilities, civic and cultural venues and other opportunities to provide a better quality of life for families, encourage early learning opportunities, and foster community participation.
- regularly assess the status of children, families, schools, and community resources with regard to their role in school readiness and use these assessments in program planning and resource allocation.

**First Review of a Protocol for the State-Directed Investigation of Testing Irregularities**

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent, division of student assessment and school improvement, presented a protocol specifying the conditions under which department staff would conduct, on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education, an investigation of a testing irregularity occurring within a school division.

Mr. Rotherham suggested using technology to put more assessments on line to make it more assessable to pick up irregularities. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that some of this is already being done but will look into doing more.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and approve the protocol specifying the conditions under which department staff would conduct, on behalf of the Board, investigations of testing irregularities occurring within school divisions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore and carried unanimously.

The Protocol for State-Directed Investigations of Testing Irregularities follows:

**Virginia Assessment Program  
Protocol for State-Directed Investigations of Testing Irregularities**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to describe those circumstances under which the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) may, on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education, conduct an investigation of an alleged breach in test security, unauthorized alteration of test materials, or improper administration of tests by local school division employees. This document describes the process of the state-directed investigation, how investigative findings are communicated, and how corrective actions and/or sanctions are implemented and monitored. The document is divided into eight sections:



- Statutory and Regulatory Authority
- Definition of a Testing Irregularity
- Reporting a Testing Irregularity
- Determining Whether an Investigation by the Virginia Department of Education is Warranted
- Process of the Investigation
- Reporting the Findings
- Implementing and Monitoring the Corrective Actions/Sanctions

### **Statutory/Regulatory Authority**

#### Authority for the Investigation of Testing Irregularities

The *Code of Virginia* at § 22.1-253.13:3, Standard 3 D pertains to the review or investigation of any alleged breach in test security, unauthorized alteration of test materials or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests. It states, in part:

The Board of Education may pursue all available civil remedies pursuant to § 22.1-19.1 or administrative action pursuant to § 22.1-292.1 for breaches in test security and unauthorized alteration of test materials or test results.

The Board may initiate or cause to be initiated a review or investigation of any alleged breach in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests.

Records and any other information furnished to or prepared by the Board during the conduct of a review or investigation may be withheld pursuant to subdivision 12 of § 2.2-3705.3. However, this section shall not prohibit the disclosure of records to (i) a local school board or division superintendent for the purpose of permitting such board or superintendent to consider or to take personnel action with regard to an employee or (ii) any requester, after the conclusion of a review or investigation, in a form that (a) does not reveal the identity of any person making a complaint or supplying information to the Board on a confidential basis and (b) does not compromise the security of any test mandated by the Board. Any local school board or division superintendent receiving such records or other information shall, upon taking personnel action against a relevant employee, place copies of such records or information relating to the specific employee in such person's personnel file.

#### Potential Actions for Violations of Test Security Procedures

The *Code of Virginia* at § 22.1-19.1 states the actions for the violation of test security procedures. It states, in part, the following:

- A. The Office of the Attorney General, on behalf of the Board of Education, may bring a cause of action in the circuit court having jurisdiction where the person resides or where the act occurred for injunctive relief, civil penalty, or both, against any person who knowingly and willfully commits any of the following acts related to secure mandatory tests required by the Board to be administered to students:
  1. Permitting unauthorized access to secure test questions prior to testing;
  2. Copying or reproducing all or any portion of any secure test booklet;
  3. Divulging the contents of any portion of a secure test;
  4. Altering test materials or examinees' responses in any way;
  5. Creating or making available answer keys to secure tests;
  6. Making a false certification on the test security form established by the Department of Education; or
  7. Participating in, directing, aiding or abetting, or assisting in any of the acts prohibited in this section.

For the purpose of this subsection, "secure" means an item, question, or test that has not been made publicly available by the Department of Education.

- B. Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit or restrict the reasonable and necessary actions of the Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Department of Education or their agents or employees engaged in test development or selection, test form construction, standard setting, test scoring, reporting test scores, or any other related activities which, in the judgment of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or Board of Education, are necessary and appropriate.
- C. Any person who violates any provisions of this section may be assessed a civil penalty not to exceed \$1,000 for each violation. Furthermore, any person whose administrative or teaching license has been suspended or revoked pursuant to § 22.1-292.1 may be assessed a civil penalty for the same violation under this section and the reasonable costs of any review or investigation of a violation of test security.

All civil penalties paid to the Commonwealth pursuant to this section shall be deposited into the Literary Fund.

The *Code of Virginia* at §22.1-292.1 gives permission for the Board of Education to suspend or revoke the administrative or teaching license of any individual who knowingly and willfully compromises secure mandatory tests. It states the following:

- A. The Board of Education may suspend or revoke the administrative or teaching license it has issued to any person who commits any of the following acts knowingly and willfully with the intent to compromise secure mandatory tests administered to students as required by this title or by the Board of Education:
  - 1. Giving unauthorized access to secure test questions;
  - 2. Copying or reproducing all or any portion of any secure test booklet;
  - 3. Divulging the contents of any portion of a secure test;
  - 4. Coaching or assisting examinees during testing or altering test materials or examinees' responses in any way;
  - 5. Making available any answer keys;
  - 6. Failing to follow test security procedures established by the Department of Education;
  - 7. Providing a false certification on any test security form required by the Department of Education;
  - 8. Retaining a copy of secure test questions; and
  - 9. Participating in, directing, aiding, assisting in, or encouraging any of the acts prohibited by this section.

For the purposes of this section, "secure test" means an item, question, or test that has not been made publicly available by the Department of Education.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit educational personnel from providing input to administrators or other authorized personnel, including school board members and members of the General Assembly, except when done in a manner that violates test integrity or security regarding the accuracy, clarity, or propriety of test items or test administration procedures.

- B. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit or restrict the reasonable and necessary actions of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or the Department of Education in test development or selection, test form construction, standard setting, test scoring and reporting, or any other related activities which, in the judgment of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Board of Education, are necessary and appropriate.

- C. Any suspension or revocation imposed for the acts enumerated in this section shall be rendered pursuant to Board regulations promulgated pursuant to the Administrative Process Act (§ 2.2-4000 et seq.) and § 22.1-298.1, governing the licensure of teachers.

Authority to Withhold or Deny Accreditation Ratings

Section 8 VAC 20-131-340 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) gives the Virginia Board of Education the authority to withhold or deny a school's accreditation rating if a school is found to be in violation of test security procedures. It states the following:

- 8 VAC 20-131-340. Special provisions and sanctions.
  - A. Any school in violation of these regulations shall be subject to appropriate action by the Board of Education including, but not limited to, the withholding or denial of a school's accreditation.
  - B. A school's accreditation rating may be withheld by action of the Board of Education for any school found to be in violation of test security procedures pursuant to § 22.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia. Withholding of a school's accreditation rating shall not be considered an interruption of the three-consecutive-year period for purposes of receiving an Accreditation Denied status pursuant to 8 VAC 20-131-300.
  - C. The Board of Education may exercise its authority to seek school division compliance with school laws pursuant to relevant provisions of the Code of Virginia when any school within a division is rated Accreditation Denied.

Authority to Withhold Test Investigation Information

Section 2.2-3705.3 of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act states:

The following records are excluded from the provisions of this chapter but may be disclosed by the custodian in his discretion, except where such disclosure is prohibited by law:

12. Records furnished to or prepared by the Board of Education pursuant to subsection D of § 22.1-253.13:3 in connection with the review or investigation of any alleged breach in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests. However, this section shall not prohibit the disclosure of records to (i) a local school board or division superintendent for the purpose of permitting such board or superintendent to consider or to take personnel action with regard to an employee or (ii) any requester, after the conclusion of a review or investigation, in a form that (a) does not reveal the identity of any person making a complaint or supplying information to the Board on a confidential basis and (b) does not compromise the security of any test mandated by the Board.

**Definition of a Testing Irregularity**

A testing irregularity is defined as any occurrence that may inappropriately influence a student's performance on a test or the reporting of a student's performance, or any occurrence that constitutes a breach in test security or improper administration of mandatory student testing.

**Reporting a Testing Irregularity**

Test Examiners are directed to report any testing irregularity to the designated School Test Coordinator (STC) immediately, and STCs are directed to report testing irregularities to the Division Director of Testing (DDOT) within 24 hours of their occurrence. While some irregularities may be resolved locally by the DDOT, most irregularities are forwarded by the DDOT within 24 hours to the VDOE for review and guidance.

DDOTs are required to report certain irregularities to the VDOE. All situations that involve the retesting of students, compromised testing procedures or policies, or student test record exclusions must be reported to the VDOE. In some cases testing irregularities are reported to the VDOE by concerned individuals, some of whom wish to remain anonymous, through means other than through the normal reporting structure.

#### **Determining Whether an Investigation by the Virginia Department of Education Is Warranted**

Most testing irregularities are investigated by the DDOT under the guidance of the Virginia Department of Education's Office of Test Administration, Scoring and Reporting. If the reported irregularity is egregious or suggests that staff from the school division's central office is involved, then an investigation by the Virginia Department of Education on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education may be warranted.

A determination of whether to conduct a state-directed investigation is made collaboratively by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chief Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Student Assessment and School Improvement.

#### **Process of the Investigation**

Once it is determined that the scope of the violation warrants an investigation, the local school division is informed and the VDOE convenes a Review Team to conduct the investigation. The Review Team conducts the investigation in an expeditious manner but takes the necessary time to collect thorough and detailed information. Throughout the scope of the investigation, the Review Team Coordinator updates the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chief Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Student Assessment and School Improvement on the progress of the investigation.

#### **Reporting the Findings**

Once the investigation is complete, the Review Team Coordinator summarizes the findings and provides a written report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chief Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Student Assessment and School Improvement.

The written report documents the investigation, the laws or regulations that guided the investigation, a summary of the methodology of the review process, and the findings and conclusions of the investigation. As necessary, the written report may include a corrective action plan and a timeline for implementation. The corrective action plan addresses the weaknesses of the testing program in the school or division and provides a mandatory framework of actions needed for improvement.

The written report is shared with the local school division. If applicable, the Superintendent of Public Instruction informs the Division of Teacher Education and Licensure and the Office of the Attorney General so that appropriate actions may be taken in accordance with the Code of Virginia and Board regulations.

#### **Implementing and Monitoring the Corrective Actions/Sanctions**

If the findings and conclusions of the investigation indicate that a corrective action plan is necessary, it will be part of the final written report. The corrective action plan is specific to the identified weaknesses and outlines actions to be completed by the school or division.

As per Section 8 VAC 20-131-340 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, accreditation ratings may be withheld for any school that violates § 22.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia. Depending upon the situation, accreditation ratings may be determined after corrective actions are implemented.

Adequate Yearly Progress ratings for a school or division may also be withheld or denied until specified corrective actions are implemented. Schools or divisions will be placed in a To Be Determined (TBD) status until the VDOE is certain that all reporting data is accurately reflected in the AYP reports.

**First Review of Recommended Cut Scores for the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) in Science**

Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) was developed to assess the achievement of students with disabilities who are unable to demonstrate their attainment of the Standards of Learning through multiple-choice tests. A compilation of student work, called a Collection of Evidence, that represents the student's achievement of the Standards of Learning addressed in the test blueprint is prepared for students participating in VGLA.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that 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 in 2006, stated that this procedure was not an acceptable method of determining the cut scores for the tests used for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and that a separate standard setting process for the reading and mathematics components of VGLA should be conducted.

Based on recommendations of committees of Virginia educators, in November 2006, the Virginia Board of Education adopted cut scores representing the achievement levels of fail/basic, pass/proficient, and pass/advanced performance for students in grades 3 through 8 who were submitting Collections of Evidence for the VGLA in the areas of reading and mathematics.

For 2006-2007, the scores required to earn the achievement ratings of pass/proficient and pass/advanced on the VGLA for science continued to be based on the cut scores adopted by the Virginia Board of Education for the associated Standards of Learning tests.

Under the requirements of NCLB, by 2007-2008, all states must administer science tests at least once in the elementary school, once at the middle school, and once at the high school. Because Virginia's science assessments must now comply with NCLB requirements, and based on previous guidance supplied by USED for the mathematics and reading VGLA, Virginia Department of Education staff decided that a separate standard setting for the VGLA in science was warranted.

On April 1-2, 2008, a committee of educators was convened to recommend cut scores for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for the science VGLA for grades 3, 5, and 8.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder presented to the Board a range of recommended cut scores for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for science for students in grades 3, 5, and 8.

Dr. Jones made a motion to waive first review and adopt the following cut scores for the VGLA in science for students in grades 3, 5, and 8. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously.

Science VGLA Cut Scores

|                 | Proficient | Advanced |
|-----------------|------------|----------|
| Grade 3 Science | 88         | 135      |
| Grade 5 Science | 83         | 130      |
| Grade 8 Science | 91         | 150      |

**First Review of No Child Left Behind Differentiated Accountability Pilot Proposal**

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that on March 18, 2008, the United States Department of Education (USED) announced a pilot project that allows states to propose their own methods for: 1) categorizing schools identified for Title I school improvement sanctions; and 2) determining the interventions required for each category. The purpose of the pilot is to allow states the flexibility to distinguish different consequences for Title I schools in improvement that are close to meeting the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and those that are farther away from meeting the targets.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposal for the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) differentiated accountability pilot. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward. The motion carried with a vote of eight to one. Mr. Rotherham voted “no”.

***No Child Left Behind Differentiated Accountability Pilot Proposal  
AYP: Targeting Choice and Supplemental Services***

**Request:** The proposed differentiated accountability model will prioritize public school choice (PSC) and supplemental educational services (SES) to low-academic and low-income students who 1) belong to the subgroup(s) for which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and 2) fail the test(s) in the subject(s) in which the school did not make AYP. The prioritization plan that will apply only to those Title I schools in years 1 and 2 of improvement will be implemented as follows:

**Year 1:**

Public School Choice

Priority 1: PCS will be offered to parents of low-academic and low-income students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP.

Priority 2: PCS will be offered to parents of all other low-academic and low-income students regardless of subject or subgroup.

Priority 3: PCS will be offered to parents of all students.

**Year 2:**

Public School Choice

Same priorities as described above.

Supplemental Educational Services

Priority 1: SES will be offered to parents of low-income and low-academic students in the same subject and subgroup for which the school did not make AYP.

Priority 2: SES will be offered to parents of all other low-income and low-academic students regardless of subject or subgroup.

Priority 3: SES will be offered to parents of all students.

**Year 3 and Beyond:**

Sanctions as indicated under current NCLB statute will remain without change.

**Rationale:** The NCLB statute treats all schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) equally, regardless of whether such failure is based on one subgroup failing to make AYP in one subject, or all subgroups failing to make AYP in both reading and mathematics. Currently, all students in a Title I school in school improvement status are eligible for school choice with priority given to academic need. In addition, all low-income students in a school that is in Year 2 school improvement status or beyond are eligible to receive supplemental services, regardless of their performance on the Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Using federal funds to provide school choice to all students impacts the level of assistance available to serve students in the school that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments. Additionally, school divisions have reported that the majority of students who choose the choice option are not from low-income families nor are they students who are struggling academically. Similarly, using federal funds to provide tutoring services to all low-income students in a school reduces funds available to serve subgroups and individual students that are not meeting the proficiency targets on the SOL assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. Since NCLB focuses on ensuring that one hundred percent of Virginia's students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2013-2014, the proposed differentiated accountability model targets available resources to those students who are not proficient.

**First Review of the Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers**

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item. Mrs. Pitts said that the *Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers* were developed as a result of a recommendation from the Committee to Enhance the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia. The development of the teaching standards by a task force of educators, representing all regions within the state, was an initiative supported by the Governor's Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant.

The standards are intended as a resource for the implementation of the Board of Education's performance standards criteria. The performance evaluation standards are defined in *The Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents*. The standards are designed to provide a conceptual model of good teaching. They represent the knowledge and skills that are common to all teachers from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Teachers need to know what will be expected of them and how they will be evaluated. The standards will assist teachers to reflect on student learning and teaching and to develop professional development plans to improve teaching practice.

Mrs. Pitts said that the standards are not intended to describe the performance of beginning teachers, but to guide the development of all teachers throughout their careers as they continually seek to improve their practice.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept for first review the *Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice for Teachers*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

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

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

**Career and Technical Education**

Ms. Russell said that the Board of Education approved the Virginia System of Performance Standards and Measures as part of the 2000-2004 State Plan for Career and Technical Education (CTE). Beginning with the 2007-2008 report, we will be under the 2008-2013 State Plan for Career and Technical Education. The federal Perkins act requires that the results on the negotiated state-adjusted levels of performance for both secondary and postsecondary CTE be communicated to the Board and other audiences.

Ms. Russell reported that each school division and the Virginia Community College System received an annual report of performance. The secondary performance standards were met or exceeded by the Virginia Department of Education. Ms. Russell's report included the following:



Academic Achievement

Percent of secondary students enrolled in Career and Technical Education courses in Virginia who passed the 2006-2007 Standards of Learning end-of-course tests.

| Subject Area | Percent of Test Takers     |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| English      | 89.22% (74,328 of 83,312)  |
| Mathematics  | 78.10% (71,365 of 91,382)  |
| History      | 86.05% (88,005 of 102,269) |
| Science      | 80.75% (74,699 of 92,503)  |

Note: The Academic Achievement data in this report represent a sub-population of the total population of test takers and is based on the performance of students enrolled in Career and Technical Education courses in the state. These academic attainment data are completed solely for federal performance and reporting purposes. These data shall in no way be used in conjunction with or interpreted for a school's accreditation status.

<sup>1</sup> The Board set the minimum acceptable pass rates required for a school to achieve the rating of Fully Accredited for:

Occupational Competence

Career and Technical Education Program Completers

| Completers who Attained 80% of the Competencies | Completers <sup>2</sup> | Percent that Attained 80% of the Competencies |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| 31,068  | 32,145                  | 96.64%  |

Note: A Career and Technical Education Program Completer is a student who has met the requirements for a career and technical concentration or specialization and all requirements for high school graduation or an approved alternative education program.

<sup>2</sup> Includes all completers from the comprehensive high schools and the Career and Technical Education local and regional centers.

Non-Traditional Career Preparation

Non-Traditional Career Preparation Enrollment

| Non-Traditional Enrollment | Enrollment of Non-Traditional Courses | Percent of Non-Traditional Enrollment |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 116,064                    | 337,105                               | 34.45%                                |

Non-Traditional Career Preparation Completion

| Non-Traditional Completers | Completers of Non-Traditional Programs | Percent of Non-Traditional Completers |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 6,143                      | 25,749                                 | 23.85%                                |

Secondary School Completion

| $c^3$  | $c + d^3$ | Completion Rate <sup>3</sup> |
|--------|-----------|------------------------------|
| 32,145 | 32,403    | 99.20%                       |

<sup>3</sup>The Completion Rate was calculated using the number of completers (c) reported on the 2006-2007 Completer Demographics Report (CDR) and the number of dropouts (d) who completed a career and technical education program sequence or concentration as reported on the 2006-2007 Division Dropout Report. The formula is  $c \div (c+d)$ .

Diploma/Credential

| Completers who earned at least one Seal | Completers | Percent that Earned a Board Seal |
|---|------------|----------------------------------|
| 20,456                                  | 32,145     | 63.63%                           |

Transition

| Completers who transitioned | Completers who indicated transition status | Transition Rate |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 22,950                      | 24,086                                     | 95.28%          |

Virginia Community College System

Ms. Cramer said that each year, the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) is required to report performance on seven federally established Perkins measures and is expected to meet established targets. These measures focus on skills attainment, graduation, placement (employment or further study), retention in enrollment, and nontraditional gender representation.

The Perkins program annually provides over \$3.4 million to community colleges in Virginia to develop and/or enhance certificate or degree bearing occupational and technical programs. For the 2006-2007 year, the VCCS exceeded three of the seven Perkins performance targets. The table below provides data on the VCCS actual performance on the seven performance measures compared to the VCCS target. It is important to note that while VCCS did not meet several targets, in three out of the four targets that were missed, VCCS increased or maintained performance over the prior year. For example, in the nontraditional gender representation in graduates' measure VCCS increased 2.6 percentage points from 21.89 in 2005-06 to 24.51. However, this was not adequate to meet the target of 27.35. In addition, for two of the four measures that did not make the expected target, VCCS missed the measure by approximately one or less percentage points.

| VCCS Performance on Perkins Performance Measures<br>2005-06 to 2006-07 Academic Year |                   |                   |                           |                                    |                                 |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Performance Measure  | 2005-06<br>Actual | 2006-07<br>Actual | 2006-07<br>VCCS<br>Target | Difference<br>Actual vs.<br>Target | Increase from<br>05-06 to 06-07 |
| Academic Skills Attainment (1P1)   | 77.99             | <b>77.19</b>      | 78.37                     | -1.18                              | -0.8                            |
| Technical Skills Attainment (1P2)  | 86.84             | <b>87.00</b>      | 87.82                     | -0.82                              | 0.16                            |
| Graduation (2P1)   | <b>16.89</b>      | <b>14.78</b>      | 17.42                     | -2.64                              | -2.11                           |
| Employment/Further Study (3P1)   | 75.07             | 74.28             | 71.01                     | 3.27                               | -0.79                           |
| Retention in Employment (3P2)  | 94.08             | 93.72             | 91.45                     | 2.27                               | -0.36                           |
| Nontraditional Gender Representation in Enrollment (4P1)                             | 20.32             | 20.11             | 19.28                     | 0.83                               | -0.21                           |
| Nontraditional Gender Representation in Graduates (4P2)                              | <b>21.89</b>      | <b>24.51</b>      | 27.35                     | -2.84                              | 2.62                            |

Mr. Moore made a motion to accept the report as presented. The report will be maintained as a part of the Board meeting records and communicated to audiences as required by the Perkins legislation. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

**Report on 2006-2007 Supplemental Educational Services Evaluation**

Mrs. Roberta Schlicher, director of program administration and accountability, and Dr. Steven Ross, executive director, center for research in educational policy, presented this item.

Mrs. Schlicher said that the 2006-2007 evaluation report was prepared in response to a request made by the Board of Education at its January 2008 meeting for information regarding the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers. The evaluation is a requirement under Section 1116(e)(4)(D) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). NCLB requires states to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by the approved SES providers.

Dr. Ross' report on 2006-2007 supplemental educational services included the following:

Supplemental Educational Services, a requirement under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), provide additional academic assistance outside of the regular school day for eligible children. Specifically, students from low-income families who attend Title I schools that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for three consecutive years or more in the same subject area are eligible to receive these services.

Additionally, four school divisions in Virginia participated in a United States Department of Education (USED) pilot for reversal of Public School Choice (PSC) and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) during the 2006-2007 school year. These divisions offered SES to eligible students attending schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years or more in the same subject area.

NLCB requires that states monitor and determine the effectiveness of approved SES providers on an annual or periodic basis. To comply with the NCLB monitoring requirement, Virginia contracted with the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) to conduct a study on the implementation and effectiveness of SES services.

The study design consisted of two parts. The first part was a descriptive study of SES implementation on the part of the school divisions and providers. Information for the descriptive study was collected through a survey to division SES coordinators, parents of students receiving SES services, and SES providers. The second part was an evaluation of the effectiveness of SES services at the state-level and individual SES provider-level. Student achievement data were analyzed for the evaluation study.

In 2006-2007, 22 SES providers tutored 3,030 students located in 22 school divisions in Virginia. A total of 53 SES providers, approved by the Virginia Board of Education operated in the state, although all providers did not serve all divisions. Parents of eligible students had a choice of at least two providers in each division. Sixteen (16) SES providers delivered SES services in mathematics to 945 students, while 22 SES providers delivered SES services in reading/language arts to 2,641 students. Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors) served the largest percentage of students receiving mathematics services (34 percent), while Ability Plus, Inc., and Kumon North America both served the lowest percentage of students receiving mathematics services (less than 1 percent). Club Z! Inc., served the largest percentage of students receiving reading/language arts services (17.8 percent), while Tsquared Tutors, LLC served the lowest percentage of students receiving reading/language arts services (less than 1 percent).

School division SES coordinators, parents of students receiving SES, and SES providers from all 22 school divisions were asked to respond to survey questions. School division SES coordinators were asked to complete separate online surveys for each SES provider serving the school division. Fifty-five (55) percent of school division SES coordinators responded to the survey. Forty-one (41) responses were received from twelve (12) school division SES coordinators. Paper surveys were mailed to participating schools to be distributed to parents of students participating in SES. The percentage of surveys returned by parents is undetermined due to more surveys sent to be distributed than were actually distributed to this group. Three-hundred forty-nine (349) parents responded to the surveys.

State-approved SES providers were asked to complete separate online surveys for each school division they served. Seventy-three (73) percent of SES providers responded to the surveys.

One-hundred eleven (111) responses were received from sixteen (16) SES providers. The following summarizes the questions and responses from the survey.

1. Do school divisions make SES available to eligible students?
  - Over half of the SES provider representatives (56.7 percent) were either ‘Highly Satisfied’ or ‘Satisfied’ with division cooperation and involvement.
  - A large majority of parents (91.9 percent) had positive perceptions of school division efforts to implement SES and noted that they were pleased with the way their school division helped them obtain SES for their children.
2. Are SES providers communicating regularly with principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?
  - Over three-fourths of the SES provider representatives (76.5 percent) indicated that their tutors communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers, and 81.1 percent of the SES providers indicated that tutors communicated with parents frequently or occasionally regarding students’ progress.
  - Many division SES coordinators (68.3 percent) reported that SES providers frequently or occasionally communicated with teachers.
  - Most parents (67.0 percent) indicated SES providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them throughout the year.
3. Are SES providers developing instructional plans geared to student needs?
  - The majority of SES provider representatives (66.7 percent) indicated that their tutors frequently or occasionally integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities. Over half of the tutors (55 percent) frequently shared their lesson plans or materials with the homeroom or subject teachers of the children with whom they worked.
  - Of the 41 division SES coordinators, 43.9 percent indicated that SES providers frequently or occasionally collaborated with them to set goals for student growth during the school year, while 48.8 percent indicated that SES providers did not collaborate with them.
  - Most parents (75.7 percent) reported that SES providers helped their children with subjects they were working on in the regular school classroom either frequently or occasionally.
4. Are SES providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic standards?
  - The majority of SES provider representatives (80.2 percent) reported that their tutors frequently or occasionally aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic standards.
  - Many division SES coordinators (65.9 percent) indicated that SES providers’

services were aligned with federal, state and local standards.

5. Are SES providers offering services to special education and ELL students?
  - Most SES provider representatives (74.8 percent) reported that their tutors frequently or occasionally gave instructions to students with disabilities, consistent with their Individualized Education Programs or Individualized Services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Most SES providers (71.1 percent) indicated that their tutors frequently or occasionally offered appropriate instruction to ELL students when needed.
  - The majority of division SES coordinators (82.9 percent) agreed that SES providers offered services to special education and ELL students.
  - Special education contracts comprised 19 percent or 678 of all SES contracts and were served by 16 of 22 providers. ELL students comprised 19 percent or 680 of all SES contracts and were served by 14 of 22 providers.
  
6. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of SES provider performance?
  - Most division SES coordinators (87.8 percent) were satisfied with SES provider services overall and 83.0 percent indicated that tutoring services positively impacted student achievement.
  - The majority of parents (83.4 percent) indicated that they were very pleased with the services that their children received.

#### Student Achievement Results:

1. What are the effects of SES provider services on student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics?

For the state-level study of the effect of all SES providers combined, the statistical analysis showed no significant differences in 2006-2007 SOL mathematics performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services, with a small adjusted effect size of 0.086. While not statistically significant, SES students receiving mathematics services had slightly more favorable results than students not receiving SES services. The statistical analysis showed a significant program effect in reading/language arts in favor of students not receiving SES services, with a small adjusted effect size of -0.180.

For the SES provider-level study, no individual SES provider was found to have a significant impact on student achievement. The statistical analysis showed no significant differences in either 2006-2007 SOL mathematics or reading/language arts performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services. For three of five SES providers, mathematics results for students receiving SES were slightly more favorable than students not receiving SES. For two of six SES providers, reading/language arts performance for students receiving SES services was slightly higher than students not receiving SES services. Effect sizes ranged

from -0.569 to 0.783 in mathematics and from -0.394 to 0.055 in reading/language arts.

The results of special education students served by all SES providers were aggregated for the descriptive (non-statistical) analysis of 2006-2007 SOL results because of the small special education population receiving SES services. Without taking hours of attendance into account, 34.1 percent of all special education students were Proficient or Advanced in mathematics and 46.3 percent were Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts. After excluding special education students with fewer than 18 hours of attendance, 29.7 percent were Proficient or Advanced in mathematics and 44.4 percent were Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts.

2. How did students who received SES services in the schools participating in the USED pilot for reversal of SES and PSC perform relative to the other students attending schools that were not participating in the USED pilot?

The statistical analysis showed no statistically significant differences in either 2006-2007 SOL mathematics or reading/language arts performance between students that attended schools that participated in the USED pilot and students who attended schools not participating in the USED pilot. The results were slightly more favorable for students attending the pilot schools than for students not receiving SES services in both subjects, with a small adjusted effect size in mathematics (0.048), and a more prominent effect size in reading/language arts (0.224). Overall, the statistical analysis showed no basis for concluding that the effects of SES services on student achievement differed for students attending the schools that participated in the pilot.

### Conclusions

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in Virginia during the 2006-2007 school year received mostly positive ratings from survey respondents. Parents were generally pleased with the services their children received. While noting areas for improvement, division SES coordinators also indicated satisfaction with SES services. Efforts at the division level to increase awareness and participation in SES services were reported to be appreciated by the parents.

No SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served in either reading/language arts or mathematics. Students who received SES services scored similarly on the 2006-2007 SOL tests in reading/language arts and/or mathematics to those who did not receive SES services. The state-level study using data from all SES providers combined found no significant differences in mathematics achievement scores between students receiving SES services and those students not receiving SES services.

However, a significant difference favoring students not receiving SES services was found in reading/language arts. These results may not generalize to students who

were excluded from the analyses, who comprise the majority of students served through the SES program.

The Board accepted the report on 2006-2007 supplemental educational services evaluation.

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

Dr. Cannaday presented the following issues to the Board:

#### Issue #1 – Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton

The Bond Bill passed by the General Assembly that concerns the Virginia School for the Deaf and Blind at Hampton requires the Board to take action on closing the state operated day program at Hampton before new construction can be done in Staunton. This action will take place during the May Board meeting. Also at that time, a report will be presented showing how the young people who are still in the Hampton area will be served.

#### Issue #2 – Current budget status

The Governor's Chief of Staff has called a special session meeting to discuss the current budget status in Virginia. Dr. Cannaday and Dr. Wright will attend the meeting and will keep the Board informed of things the department must do to meet the budget reduction target and at the same time maintain services provided to school divisions.

#### Issue #3 – Office of Early Childhood Development

The Governor announced recently that there will be a new Office of Early Childhood Development that will report to the Department of Social Services and Department of Education. The transition will have several phases and the Board will be kept informed.

#### Issue #4 – Restructuring Regulations

Virginia does not have a very rigorous restructuring intervention, not by design, but by implementation. Instead, people go through the motion of putting together alternative government structures that have not resulted in being significantly different. This fall the Board will take action on the proposed regulations.

Dr. Emblidge said that during the previous General Assembly session, the House at the last minute came forward with a different formula to calculate the Standards of Quality (SOQ), which did not prevail. As a result, a commission was formed to look at SOQ funding. Dr. Emblidge urged Board members to follow the commission carefully because a new formula would mean less money for school divisions across the state.



Dinner Session

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel with the following members present: Dr. Emblidge, Dr. Brewster, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Johnson, 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.

***EXECUTIVE SESSION***

Dr. Ward made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code 2.2-3711.A*, specifically to discuss personnel matters related to licensure. Dr. Jones seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. The Board adjourned for the Executive Session at 12:23 p.m.

Dr. Ward made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Dr. Brewster and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

Dr. Ward 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 Mr. Moore and carried unanimously.

## Board Roll call:

Andrew Rotherham – Yes

Ella Ward – Yes

Gary Jones – Yes

Isis Castro – Yes

Eleanor Saslaw – Yes

David Johnson – Yes

Kelvin Moore – Yes

Mark Emblidge – Yes

## The following motions were made:

Dr. Ward made a motion to deny the license of Gene Rizzo. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Dr. Ward made a motion to revoke the license of Richard Forsythe. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Emblidge adjourned the meeting at 1:02 p.m.

---

 President