

# Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: G.

Date: November 20, 2008

Topic: Final Review of the Standards of Quality

Presenter: Ms. Anne D. Wescott, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2403 E-Mail Address: [Anne.Wescott@doe.virginia.gov](mailto:Anne.Wescott@doe.virginia.gov)

## Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by  
 State or federal law or regulation  
 Board of Education regulation  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Action requested at this meeting  Action requested at future meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

## Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action  
date September 25, 2008, October 23, 2008  
action First review, second review

**Background Information:** Article VIII, § 2 of the *Constitution of Virginia* requires the Board of Education to determine and prescribe Standards of Quality for the public schools in Virginia. The *Constitution* says:

“Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly. The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local units of government comprising such school divisions. Each unit of local government shall provide its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available funds.”

The *Code of Virginia* requires the Board of Education to review the Standards of Quality every two years. Section 22.1-18.01 of the *Code* says, in part:

“To ensure the integrity of the standards of quality, the Board of Education shall, in even-numbered years, exercise its constitutional authority to determine and prescribe the standards, subject to revision only by the General Assembly, by reviewing the standards and either (i) proposing amendments to the standards or (ii) making a determination that no changes are necessary....”

The *Code* also requires that the Board’s annual report to the Governor and General Assembly include any recommendations for revisions to the Standards of Quality. Section 22.1-18 of the *Code* says, in part:

“...the Board of Education shall submit to the Governor and the General Assembly a report on the condition and needs of public education in the Commonwealth and shall identify any school divisions and the specific schools therein which have failed to establish and maintain schools meeting the existing prescribed standards of quality. Such standards of quality shall be subject to revision only by the General Assembly, pursuant to Article VIII, Section 2 of the Constitution of Virginia. Such report shall include a complete listing of the current standards of quality for the Commonwealth's public schools, together with a justification for each particular standard, how long each such standard has been in its current form, and whether the Board recommends any change or addition to the standards of quality.”

On August 7, 1971, the Board of Education adopted the first Standards of Quality (SOQ). They were revised by the General Assembly in 1972 and adopted as uncodified Acts of Assembly. In 1974, they were revised into eight standards. In 1984, they were codified by the General Assembly, and in 1988 they were arranged into their current format.

The Board of Education revised its bylaws in October 2001 to require the Board to “...determine the need for a review of the SOQ from time to time but no less than once every two years.” The Standing Committee on the Standards of Quality was created by resolution of the Board of Education in November 2001 and held its first meeting in January 2002.

The Board has made recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly, or has reaffirmed previous recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly, on June 25, 2003, November 17, 2004, October 26, 2005, November 29, 2006, and November 29, 2007.

**Summary of Major Elements:** The attached table lists the Board’s unfunded recommendations; the estimated state and local share of the cost of each recommendation for Fiscal Year 2010, along with the total estimated cost of each recommendation; intermediate implementation options for the Board’s consideration; and background information for each of the options.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:** N/A

**Impact on Resources:** The impact on state funds for the review of the Standards of Quality is expected to be minimal and can be absorbed within current resources.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:** Following the Board's adoption, this resolution will be transmitted to the Governor and the General Assembly, as required by the *Code of Virginia*.

## Standards of Quality (SOQ) Review and Options for Discussion

Descriptor of Proposed SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Requires one full-time position per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12 to provide schools support in data management and the utilization and administration of state assessments. The data manager/test coordinator would hold a license issued by the Board of Education and would serve as a resource to principals and classroom teachers in analyzing and interpreting data for instructional purposes.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2006 and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$41.7 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$33.4 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$75.1 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p> <p>The Standards of Quality currently provide funding for one instructional technology resource teacher (ITRT) per 1,000 students. As an intermediate implementation option, provide flexibility to school divisions to use the instructional technology resource teacher funding to hire a data coordinator position, an instructional technology resource teacher position or a data coordinator/instructional resource teacher <u>blended</u> position. SOQ language would need to be amended.</p>	<p>Standards of Quality: § <a href="#">22.1-253.13:2</a>. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.</p> <p>Local school boards shall employ two full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12, one to provide technology support and one to serve as an instructional technology resource teacher.</p>

Descriptor of Proposed SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Require one full-time equivalent instructional position for each 1,000 students in average daily membership to serve as reading specialists for the school division.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2003, 2006, and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$41.7 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$33.4 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$75.1 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p> <p>As an intermediate implementation option, provide flexibility to school divisions to use Early Intervention Reading Initiative (EIRI) funding to hire reading specialists to provide the required intervention. The EIRI is a Lottery-funded incentive program outside of the SOQ. The SOQ could be amended to connect the reading specialists to the EIRI.</p>	<p>The Early Reading Intervention program is funded outside of the Standards of Quality. The estimated state share of funding for fiscal year 2010 is \$17.1 million and the local share is \$13.6 million, for total funding of \$30.7 million from the Lottery Fund. The program's intent is to reduce the number of students needing remedial services. The program funds are used by school divisions to fund: 1) special reading teachers; 2) trained aides; 3) volunteer tutors under teacher supervision; 4) computer-based reading tutorial programs; aides to instruct groups while teachers provide targeted assistance; or 5) extended instructional time.</p> <p>The funding formula is based on a ratio of 1 teacher to 5 students in grades K through 3.</p>

Descriptor of Proposed SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Require one full-time instructional position for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through eight to serve as the mathematics teacher specialist.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2006 and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$28.6 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$22.8 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$51.4 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p> <p>As an intermediate implementation option, provide flexibility to school divisions to use Algebra Readiness Intervention (ARI) initiative funding to hire mathematics teacher specialists to provide the required intervention. The ARI is a Lottery-funded incentive program outside of the SOQ. The SOQ could be amended to connect the mathematics teacher specialists to the Algebra Readiness Intervention initiative.</p>	<p>The SOL Algebra Readiness program is funded outside of the Standards of Quality. The estimated state share of funding for fiscal year 2010 is \$9.0 million and the local share is \$5.9 million, for total funding of \$14.9 million from the Lottery Fund. Funding is based on the estimated number of 7<sup>th</sup>- and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students who are at-risk of failing the Algebra I end-of-course test. The number of at-risk students is approximated based on the free lunch eligibility percentage for each school division.</p>
<p>Require one full-time principal in every elementary school.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2003, 2006, and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$7.7 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$4.2 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$11.9 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p>	

Descriptor of Proposed SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Require one assistant principal for each 400 students in every elementary school, middle school, and high school.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2003, 2006, and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$57.3 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$47.9 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$105.2 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p>	
<p>Require local school boards to employ speech-language pathologists in sufficient numbers to ensure that a caseload does not exceed 60 students per position.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2003, 2006, and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$4.3 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$3.6 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$7.9 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p>	

Descriptor of Proposed SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Require local school boards to employ instructional and paraprofessional staff to ensure a student to teacher ratio according to the level of services needed. For instance, resources would be provided at 24:1 for the least intensive service level. More intensive services require a 10:1 ratio and the most intensive services require an 8:1 ratio with an additional weight or service level if the student is in a self-contained environment.</p> <p>Years Recommended: 2006 and 2007</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$3.8 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$3.2 Million</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> No additional cost in current biennium</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> \$7.0 Million</p>	<p><u>Option I:</u> Support requirement for full implementation.</p> <p><u>Option II:</u> Affirm need for this requirement, but defer implementation of requirement to a later year.</p>	
<p><b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b></p>	<p><b>\$185.1 Million</b></p>	<p><b>\$148.5 Million</b></p>	<p><b>\$333.6 Million</b></p>		

**Additional Option for Discussion:**

Descriptor of Proposed Language in SOQ	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated State Share	Fiscal Year 2010 - Estimated Local Share	Total Cost	Intermediate Implementation Options	Background Information on Options
<p>Provide flexibility to address the instruction of English Language Learners (ELL) who have limited English proficiency</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>		<p>As an alternative for providing additional instructional services to English Language Learner (ELL) students, allow school divisions to use funds from the SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation account to hire additional ELL teachers to provide instruction to identified LEP students. This funding would supplement the instructional services provided by the current SOQ staffing standard of 17 per 1,000 LEP students.</p> <p>SOQ language would need to be amended.</p>	<p>Currently, the SOQ provides funding for 17 instructional positions for every 1,000 students identified as having limited English proficiency. The funding supports the salary and benefits cost of instructional positions needed for providing instruction to children not having English as their primary language.</p> <p>The Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation account is a funding mechanism that provides prevention, intervention, and remediation services to students in need of additional instruction in the Standards of Learning. The estimated state share of funding for fiscal year 2010 is \$69.5 million and the estimated local share is \$45.1 million, for total funding of \$114.6 million from general funds.</p> <p>Funding is based upon a pupil teacher ratio that is adjusted according to division level failure rates on SOL English and mathematics tests for a population of at-risk students (estimated based upon free lunch eligibility.)</p>

**Virginia Board of Education**

**November 20, 2008**

***Final Review of the Standards of Quality  
(SOQ)***



FLUCCANO

November 20, 2008

**Summary of October Meeting:**

- **Broad overview of programs contained in the SOQ and those outside the SOQ.**
- **Presentation of recommended changes to the SOQ brought forward by the Board beginning in 2003.**
- **Discussion of the status of recommendations made by the Board that have not yet been implemented and funded.**



FLUCCANO

November 20, 2008

## **Board Recommendations That Have Not Yet Been Implemented and Funded**

- Providing for a Data Manager/Test Coordinator for every 1,000 students in grades K-12
- Providing one full-time reading specialist for every 1,000 students in grades K-12
- Providing one full-time mathematics specialist for every 1,000 students in grades K-8
- Providing one full-time principal in each elementary school
- Providing one full-time assistant principal for every 400 students in grades K-12
- Reducing the caseload standards for speech-language pathologists
- Reducing the caseload standards related to visually impaired students



November 20, 200

## **Options To Consider – Data Manager/Test Coordinator (2006 and 2007 Recommendation)**

**Option 1: Support requirement for full implementation – Cost is \$41.7 Million in state funds and \$33.4 Million in local funds.**

**Option 2: Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer full implementation of requirement to a later year.**

**Intermediate implementation option: Permit school divisions to use the instructional technology resource teacher funding in the SOQ to hire a data coordinator position, an instructional technology resource teacher position or a data coordinator/instructional resource teacher blended position. (SOQ language would need to be amended.)**



November 20, 200

## **Options To Consider – Reading Specialist (2003, 2006, 2007 Recommendation)**

**Option 1: Support requirement for full implementation – Cost is \$41.7 Million in state funds and \$33.4 Million in local funds.**

**Option 2: Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer full implementation of requirement to a later year.**

**Intermediate implementation option: Permit flexibility to school divisions to use Early Intervention Reading Initiative (EIRI) funding to hire reading specialists to provide the required intervention. The EIRI is a Lottery-funded incentive program outside of the SOQ. The SOQ could be amended to connect the reading specialists to the EIRI.**



November 20, 200

## **Options To Consider – Mathematics Specialist (2006 and 2007 Recommendation)**

**Option 1: Support requirement for full implementation – Cost is \$28.6 Million in state funds and \$22.8 Million in local funds.**

**Option 2: Affirm need for this requirement, but support an intermediate implementation option and defer full implementation of requirement to a later year.**

**Intermediate implementation option: Permit flexibility to school divisions to use Algebra Readiness Intervention (ARI) initiative funding to hire mathematics teacher specialists to provide the required intervention. The ARI is a Lottery-funded incentive program outside of the SOQ. The SOQ could be amended to connect the mathematics teacher specialists to the Algebra Readiness Intervention initiative.**



November 20, 200

## Options To Consider – Remaining Four Recommendations

Two Recommendation Options:

**Option 1:** Support requirement for full implementation.

OR

**Option 2:** Affirm the need for this requirement but defer implementation to a later year.

Applies To:

- Providing one full-time principal in each elementary school (Cost is \$7.7 Million in state funds and \$4.2 Million in local funds.)
- Providing one full-time assistant principal for every 400 students in grades K-12. (Cost is \$57.3 Million in state funds and \$47.9 Million in local funds.)
- Reducing the caseload standards for speech-language pathologists. (Cost is \$4.3 Million in state funds and \$3.6 Million in local funds.)
- Reducing the caseload standards related to visually impaired students. (Cost is \$3.8 Million in state funds and \$3.2 Million in local funds.)



November 20, 200

## Additional Option for Discussion – Instruction of English Language Learners (ELL) With Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

- Allow school divisions to use funds from the SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation account to hire additional ELL teachers to provide instruction to identified LEP students.
- This option is intended to supplement the instructional services provided by the current SOQ staffing standard of 17 per 1,000 LEP students.



November 20, 200