COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

April 29, 2009

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

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

Mr. K. Rob Krupicka
Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin
Mr. Kelvin L. Moore
Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dr. Emblidge, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. Dr. Emblidge opened the planning session by welcoming members of the Board of Education Student Advisory Committee and reviewing the planning meeting agenda.

STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

Mrs. Castro and Mrs. Saslaw are the Board sponsors of the Student Advisory Committee. Members of the 2008-2009 Student Advisory Committee were selected from more than 100 nominations received in December 2008 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:

Jonathon Bishop, Nottoway High School, Nottoway County Public Schools
Meghan Bryan, Eagle Ridge Middle School, Loudoun County Public Schools
Tara Coleman, Council High School, Buchanan County Public Schools
Calvin Hunt, Millbrook High School, Frederick County Public Schools
Kevin Kabaria, Richlands Middle School, Tazewell County Public Schools
David Krawczyk, William Fleming High School, Roanoke City Public Schools
Abigail Moul, Bruton High School, York County Public Schools
Londeka Mthethwa, Prospect Heights Middle School, Orange County Public Schools
Kelly Robeson, North Stafford High School, Stafford County Public Schools

Jose Soto, Bayside Middle School, Virginia Beach City Public Schools
Kiyoko Timmons, Richmond Community High School, Richmond City Public Schools
Madison Wilson, Harrisonburg High School, Harrisonburg City Public Schools

During the first meeting in December 2008, 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 18, 2009, the members continued their discussions and formulated preliminary findings. During the committee meeting on April 28, 2009, the members discussed their findings and drafted final recommendations for presentation to the Board of Education. The following is the report given to the Board of Education by the members of the Student Advisory Committee.

Priority Issue Number 1:
Increasing the recognition of students in a variety of achievement areas.

Background
The derivative of this project was the realization of the overall lack of scholarships that reward the student for achievement in a variety of areas. In searching for scholarships, students often find that one of the main criteria to qualify is to have financial need. Thus, it has been decided that recognition by the Virginia Department of Education is sought to identify outstanding student achievement without considering finances.

The Student Advisory Committee conducted scholarship searches and found that most scholarships are only available to students based on financial need, such as the Coca-Cola Scholarship. Analyzing the probability of receiving a national scholarship (as they are some of the few that do not require financial need such as the Best Buy Scholarship) one finds the chances of receiving the scholarship are minuscule. In an equation that defines students' attempts in applying for scholarships, the likelihood of receiving a local or state scholarship is greater than receiving a national one.

Our justification for creating this scholarship is to provide an opportunity for students that have saved money over the years for college, but are still in need of funds for continuing education. These students should not be jeopardized in applying for scholarships that require demonstrated financial need. When applying for financial aid, people must disclose all financial assets and scholarship committees consider the money as being solely devoted to post-secondary education, even though that may not be the case.

Position of the Student Advisory Committee
As a committee, we feel that it is necessary to provide students in the state of Virginia the opportunity to be recognized for their outstanding achievements in specific areas over the years without considering finances.

We want to create a Web site from the Department of Education recognizing students that have been selected by their school division for excelling in one of the areas that follow: Mathematics, Science and Engineering, History, Foreign Language, Performing Arts (Music, Dance, Theater, Debate), Visual Arts (Architecture, Graphic Design, Painting, Video, Web Design), Literature/ Writing for Publication, Entrepreneurship, Leadership, and Community Service. We would eventually like the program to expand to scholarship offerings so that there are opportunities not limited to financial need. Our achievement program will give equal opportunity to all students. This program will include statewide recognition for students entering colleges and the workforce. For example, if a student does not excel in academia, but they are very involved in the community, they will be able to showcase their achievement through this recognition program.

Recommendations
With available resources, the following are recommendations to the State Board of Education:

- Stage I: Creation of a link on the Department's Web site with a list of high school students selected by school divisions who have significant achievements in academic and/or extracurricular areas
- Stage II: Further development of the recognition program in cooperation with local school divisions. (The group has submitted criteria for future reference and consideration.)
- Stage III: Pursuit of opportunities for scholarship awards and increased awareness of the recognition program by institutions of higher learning, business and industry, and other entities

Priority Issue Number 2:
Expanding online education throughout Virginia elementary schools.

Background
As technological inventions progress, our school systems also progress. Students are exposed more to technology through home and school. Not only is this happening at an older age but also at the elementary grade level. Implementing online education starting in an elementary grade level would better prepare our younger generation for the future. Online learning broadens the educational opportunities and gets children more involved with their surrounding world. Online learning gives students the opportunity to meet more people in their surrounding areas, even as far as other countries. Online learning gives the ability to be able to learn subjects not provided in their own school or community. This provides a better outlook on high school and college and career opportunities in the future. This meets the curriculum of the Virginia Public School Systems, while also making sure to meet the Standards of Learning.

Position
Through our personal experience with the Virginia Public Schools System, we feel that technology is progressing as a standard tool of learning. Starting online learning at an earlier age will help teachers and students in the classroom. Implementing online classes in elementary schools, will broaden the minds of younger students, and better prepare

them for the future. Starting online education at an early age will make the transition to elementary school years a natural process, for both the students and teachers. This is a teaching tool not only for students but teachers as well. We feel that the younger generation is the future of our society, and we need to provide them with the future in technological advances. Within the next decade more and more computers and online education will be used not only in schools but in everyday life.

Recommendations
With available resources, the following are our recommendations to the State Board of Education:

- Implement online classes and experiences in elementary schools.
- Make the classes more appealing to younger students by including an entertaining curriculum for easier understanding, while grasping students' attention.
- Provide a variety of courses.
- Provide a special study environment, apart from other classrooms.
- Make classes available to every school, leaving the distribution to the school or school district on providing the way of teaching in that particular school or district.
- Provide teachers informational sessions on using the online courses and technology of the courses.
- Provide each school with the newest technology available.

Priority Issue Number 3:
Improving the foreign language and technology education and exposure in Virginia public schools with the goal of helping students become bilingual and achieve the level of technology necessary to be competitive in the workplace.

Background
We examined data of foreign language and technology study throughout schools in Virginia and have found inconsistencies in the number of languages taught and the fluency achieved. Americans are infamous for their negative image in foreign language competence which is especially detrimental in the United States' effort to further globalization.

Position of the Student Advisory Committee
We feel that to better cooperate and succeed in today's world, it is necessary for Virginia students to become competent in marketable languages and technology. Our project hopes to expand students' knowledge of technology and foreign language. Technology helps us communicate effectively in the global market. Because technology consistently progresses and becomes obsolete so quickly, it is important and necessary to have a continuing and complete technological education. If we teach students to use language and technology at a younger age, they will be more successful citizens and workers in our global society. In an increasingly global environment, we feel that it is imperative that Virginia students contribute to the United States' development towards becoming more

cooperative towards other nations and ambassadors of goodwill by learning to communicate in at least one other language.

Recommendations
With available resources, the following are our recommendations to the State Board of Education:

- Begin instruction in foreign language at an earlier age, as early as kindergarten
- Supplement current foreign language instruction
  - Language immersion classes
  - Incorporate foreign language instruction with the Standards of Learning for other subjects
  - Before/after school classes in foreign language
  - Foreign language technology (e.g., Rosetta Stone, advanced foreign language classes available on Virtual Virginia)
  - Extracurricular clubs dedicated to use foreign languages in a realistic environment
- Incorporate more technology into the everyday curriculum of the classroom
  - Use technology for individual/group projects
  - Teachers/school systems to become more aware of how to incorporate relevant technology into instruction to familiarize students with its use (e.g., student and teacher used Web sites, presentations, etc.)
- In future years, create and execute foreign language SOL

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, grandparents, and school personnel attending the meeting with the students. They also thanked Michelle Parker and Michelle Vucci of the Policy and Communications staff at the Department of Education.

THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY M. KAINE, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Dr. Emblidge welcomed Governor Kaine on behalf of the Board. Dr. Emblidge also thanked the Governor for giving Board members the opportunity to serve the Commonwealth through the Board of Education and for his leadership in education issues.

Dr. Emblidge and Governor Kaine reflected on the Governor's recent trip to Israel, Morocco, and Dubai. The Governor met with Benjamin Netanyahu and Shimon Peres, and they talked mostly about education issues. He said the primary purpose for the visit to Israel and Morocco was economic development and diplomacy. The Governor noted that Israel has a very strong educational system, and Morocco is trying to build

one. Governor Kaine said that the more he travels, the better he feels about what the Board and Virginia have done for education. He said it was a great trip, and was glad to be back.

Governor Kaine said his discussion will reflect on things that the Board had done in the last few years that have been powerful. The Governor emphasized that he has a lot left to do before his term ends, and some of those things deal with education. The Governor added that the Board and everyone in public service are doing their jobs in the toughest times the nation has faced since the 1930s.

The Governor talked about some of the things the Board has done to work with him and the legislature over the last few years and during a time of difficult economic challenges. This was accomplished to make positive policy moves in education so that Virginia can be more competitive as a state. The Governor emphasized that a particular passion of his has been pre-k and the creation of the Office of Early Childhood Education. Governor Kaine also highlighted other accomplishments of the Board, including the following:

- On-time graduation rate;
- Academic career plan for middle school students beginning with the 2010-2011 school year;
- Creation of a Technical Diploma;
- An increase in students taking AP courses enrolled in International Baccalaureate courses;
- Expansion of the Virtual Virginia program;
- Establishment of the VIP (Virginia Index of Performance) Program to reward schools that go beyond the minimum;
- Revised Mathematics and English Standards of Learning;
- Increased standards for the Advanced Diploma; and
- Governor's Career and Technical Academy designations.

The Governor pointed out that for the future, Virginia will need to continue to work on teacher recruitment. The Governor will continue working with a two-year budget that he will write at the end of his term, helping to allocate money that will come to Virginia in the economic stimulus package. He will work with the federal "Race-to-the Top" program, which is included in the stimulus package coming to Virginia from the federal budget. Governor Kaine said it has been an honor working with the Board, and he will continue to be active in Virginia after his term ends.

After the Governor's presentation, Board members had the following comments:

- Dr. Brewster said that the Board appreciates the Governor's work on getting the pre-school initiative out in the Commonwealth.
- Mrs. Saslaw said that without the Governor's focus the Board would not have been able to go forward with a lot of their initiatives.

- Dr. Ward thanked Governor Kaine for an excellent presentation and asked if "Race-to-the Top" money could be used for pre-k. The Governor said that it could because childcare money is included in the package.
- Mrs. Castro asked the Governor if any foreign language ideas have come about during his travels. Governor Kaine responded that in other parts of the world it is common for people to speak as many as five or six languages. He said the more the American public hears other languages spoken in their neighborhoods the more interest there will be in learning languages.
- Mr. Krupicka thanked the Governor on his leadership on the pre-k initiative and asked the Governor about his thoughts on school divisions using stimulus money to balance the budget. Governor Kaine said that he has encouraged local governments to use the stimulus money for plus investments and not for balancing the budget.

Once again, Dr. Emblidge thanked the Governor for taking time from his schedule to spend with the Board. Before leaving, the Governor's photographer took pictures of the Governor and members of the Board.

STANDARDS OF QUALITY COMMITTEE

Dr. Emblidge opened the first meeting of the new Standards of Quality (SOQ) Committee and gave an overview of how the General Assembly and Governor's office had to work with a four billion dollar deficit in the budget. Dr. Emblidge said that they agreed to bridge the gap by putting a cap on support services in the schools. He said the General Assembly made it clear that this would not be a permanent move and asked the Board to report back to the General Assembly in November with recommendations for capping support services to the schools.

Dr. Emblidge turned the meeting over to Mrs. Saslaw who had been previously asked to chair the SOQ Committee. Mrs. Saslaw called the meeting of the Board of Education Standards of Quality Committee to order. Mrs. Saslaw said that Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent of policy and communications, will review the SOQ from the perspective of the *Code of Virginia* and Mr. Kent Dickey, assistant superintendent for finance, will review the SOQ from the perspective of the Appropriations Act.

Mrs. Westcott's report included the following:

REVIEW OF THE STANDARDS OF QUALITY

General Assembly's Charge
Item 140.C.5.k.3), 2009 Appropriation Act:
The Board of Education shall review the current Standards of Quality to evaluate the appropriateness of the existing staffing standards for instructional positions and the appropriateness of establishing ratio standards for support positions, with the objective of maximizing resources devoted to the instructional program.

The findings of this review, its associated costs, and its final recommendations for rebenchmarking shall be submitted to the Governor, the Chairmen of House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees and the Joint Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education Funding established pursuant to Item 1, paragraph H. of this Act no later than November 1, 2009.

Item 140.C.5.k.2), 2009 Appropriation Act:
The Department of Education shall make its calculation for the total cost of rebenchmarking for the fiscal year 2010-2012 biennium to be consistent with the following methodologies:
(i) using the 'support position funding cap' methodology change contained in House Bill 1600/Senate Bill 850 ...
(ii) using the rebenchmarking methodology which was contained within Chapter 879, from the 2008 Session ...

Precipitating Factors
- National recession and reduction in general fund revenue collections
- Biennial costs of rebenchmarking
- Standards of Quality as a percentage of total general fund revenues

FY 2010 Budget
- For the purpose of achieving the necessary funding reductions in FY 2010, support positions were capped at a ratio of one support position for each 4.03 SOQ-funded instructional position.
- This was not adopted as a permanent change in funding or staffing policy.
- This action resulted in a reduction in state funding of $340.9 million for FY 2010.
- To mitigate this and other state funding reductions, the General Assembly appropriated $365.2 million in federal stimulus money from the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

Constitutional Authority
Article VIII, § 2:
 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 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.

Statutory Authority
§ 22.1-18.01, *Code of Virginia*:
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 proposing amendments to the standards or making a determination that no changes are necessary.

Background
- The Standards of Quality were first adopted by the Board of Education in 1971.
- They were revised by the General Assembly in 1972 and adopted as uncodified Acts of Assembly. They were codified by the General Assembly in 1984.
- They prescribe the minimum requirements that all school divisions in Virginia must meet.
- The standards are found in § § 22.1-253.13:1 through 22.1-253.13:8 of the *Code of Virginia.*

Eight Standards of Quality
1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives;
2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel;
3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation;
4. Student achievement and graduation requirements;
5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership;
6. Planning and public involvement;
7. School board policies; and
8. Compliance.

Standard 2: Staffing
- Standard 2, the staffing standard, is the major budget driver for K-12 funding.
- Item 140 of the 2009 Appropriation Act also addresses SOQ staffing standards.
- Both need to be reviewed concurrently. If there is a conflict between the statute and the Appropriation Act, the Appropriation Act prevails.

Divisionwide Student-Teacher Ratios

	Student-teacher ratio	Maximum class size
Kindergarten	24:1	29*
Grades 1, 2 & 3	24:1	30
Grades 4, 5 & 6	25:1	35
English classes in grades 6-12	24:1	--
*A full-time aide is required if the ADM exceeds 24 students in a kindergarten classroom.		

Schoolwide Student-Teacher Ratio

	Student-teacher ratio	Maximum class size
Middle & high schools	21:1	--

School divisions shall provide all middle and high school teachers with one planning period per day or the equivalent, unencumbered of any teaching or supervisory duties.

Schoolwide Student-Teacher Ratio

	Student-teacher ratio	Maximum class size
Middle & high schools	21:1	--

School divisions shall provide all middle and high school teachers with one planning period per day or the equivalent, unencumbered of any teaching or supervisory duties.

Principals

Elementary schools – 299 or fewer students	One half-time principal
Elementary schools – 300 or more students	One full-time principal
Middle and high schools	One full-time principal

Assistant Principals

Elementary schools – *600 to 899 students*	One half-time assistant principal
Elementary schools – *900 or more students*	One full-time assistant principal
Middle schools	One full-time assistant principal for each 600 students
High schools	One full-time assistant principal for each 600 students

Librarians

Elementary schools – *up to 299 students*	One part-time librarian
Elementary schools – *300 or more students*	One full-time librarian
Middle and high schools – *up to 299 students*	One half-time librarian
Middle and high schools – *300 to 999 students*	One full-time librarian
Middle and high schools – *1000 or more students*	Two full-time librarians

School Counselors

Elementary schools – *up to 499 students*	One hour/day/100 students
Elementary schools – *500 or more students*	One full-time counselor at 500 students, plus one hour/day/100 students
Middle schools – *up to 399 students*	One period/80 students
Middle schools – *400 or more students*	One full-time counselor at 400 students, plus one period/80 students
High schools – *up to 349 students*	One period/70 students
High schools – *350 or more students*	One full-time counselor at 350 students, plus one period/70 students

Clerical Positions

Elementary schools – *up to 299 students*	One part-time clerical position
Elementary schools – *300 or more students*	One full-time clerical position
Middle and high schools	• One full-time clerical position • One additional full-time position for each 600 students beyond 200 students • One full-time position for the library at 750 students

Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation
- Funding is provided for full-time equivalent instructional positions for students needing Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation services.
- The funding formula in the Appropriation Act is one hour of additional instruction per day based on the percent of students eligible for the federal free lunch program.

- The student-teacher ratio ranges from 18:1 to 10:1, depending upon a school division's combined failure rate on the *English* and *Mathematics Standards of Learning* tests.

Limited English Proficiency
- Staffing standard: 17 full-time equivalent instructional positions for each 1,000 students identified as having limited English proficiency.
- Language in the Appropriation Act permits school divisions to use SOQ Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation funds to employ additional English Language Learner teachers to provide instruction to identified limited English proficiency students.

Art, Music, and Physical Education
- Staffing standard: Five full-time equivalent positions per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through five to serve as elementary resource teachers in art, music, and physical education.

Instructional Technology Resource Teachers and Technology Support
- Staffing standard: 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.
- Language in the Appropriation Act permits school divisions to use funds for Instructional Technology Resource Teachers to employ Data Coordinator positions, Instructional Technology Resource Teacher positions, or Data Coordinator/Instructional Technology Resource Teacher blended positions.

Reading Specialists
- The *Code* permits, but does not require, school divisions to employ reading specialists in elementary schools.
- Language in the Appropriation Act permits school divisions to use the state Early Intervention Reading Initiative funding to employ reading specialists to provide the required reading intervention services.

Mathematics Specialists
- Language in the Appropriation Act permits school divisions to use Algebra Readiness Initiative funding to employ mathematics teacher specialists to provide the required mathematics intervention services.

Support Positions
- Each local school board is required to provide those support services that are necessary for the efficient and cost-effective operation and maintenance of its public schools.
- Pursuant to the Appropriation Act, support services are funded on the basis of prevailing statewide costs.

Support Services include
- School board members
- The superintendent and assistant superintendents
- Pupil transportation
- Student services
- Attendance and health
- Operations and maintenance
- Administrative, clerical, and technical

Staffing Provisions in the Appropriation Act
The Appropriation Act provides for a minimum of:
- 51 professional instructional positions and aide positions for each 1,000 students;
- One professional instructional position for gifted education for each 1,000 students; and
- Six professional instructional positions and aide positions for special education and career and technical education for each 1,000 students.

Next Steps
- Review and approval of a work plan;
- Participation and involvement of education entities and the public;
- Collection and analysis of data provided by school divisions;
- Examination of all facets of the SOQ to determine the changes that may be needed;
- Identification of best practices; and
- Formulation of recommendations.

Mr. Dickey's presentation included the following:

OVERVIEW OF STANDARDS OF QUALITY FUNDING PROCESS

SOQ Requirements
- The Virginia Constitution requires the Board of Education to formulate Standards of Quality (SOQ) for public schools.
- The General Assembly is charged with revising the SOQ, determining SOQ costs, and apportioning the cost between the state and localities.
- The decision about how much to appropriate for public schools is left to the General Assembly.
- The SOQ is established in the Virginia Constitution as the minimum educational program school divisions must provide.
- The specific requirements of the SOQ are set out in the *Code of Virginia* and the Appropriation Act, such as requirements for programs and staffing.
- State funding must be matched by the locality. Localities may spend more than the required amounts and offer programs and employ staff beyond what is required.
- The primary determinant of state funding for school divisions. (FY10 funding shown in Appendix A.)
- $5.3 billion – or 91.3% of state funding for public education – in FY10. Over 80% of SOQ funding is for salaries and benefits.
- Required local match in FY10 is $3.4 billion – most localities exceed their required match for the SOQ.
- Existing SOQ funding based largely on JLARC methodology developed in the mid/late 1980s.
- The primary determinant of state funding for school divisions. (FY10 funding shown in Appendix A.)
- $5.3 billion – or 91.3% of state funding for public education – in FY10. Over 80% of SOQ funding is for salaries and benefits.
- Required local match in FY10 is $3.4 billion – most localities exceed their required match for the SOQ.
- Existing SOQ funding based largely on JLARC methodology developed in the mid/late 1980's.

SOQ Funding Summary
- Funding for the Standards of Quality is provided through the following accounts, mostly on a per pupil basis (formulas shown in Appendix B):
  - Basic Aid
  - Special Education
  - Career and Technical Education
  - Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation
  - Gifted Education
  - English as a Second Language
  - Remedial Summer School
  - Fringe Benefits for funded instructional positions
  - Sales Tax (1.125% for public education)
  - Textbooks

Determining SOQ Costs
- Three components of SOQ cost:
  1. required number of <u>instructional positions</u> (salary and benefits) – driven by staffing standards in Standard 2, Appropriation Act, and BOE regulations;
  2. recognized <u>support positions</u> (salary and benefits); and,
  3. recognized <u>"non-personal" support costs</u> (e.g., supplies, utilities, etc.).
- The support cost components (2 & 3) are funded through Basic Aid mostly on a prevailing cost basis.
- Each SOQ account is funded by a per pupil cost calculated for each division and distributed based on March 31 ADM.
- Key input data used to cost out the three components are updated every two years during rebenchmarking:
  1. number of students
  2. staffing standards for teachers and other instructional positions
  3. salaries of teachers and other instructional positions
  4. fringe benefit rates
  5. standard and prevailing support costs
  6. inflation factors
  7. federal revenues deducted from support costs
  8. amount of sales tax revenue and school division composite indices
- Key input data used to cost out the three components are updated every two years during rebenchmarking:
  1. number of students
  2. staffing standards for teachers and other instructional positions
  3. salaries of teachers and other instructional positions
  4. fringe benefit rates
  5. standard and prevailing support costs
  6. inflation factors
  7. federal revenues deducted from support costs
  8. amount of sales tax revenue and school division composite indices

Calculate Cost of Instructional Positions
- Apply all classroom, school, and division staffing standards in Standard 2 for Basic positions (i.e., K-12 teachers, principals, etc.) against school and division enrollment.
- Apply other staffing standards in Appropriation Act and BOE regs. to associated enrollments for other instructional programs: special education, CTE, remediation, gifted, and ESL.
- Apply minimum staffing standard of 51 positions per 1,000 for Basic positions and 6 positions per 1,000 for special education and CTE positions to ensure "floor" level of positions generated.
- The generated instructional positions for each division are multiplied by the applicable funded salary (and cost of competing factor if applicable).
- The instructional salary costs are assigned to the applicable SOQ accounts (i.e., Basic Aid, special education, etc.).
- The associated fringe benefit costs for the positions are funded in the separate fringe benefit accounts (VRS retirement, Social Security, and VRS group life). Health care is funded in Basic Aid.

Features of "Prevailing Cost"
- Recognize operating costs in the SOQ based on "reasonable" costs, not each school division's actual spending.
- JLARC stated "reasonable cost" should reflect what most school divisions spend, not reimbursement of actual expenditures.
- Applied to cost components not quantified in the SOQ:
  – instructional and support salary amounts
  – support staffing per pupil
  – non-personal support costs per pupil
- Includes the cost of every division but is not unduly influenced by divisions with unusually high or low costs.

- A weighted average ("linear weighted average") cost whose weights are derived from the proximity of division costs to the middle or median cost in the distribution.
- Gives greatest weight to the median cost; least weight to the very highest and lowest costs.
- Most school divisions' actual costs are a little under or a little over the calculated prevailing cost.

Calculation of "Prevailing Cost"
- Array each division's actual base-year average salary, per pupil support cost, or per pupil support staffing from high to low.
- Assign a weight of 5 to the middle or median division cost.
- Assign corresponding declining weights to costs on either side of the median cost until the highest and lowest costs are reached, which are weighted at 1.
- Apply weights to individual data points and calculate the weighted average. Adjust values for inflation.
- Array each division's actual base-year average salary, per pupil support cost, or per pupil support staffing from high to low.
- Assign a weight of 5 to the middle or median division cost.
- Assign corresponding declining weights to costs on either side of the median cost until the highest and lowest costs are reached, which are weighted at 1.
- Apply weights to individual data points and calculate the weighted average. Adjust values for inflation.
- Funding for prevailing support costs provided in Basic Aid.
    - positions and non-personal costs in areas such as technology, pupil transportation, operation & maintenance, professional development, attendance & health, administration, and superintendent, school board, and school nurse positions.
    - proposed cap of 1 support per 4.03 instructional positions would be applied to the prevailing positions.
- Basic Aid also includes funding for technology support and school-based clerical positions based on Standard 2. (Support positions funded in Basic Aid shown in Appendix C.)
- The "federal revenue deduct" reduces the final Basic Aid cost for the portion of federal expenditures (approx. 29%) picked-up in the prevailing support costs. This allows support cost funding to be driven by state and local expenditures only.
- After a total cost is determined for each SOQ account, the cost is then converted to a per pupil amount. The per pupil amounts are then multiplied by the average daily membership (ADM) for each division; from this, the total cost of each SOQ account is determined.
- For Basic Aid, the total cost is first reduced by the estimated amount of 1.125% state sales tax that will be distributed to divisions based on school-age population. The remaining amount for Basic Aid and the total amount for the other SOQ accounts are then split into state and local shares based on each locality's composite index.

Determining State & Local Shares
- Cost sharing between the Commonwealth and localities and recognizing varying ability to pay education costs are fundamental to the SOQ.
- Most SOQ funding is "equalized" based on local ability to pay as determined by the Composite Index of Local Ability-to-Pay. The composite index determines each division's state and local shares of SOQ costs.
- The composite index uses three indicators of ability-to-pay for each locality:
    - true value of real property in the locality (weighted 50%)
    - adjusted gross income in the locality (weighted 40%)
    - taxable retail sales in the locality (weighted 10%)
- Each indicator is expressed on a per capita (weighted 33%) and per pupil (weighted 67%) basis.
- The index for each locality is the proportion of the weighted local values relative to the weighted statewide values.
- Finally, each locality composite index is adjusted to establish an overall statewide local share of 45% and an overall state share of 55%.
- Local shares of cost range from a maximum of 80% to below 20%.

Support Position Categories Funded In Basic Aid
- Assistant Superintendent
- Instructional Professional
  - ex.: school social worker, instructional specialists
- Instructional Technical/Clerical
- Attendance & Health Administrative
  - ex.: school psychologist, attendance officers
- Attendance & Health Technical/Clerical
- Administration Administrative
- Administration Technical/Clerical
- Technology Professional
- Technology Technical/Clerical
- Operation & Maintenance Professional
- School-based Clerical
- Operation & Maintenance Tech. & Clerical
- Pupil Transportation
- Division Superintendent
- School Board Members
- School Nurses

After Mr. Dickey's presentation, Board members had the following questions:

Dr. Wright: Administrative positions are also recognized by staffing standards. How does the formula account for duplication?

Mr. Dickey: The formula removes the duplication.

Dr. Wright: Suggested that this may be a section of the SOQ that the Board may want to clarify.

Dr. Ward: Are clerical staff in the central office considered support and staff working directly with teachers and students considered nonsupport or instructional staff?

Mr. Dickey: Both positions are recognized as school-based positions that are driven by Standard 2 of the SOQ statute.

Dr. McLaughlin: Are all positions at the local level required to be associated with the support positions identified in the SOQ or are there additional ways that local school divisions can define employees?

Mr. Dickey: There is no requirement and there are other categories that school divisions hire under that are not recognized in the SOQ. Not all, but a majority of the support FTE positions are identified in one of the categories listed in the SOQ.

Dr. McLaughlin: How consistent are the position descriptions or role definitions that go with the categories across local school divisions?

Mr. Dickey: Department staff members have tried to keep consistent descriptions over the years and ask local finance directors and school staff to provide input and technical assistance and feedback on how they are labeled and defined.

Dr. McLaughlin: Do individual positions have to count for full FTE in one category or can they be split?

Mr. Dickey: They can be partial FTE's. It is not a position-by-position actual reimbursement of what school divisions hire but a per pupil level of staffing essentially for each category. There are specific line item job titles where divisions must report their population of support FTEs.

Mrs. Saslaw: What is the percentage or number of school systems that do not staff beyond the minimum requirements?

Mr. Dickey: This is a mandate that the department tracks and staff members work with school divisions that are not in full compliance with staffing. There are school divisions that are close to the minimum expense.

Mrs. Saslaw thanked Mrs. Wescott and Mr. Kent for their presentations. Mrs. Saslaw also thanked Dr. Deborah Jonas, executive director for research and strategic planning of the superintendent's office, and Mrs. Michelle Parker, senior policy analyst of the office of policy and communications. Mrs. Saslaw adjourned the meeting of the Board of Education Standards of Quality Committee.

PLANNING SESSION

Overview of the Comprehensive Plan

Mrs. Wescott presented a quick overview of the current comprehensive plan. Her report included the following:

Statutory Authority

22.1-253.13:7, *Code of Virginia*:
   The Board of Education shall adopt a statewide comprehensive, unified, long-range plan based on data collection, analysis, and evaluation. Such plan shall be developed with statewide participation. The Board shall review the plan biennially and adopt any necessary revisions. This plan shall include the objectives of public education in Virginia, including strategies for first improving student achievement, particularly the achievement of educationally at-risk students, then maintaining high levels of student achievement; an assessment of the extent to which these objectives are being achieved; a forecast of enrollment changes; and an assessment of the needs of public education in the Commonwealth ... .

Objectives of the Board of Education: Comprehensive Plan: 2007-2012

- OBJECTIVE 1: The Board of Education will continue to enhance the quality standards for all public schools in Virginia.

- OBJECTIVE 2: The Board of Education will provide leadership to help schools and school divisions eliminate the achievement gap between groups of students and increase the academic success of all students.

- OBJECTIVE 3: The Board of Education will support accountability for all schools, focusing on assisting chronically low-performing schools and school divisions while recognizing all schools and school divisions as they move towards excellence.
- OBJECTIVE 4: The Board of Education will work cooperatively with partners to help ensure that all young people are ready to enter kindergarten with the skills they need for success.
- OBJECTIVE 5: The Board of Education will establish policies that support the attainment of literacy skills of all students, kindergarten through grade 12.
- OBJECTIVE 6: The Board of Education will establish policies and standards that enhance the preparation, recruitment, and retention of educational personnel, including their meaningful, ongoing professional development.
- OBJECTIVE 7: The Board of Education will provide leadership in implementing the provisions of state and federal laws and regulations.
- OBJECTIVE 8: The Board of Education will provide leadership to help schools and school divisions ensure a safe and secure environment conducive to facilitating the teaching and learning process.

Highlights of Progress and Activities for Meeting Board of Education Objectives

Dr. Deborah Jonas presented this item. Dr. Jonas' report included the following:

Objective 1: Enhancing quality standards
- Student SAT scores were matched with SOL outcomes for Virginia's students
  – Matched students include 58 and 56 percent of *all* students in the 2005 and 2006 graduating classes;
  – Matching included more than 90 percent of students who participated in SAT testing.
- Analyzed how SOL proficiency levels relate to "College Ready Benchmarks" established by the College Board (Kobrin, 2007).
- College Board "College Ready" Benchmarks on SAT are based on the probability that a student will succeed in the first year of college.
  – High benchmark: $\geq$ 65% chance of earning 2.7 GPA or higher
  – Low benchmark: $\geq$ 65% chance of earning 2.0 GPA or higher

Percent of Students Scoring at or Above SAT Benchmarks and Each SOL Proficiency Level			
At or above Low SAT Benchmark*		*At or above High SAT Benchmark**	
SOL	Proficient (SOL)	Advanced Proficiency (SOL)	Proficient (SOL)	Advanced Proficiency (SOL)
Algebra I	90 %	100 %	10 %	49 %
Algebra II	94 %	99 %	10 %	44 %
Geometry	92 %	100 %	8 %	49 %
Reading	89 %	99 %	7 %	43 %
Writing	87 %	100 %	6 %	40 %

*Content specific benchmarks were used (e.g., Algebra I SOL scores compared with SAT mathematics scores).

Objective 2: Increase academic success for all students
High school graduation and dropout
- 82% Diploma Graduates
- 3.9% GED Earners
- 0.4% Certificate of Completion Earner
- 2.6% Still Enrolled
- 8.7% Dropouts
- 0.4% Long Term Absences
- 2.0% Unconfirmed Status

Challenges remain for many Virginia students, as shown below:

Subgroup	% Graduated On-Time	% Completed school on time	% Still Enrolled	% Dropout	% Long-term leave	% Unconfirmed status
All Students	82.1%	86.3%	2.6%	8.7%	0.4%	2.0%
Female	85.0%	88.4%	2.1%	7.4%	0.4%	1.7%
Male	79.2%	84.3%	3.1%	9.9%	0.4%	2.2%
Black	73.9%	78.0%	4.8%	12.6%	0.7%	3.9%
Hispanic	71.5%	75.2%	2.9%	19.9%	0.3%	1.6%
White	85.9%	90.4%	1.7%	6.3%	0.3%	1.3%
Asian	93.4%	94.5%	1.3%	3.6%	0.1%	0.5%
American Indian	75.7%	79.3%	5.0%	13.9%	0.0%	1.8%
Native Hawaiian	85.2%	89.8%	3.4%	4.6%	0.0%	2.3%
Other	90.5%	92.4%	1.8%	4.7%	0.1%	0.9%
Students with Disabilities	81.8%	86.4%	n/a	13.5%	0.0%	0.2%
Identified as Disadvantaged	70.6%	77.5%	4.7%	13.5%	0.7%	3.6%
Limited English Proficient	69.2%	72.0%	n/a	27.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Identified as Migrant	75.4%	80.7%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	3.5%
Homeless	60.2%	65.1%	10.6%	18.7%	2.0%	3.6%

Postsecondary enrollment

	Year Graduated/Completed High School		
Postsecondary enrollment	2006	2007	2008
Enrolled within one year	Percent enrolled		
4-year institution	38%	38%	37%
2-year institution	22%	24%	25%
Less than 2 year institution	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%

Objective 3: Support accountability for all schools

School Accountability

	2003-2004	2008-2009
Fully accredited Schools	78%	95%
Made AYP: Schools	55%	74%
Made AYP: Divisions	14%	41%

Virginia has fewer chronically low-performing schools, defined as schools that were accredited with warning for three consecutive years

School accreditation year	Number identified	Percent identified
2008-2009	33	2%
2007-2008	42	2%
2006-2007	58	3%

NEW VDOE TOOLS TO SUPPORT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
- 9th grade early identification tool
    - Data tool
    - Tool kit explaining and demonstrating through video clips the use of the tool
    - Can be used as part of the Academic Review process for high schools
- Watch list report (K-12 resource)
    - Will be available through Virginia's Education Information Management System (EIMS)
    - Provides school and student level "flags" for:
        - Attendance
        - SOL performance
        - Students two or more years overage for grade
        - Students who were retained.
- Postsecondary enrollment data that can help schools understand who is and who is not moving on to postsecondary education

VIP PROGRAM
- VIP achievement measure is calculated using weighted student scores on Standards of Learning assessments.
- Scores are weighted according to the achievement levels of basic, proficient, and advanced with the advanced level having the highest weight.
- The VIP score is determined by adding up to five additional points to the achievement measure.

ADDITIONAL MEASURES
- Increase the percentage of third graders reading on grade level (95% state goal);
- Increase the percentage of students enrolled in Algebra I by grade 8 (45% state goal);
- Increase the percentage of high school students taking Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual enrollment courses (25% state goal);
- Increase the number of career and technical industry certifications, state licenses, or successful national occupational assessment (15,000 state goal);
- Increase the percentage of high school graduates earning an Advanced Studies Diploma (57% state goal);
- Increase the percentage of students who receive a high school diploma recognized by the Board of Education (80% state target);

- Increase the percentage of schools that are fully accredited and making Adequate Yearly Progress (divisions only; 100% state goal);
- Increase the percent of at-risk four-year-olds who are being served by the Virginia Preschool Initiative (divisions only; 100% state goal);
- Increase the percentage of students in each student subgroup achieving at higher levels of proficiency on state assessments;
- Increase the percentage of students maintaining literacy proficiency throughout their adolescent years (95% state goal);
- Increase the percentage of schools offering foreign language instruction in the elementary grades; and
- Increase participation in the Governor's Nutrition and Physical Activity Scorecard Awards Program.

VIP AWARDS

	Schools	Divisions	Schools	Divisions
	2008-2009		2007-2008	
Governor's Awards for Educational Excellence	162	0	89	0
BOE Excellence Awards	544	24	475	19
BOE Competence to Excellence Awards	276	10	322	25
BOE Rising Star Awards	2	0	N/A	N/A

CONSIDERATIONS FOR UPDATES
- One goal of the VIP program is that:
  "high school students earn a high school diploma, especially advanced studies diplomas, within four years."
- When VIP was established only estimates of on-time graduation rates were available.
- With the availability of new data (e.g., cohort graduation and dropout rates) the Board may want to consider adopting revised eligibility criteria for the VIP program.
- Incorporating the new data provides further incentives for schools and divisions to strive for increasing graduation rates and reducing dropout rates.

SOME IDEAS FOR REVISED ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA
- Incorporate into award eligibility:
  – On-Time Graduation Rate
  – Dropout rate
  – Provisions for improvement in terms of graduation and dropout rates
- Differentiate criteria between award levels

Objective 4: Kindergarten readiness
Pre-literacy screening
- Each year, more children are arriving at kindergarten with skills needed to learn to read.
- Children who participate in VPI and other public preK programs are less likely to be identified as needing extra support to become successful readers.

Research and data-related initiatives to improve school readiness
- Developing a "Ready Schools" self assessment tool for schools;

- Participating in a VDSS-led data project focused on improving the collection, analysis, and interpretation of early care and education data;
- Collaborating with Smart Beginnings strategic initiatives to track early education outcomes; and
- Exploring the development of a brief comprehensive school readiness inventory.

Progress Report on the Office of Early Childhood Development

Mrs. Kathy Glazer, director, office of early childhood development, presented this item. Mrs. Glazer's report included the following:

Virginia's Office of Early Childhood Development
- Launched July 1, 2008
- Will maximize opportunities for Virginia's children to reach kindergarten healthy and prepared for school success
- Spans the Departments of Education and Social Services and will link to the Department of Health
- Serves as a unique cross-agency governance model that reflects the multi-faceted continuum of children's growth and development
- Incorporates existing staff, functions, programs, and funding streams from:
    - The preschool unit at the DOE (3 staff members) and
    - The child care subsidy program, quality initiatives, and Head Start State Collaboration Office at the DSS (25 staff members).
- Focuses on access, quality, and accountability

    Objectives of the new office:
- Interagency coordination and program alignment
- Development of a coordinated professional development system for the early childhood work force
- Establishment of an integrated data system to better inform policy, programming, and budget decisions

Virginia's Early Childhood Initiatives

SMART BEGINNINGS (partnership between Governor's Working Group on Early Childhood Initiatives and the Virginia Early Childhood Foundation*)
- Virginia's Plan for Smart Beginnings
- Virginia's Star Quality Initiative (QRIS)
*The Virginia Early Childhood Foundation is a 501 (c) (3) created in December 2005 which provides grants for early childhood systems-building to local communities using a blend of public and private funds.

GOVERNOR'S WORKING GROUP ON EARLY CHILDHOOD INITIATIVES
- School Readiness Task Force
- Professional Development Initiative
- Home Visiting Consortium
The Governor's Working Group was created in August 2006 and is a multi-agency council with the purpose of coordinating early childhood programs and services across agencies and sectors at the policy level.

Virginia's Plan for Smart Beginnings
- Comprehensive Strategic Plan
- Purpose: All children arrive at school healthy and ready to learn
- Five Goal Areas
    - Infrastructure
    - Parent Education
    - Early Care and Education
    - Health
    - Public Engagement

- Co-led by OECD and Virginia Early Childhood Foundation
- Data Accountability

Virginia's Star Quality Initiative
Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)
- Voluntary, market-driven strategy for both private centers and public preschool classrooms
- A method to assess, improve and communicate the level of quality in early care and education settings/programs: child care, Head Start, and the Virginia Preschool Initiative
- Administered as a partnership between the Virginia Early Childhood Foundation and the Office of Early Childhood Development
- Rating based on observation and documentation review displayed on a 5-star scale
- A mentor/coach helps programs develop a quality improvement plan based on the rater's observations and provides technical assistance

School Readiness Task Force
Building from Virginia's Definition of School Readiness: (Adopted by Board of Education, April 2008)
- Publication of *Virginia School Readiness Report*
- Development and pilot of a self-assessment tool for "ready schools"
- Exploration of a comprehensive child inventory

Professional Development Initiative
- 18-month initiative
- Develop recommendations for coordinated system to ensure a continuum of high quality pre-service, in-service, and development opportunities for early childhood professionals
- Served by subcommittees for Access, Quality, Accountability, and Infrastructure

DSS Child Care Subsidy Program Transformation
- Serves 55,000 children and 31,000 families at approximately $124 million this year
- Provides child care assistance to low-income families so they can work or receive training on their path to self sufficiency
- Strengthens school readiness services to the most at-risk children by focusing on quality of care
- Integrates quality rating and improvement system

Technological Innovations in Virginia's Assessment Program

This item was presented by Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement.

Web-based Administrative System for the Virginia Assessment Program
- Pearson Access
    - Single Web-based portal for all state assessment activities
- Used for
    - Identifying which students will test using paper/pencil and which will test online
    - Ordering additional paper/pencil test materials
    - Managing student demographic data
    - Scheduling and monitoring online test sessions
    - Entering scores for the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program and the Virginia Grade Level Alternative
    - Tracking shipments of materials

Student Data
- All students are assigned a unique State Testing Identifier (STI) when enrolled in a Virginia school
- All student records with STI are maintained in PearsonAccess
- A required matching process with STI and other student information ensures all test records are associated with the correct student record

Test Setup
- Fall, Spring, or Summer
- Writing, Non-Writing, or VGLA, VAAP, and VSEP
- Three years of test administration data are maintained and available at all times.

Participation Counts
Divisions indicate the quantity and types of tests to be administered at each school.

Tracking Test Materials
Orders *from* Pearson and Shipments *to* Pearson

Test Management
- Includes management of SOL tests (paper/pencil & online), VGLA, VAAP, and VSEP
- Identify specific students to be tested
- Can be done manually or electronically by file upload
- Indicate specific tests to be completed
- Identify the format (paper or online)
- Can be done manually or electronically
- All data managed electronically in PearsonAccess
- Fields no longer visible to students
- Improved data management and accuracy
- Previously data was coded on each answer document
- All coding had to be completed prior to shipping answer documents for scoring

Test Scores
- Used for entry of VGLA and VAAP scores by divisions
- Can be done manually or electronically by file upload
- Example of score entry for VGLA Grade 8 Mathematics

Test Results
- Score reports for all assessments (SOL, VGLA, VAAP, VSEP)

On Demand Reports
- Available for online SOL tests only
- Sample individual student performance report

Published Reports
- Reports and data files available for all assessments
- Divisions can view, print, and/or save reports and data files
- Sample student performance report
- Divisions may request that printed copies of reports be prepared and delivered

Additional Uses of PearsonAccess
   • Accessing student, school, and division score reports and data files
   • Verifying accuracy of student demographic data and making record changes as needed
   • Certifying that student data is correct and authorizing the preparation of official summaries
   • Ordering printed score reports

Virginia's Modified Achievement Standard Test (VMAST)

Virginia's Alternate and Alternative Assessments
   • Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA)
        • Grades 3 – 8
        • On grade level test for students with disabilities who are unable to demonstrate mastery
          via a multiple-choice assessment

- Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program (VSEP)
    - End-of-Course
    - On grade level test for students with disabilities who are unable to demonstrate mastery via a multiple-choice assessment
- Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)
    - Grades 3 - 8 and 11
    - For students with significant cognitive impairments who are instructed in the aligned Standards of Learning
- Virginia Modified Achievement Standards Test (VMAST)
    - USED participation requirements:
        - Student's disability must preclude the student from achieving grade level proficiency;
        - Even with appropriate instruction, the student would not achieve grade level proficiency in the year covered by the IEP;
        - Student's IEP must include goals based on grade level academic content.
    - USED assessment requirements:
        - Must measure grade level content standards;
        - May be less rigorous;
        - Must not be a reduction in cut score on an existing test.

VMAST Development Overview
- April 2007 – USDOE sanctioned the development of modified achievement standards and assessments for a small group of students with disabilities.
- July 2007 – USDOE established a funding competition to support States developing alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and/or developing guidance for IEP teams.
- September 2007 – Virginia's grant was approved for funding.

Goals of Virginia's Grant
- To develop participation criteria to identify students appropriate for the VMAST
- To develop Performance Level Descriptors to describe student performance
- To add supports and scaffolds to existing grade 8 math and reading online assessment items
- To administer the VMAST to eligible participants

Progress to Date
Requested stakeholder input by:
- Establishing a Steering Committee
- Conducting focus groups (5) of teachers and instructional leaders
- Conducting an online survey of grade 8 reading and mathematics teachers
Utilized stakeholder input to:
- Develop draft participation criteria
- Develop draft performance level descriptors
- Identify potential supports and scaffolds for mathematics and reading assessments
Conducted a small pilot test in grade 8 reading and mathematics

Draft VMAST Participation Criteria
Required Components:
1. The student has a current IEP with grade-level content goals.
2. The student is not eligible for VAAP.
3. For the content area being considered, VGLA is not an appropriate assessment.
4. Eligibility must be determined for each content area separately.
5. Student's disability precludes him or her from achieving and progressing commensurate with grade-level expectations.
6. Student's achievement and progress is evaluated and documented using multiple objective sources of evidence.
7. Student's daily instructional and assessment modifications are clearly documented.

Potential Supports and Scaffolds
- Provide reminders, hints, mnemonic devices, graphic organizers
- Provide additional instructions, altered graphics, mathematics formulas
- Divide test items into discrete steps
- Present reading items near relevant sections of short reading passages
- Reduce answer options from 4 to 3
- Highlight or color code important information

Next Steps
- Finalize Participation Criteria
- Finalize Performance Level Descriptors
- Convene teacher committees to review and refine supports and scaffolds
- Conduct a field test in grade 8 reading and mathematics in spring 2010

Technology Innovations in Virginia's On-Time Graduation Tool: The Pilot

This item was presented by Dr. Kathleen Smith, director, office of school improvement. Dr. Smith's report included the following:

Purpose of Graduation Pilot
- Work with a small number of school divisions to assess the value of a tool that enables schools to identify and monitor students who are at-risk of dropping out.
- Develop protocols for academic review as they relate to schools' failure to be fully accredited based on graduation rates.
- Identify and document best practices to increase graduation rates.

Research - "Why?"
Early warning systems use routinely available data housed at the school that are good predictors of whether a student is likely to drop out of high school.

- Divisions and schools can use this information to target interventions that support off-track students while they are still in school, before they drop out.

- Divisions and schools can use the information to look for patterns and identify school climate issues that may contribute to disproportionate dropout rates at a subset of high schools or within subpopulations of students.

Graduation Pilot Decision 1: What are the Indicators for Incoming 9th Graders?
- SOL grade 8 reading scaled score
- Proficiency level (state-approved alternative/alternate reading assessments only)
- Failed state reading assessment for the last two years of data
- English Language Arts - Final Grade 2007-2008
- F or D in reading for the last two years
- SOL grade 8 mathematics scaled score
- Proficiency level (state-approved alternative/alternate mathematics assessments only)
- Failed state mathematics assessment for the last two years of data
- Mathematics - Final Grade 2007-2008
- F or D in mathematics for the last two years
- Overage (as of 9/1/08)
- Ninth-grade repeater
- Number of days absent 2007-2008
- Number of in- and out-of-school suspensions 2007-2008

Graduation Pilot: Off-Track Benchmarks
Students were identified as "Off-Track" for graduation based on two types of criteria:

Benchmarks consistent with research focusing on pre-9th- grade indicators (Neild & Balfanz, 2006).
- Grade 8 attendance < 80%; OR
- Failed mathematics class in 8th grade; OR
- Failed English class in 8th grade; OR
- Were 16 or older.

Graduation Pilot
The data tool identifies students that need an intervention. There must be a process in place that helps schools and divisions analyze the data to determine effective K-12 intervention strategies.

In addition, the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) recognized that there needed to be a process in place to validate the data set collected by the pilots before a "scale-up" could take place. This would require some changes in the tool.

The Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center at Edvantia, Inc. (ARCC) and the National High School Center (NHSC) are developing a process and guidance document for making data-driven decisions using the graduation pilot tool.

Questions regarding data were developed by the VDOE, ARCC and NHSC to guide changes to the tool, the validation process, and the development of the guidance document.

Guiding Questions
As a part of this project, pilot divisions shared their responses to the following questions with each other and with the partners:
- What did you find most useful about the data tool?
- Describe the process you used to analyze the data.
- What did you do first, second, third?
- Who did you initially bring to the table to discuss the data?
- Who was missing and did you invite them later or have plans to invite them later?
- As you discussed the data, did you find anything missing?
- Do you think that the tool identified the right students?
- Did you agree with the tool?
- What did you find once you began looking at the data?
  For example: What trends did you find?
- What conclusions did you come to? Any big "ah-hahs"?
- What elements of the data analysis process or the tool have helped you discuss possible strategies to improve?
- What are your next steps?
- How will the identification of these students 1) change your thinking? 2) change your practices?
- What challenges do you face?
- If you could change anything about the data collected, what would it be?

Next Steps
- Continue to revise the tool and validate the data. The tool will be available on the Single Sign-on for Web Systems (SSWS) to all school divisions.
- Continue to work with our partners to develop the resource guidance document that will accompany the tool.
- Present conference with planning time—"From Vision to Practice Fifth Annual Institute: Seven Million Minutes from Pre-Kindergarten to Graduation," July 14-17, 2009. This conference will focus on research-based K-12 strategies to increase the graduation rate.
- Develop a school improvement planning tool and division improvement planning tool with the Center for Innovation and Improvement that focuses on indicators for increasing the graduation rate.

- Develop a video using the partner divisions that will describe how to use the tool, how to analyze the data, and identify interventions that increase the graduation rate.

Adjournment of the Planning Session

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Emblidge adjourned the meeting. Dr. Emblidge announced that the business session will begin the next day at 9 a.m.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

April 30, 2009

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

Dr. Mark E. Emblidge, President   Mr. K. Rob Krupicka
Dr. Ella P. Ward, Vice President   Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin
Dr. Thomas M. Brewster   Mr. Kelvin L. Moore
Mrs. Isis M. Castro   Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw
Mr. David L. Johnson

                                         Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent
                                         of Public Instruction

Dr. Emblidge called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Emblidge asked Dr. McLaughlin to lead in a moment of silence and Pledge of Allegiance.

RECOGNITION

A Resolution of Appreciation was presented to Ms. Sarah Warnick, 2009 Southern Regional Education Board Online Teacher of the Year for Virginia. Mrs. Warnick is in her second year of virtual instruction and teaches AP Spanish language, Spanish IV, and survey of world languages and cultures.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:
    James Batterson
    Bruce Davidson
    Al Butler
    Marcus Newsome
    Milton Liverman
    Scott Kizner
    Jim Council

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Castro made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 26, 2009, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

The Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the literary fund as of December 31, 2008.

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans

The Board's approval of four applications totaling $9,500,000 was approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

SCHOOL DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Nottoway County	Blackstone Primary	$666,667.00
Nottoway County	Crewe Primary	666,667.00
Nottoway County	Burkeville Elementary	666,666.00
Virginia Beach City	Great Neck Middle	6,500,000.00
	TOTAL	$9,500,000.00

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

The following elements were approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda:

1. Six new projects, totaling $24,500,000, are eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List.

SCHOOL DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Giles County	Giles County Technology Center	$7,500,000.00
Giles County	Eastern Elementary/Middle	7,500,000.00
Nottoway County	Blackstone Primary	666,667.00
Nottoway County	Crewe Primary	666,667.00
Nottoway County	Burkeville Elementary	666,666.00
Fluvanna County	Fluvanna County High	7,500,000.00
	TOTAL	$24,500,000.00

2. One new project, totaling $7,500,000, has a Literary Fund application, which is approved as to form, but the plans have not yet been finalized. When the Department receives the plans, this project will be eligible for placement on a waiting list. Until such time, this project should remain on the Approved Application List.

SCHOOL DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Virginia Beach City	Great Neck Middle	$7,500,000.00

Action/Discussion Items

First Review of the Proposed Consolidated Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions (8 VAC 20-720-10 et seq.)

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. These regulations have not been amended since that time and are out-of-date. Additionally, several other regulations have been promulgated that address regulatory requirements for local school boards and school divisions. Some of these regulations were adopted on or about September 1, 1980 as well. They all lend themselves to consolidation with the *Regulations Governing School Boards Local*.

Mrs. Wescott said that the Proposed Regulation Agency Background Document summarizes the major elements of this project. This proposal is to amend and reenact the *Regulations Governing School Boards Local* (8 VAC 20-490-10 et seq.) into the *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions* (8 VAC 20-720-10 et seq.) by consolidating several applicable regulations into one concise regulation and in doing so, updating them. The regulations to be consolidated into this one regulation are as follows:

8 VAC 20-150-10 et seq.	Regulations Governing Management of the Student's Scholastic Record in the Public Schools of Virginia
8 VAC 20-180-10	Regulations Governing School Community Programs
8 VAC 20-210-10	Classification of Expenditures
8 VAC 20-240-10 et seq.	Regulations Governing School Activity Funds
8 VAC 20-250-10	Regulations Governing Testing Sight and Hearing of Pupils
8 VAC 20-310-10	Rules Governing Instruction Concerning Drugs and Substance Abuse
8 VAC 20-320-10	Regulations Governing Physical and Health Education
8 VAC 20-390-10 et seq.	Rules Governing Division Superintendent of Schools
8 VAC 20-410-10	Rules Governing Allowable Credit for Teaching Experience
8 VAC 20-420-10	Regulations Governing Personnel in Public School Libraries Operated Under Joint Contract Under Control of Local School Board or Boards
8 VAC 20-460-10 et seq.	Regulations Governing Sick Leave Plan for Teachers
8 VAC 20-490-10 et seq.	Regulations Governing School Boards Local

8 VAC 20-565-10 et seq.   Regulations for the Protection of Students as Participants in
                               Human Research

When these regulations have been consolidated into the *Regulations Governing
Local School Boards and School Divisions*, the current individual regulations will be
repealed simultaneously with the promulgation of the new regulation.

Dr. Brewster made a motion to waive first review and authorize the Department
staff to proceed with the requirements of the Administrative Process Act. The motion
was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Regulations Governing Jointly Owned and Operated Schools and Jointly Operated Programs (8VAC 20-280-10 et. seq.)

Mrs. Wescott presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the *Regulations
Governing Jointly Owned and Operated Schools and Jointly Operated Programs*,
8VAC 20-280-10 et seq., were adopted on or before September 1, 1980. These
regulations have not been amended since that time and do not address changes that have
been made in the operation of joint schools since the regulations were initially written.

Joint schools include schools and programs established by two or more local
school boards, including regional public charter schools, as defined in §22.1-212.5 of the
Code of Virginia; comprehensive schools offering all day academic programs and career
and technical education; regional residential charter schools for at-risk pupils; joint or
regional schools, including regional public charter schools, that serve as high schools
offering (i) a comprehensive high school curriculum and specialized training to students
desiring to pursue careers in law enforcement, fire fighting, emergency and rescue
services, and other occupations addressing public safety and welfare; or (ii) a specialized
curriculum leading to a high school diploma and a postsecondary credential, such as an
industry certification, career certificate, or degree; or (iii) both; or Governor's Schools
that meet the provisions of §22.1-26.

Requirements from legislation passed in 2003, 2004, 2007, and 2008 have been
incorporated in the proposed regulations.

- SB 1099 was patroned by Senator Edwards and approved during the 2003
  General Assembly Session. It allows two or more school boards, with the
  consent of the Board of Education, to establish joint or regional schools,
  including regional public charter schools, to serve as high schools offering a
  comprehensive high school curriculum and specialized training to students
  desiring to pursue careers in law enforcement, fire fighting, emergency and
  rescue services, and other occupations addressing public safety and welfare.

- SB 553 was patroned by Senator Lucas during the 2004 General Assembly
  Session. It allows two or more school boards, with the consent of the State
  Board, to establish joint or regional schools, including regional public charter
  schools, to serve as high schools offering a specialized curriculum leading to a

high school diploma and a postsecondary credential, such as industry certification, career certificate, or degree; or (iii) both.

- During the 2007 General Assembly Session, HB 2371, sponsored by Delegate Tata, was passed. This bill permits all joint school boards, by agreement and with the approval of their governing bodies, to designate a fiscal agent for a joint school from among the treasurers of the participating localities. In addition, this bill allows title to property acquired for a joint school to be vested in the school's governing body, with the approval of the participating school boards and the governing bodies. HB 2371 resulted from a legislative proposal proposed by the Department of Education to streamline the operation of joint schools.

- HB 771 was approved during the 2008 General Assembly Session and it permits any joint school already in operation to request a waiver from any new regulation requirements promulgated, effective July 1, 2008.

As a result of this legislation and because of the need for periodic review of these regulations, revisions are being proposed. Because the changes will be extensive, the current regulations, 8VAC 20-280-10 et seq., will be repealed and the new regulations will be promulgated bearing the number 8 VAC 20-281-10 et seq.

The first review of the proposed regulations included three major changes:

- Addition of a definitions section to the regulations for clarity. (8 VAC 20-281-10)
- New language that is needed to address the changes in the operation of joint schools and programs since the initial regulations were written.
- New language for requirements in legislation approved during the 2003, 2004, and 2007 General Assembly Sessions.

In addition to the above changes, the final review of the proposed regulations includes four additional changes:

- New language for requirements in legislation approved during the 2008 General Assembly Session related to waivers.
- Deletion of the term "finance officer" and use of the term "fiscal agent" for clarity. The term "fiscal agent" is used in § 22.1-117 of the *Code of Virginia*, which defines fiscal agent and addresses the selection of the fiscal agent when a school division is comprised of more than one city or county.
- Deletion of the terms "alternative education program" and "classification of expenditures" from the definition section because these terms are not referenced anywhere else in the regulations.
- Deletion of the requirement that a finance officer be elected for a joint board because the term finance officer has been deleted from the regulations and because a joint board's fiscal operations can be addressed in bylaws.

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to waive first review and authorize the Department staff to proceed with the remaining requirements of the Administrative Process Act. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Proposed Plan for the 2009 Review of the Standards of Quality

Mrs. Wescott presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that 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. It completed its work on its first set of recommendations in June 2003, for consideration by the 2004 General Assembly.

The Board's policy changes adopted by the 2004 General Assembly:
- Established the academic review process, and sets the requirements for corrective action plans for any schools that have been rated Accredited with Warning;
- Strengthened provisions related to test security and unauthorized alteration of test materials and results;
- Clarified the expectation for performance standards and high quality professional development for teachers;
- Required professional development in interpreting test data for instructional purposes; and
- Required school boards to provide information about policies addressing parental concerns.

The Board's staffing changes adopted by the 2004 General Assembly:
- Required elementary resource teachers in art, music, and physical education;
- Established one planning period per day or the equivalent for all middle and high school teachers;
- Required positions for technology support and to integrate technology into classroom instruction; and
- Revised the funding formula for SOQ prevention, intervention, and remediation.

The Board's staffing changes that were not adopted by the 2004 General Assembly would have required:

- A full-time principal for each elementary school;
- A full-time assistant principal for every 400 students in the school;
- A reduction in the caseload of speech-language pathologists; and
- One reading specialist for every 1,000 students in the school division.

The Board's policy changes adopted by the 2005 General Assembly:

- Required the curriculum adopted by the local school board to be aligned to the Standards of Learning;
- Required full accreditation of all schools within a school division;
- Required local school boards to collect and analyze data, and use the results to evaluate and make decisions about the instructional program;
- Specified the requirements for teacher evaluations, including regular observation of the teacher in the classroom, determination that the instruction is aligned with the curriculum, and identification of appropriate professional development;
- Required all instructional personnel to participate each year in high quality professional development programs;
- Required each local school board to review its professional development program annually for quality, effectiveness, participation by instructional personnel, and relevancy;
- Required each local school board's comprehensive, long-range plan shall be based on data collection, analysis, and evaluation;
- Provided that the plan include, or be consistent with, all other division plans required by state and federal laws and regulations;
- Required the plan to include strategies for improving student achievement; and
- Required provisions for parent and family involvement to build successful school and parent partnerships.

The Board's policy changes adopted by the 2007 General Assembly:

- Required the program of instruction offered by local school divisions to include the knowledge and skills needed for gainful employment;
- Specified that programs of prevention, intervention, and remediation include components that are research-based;
- Required the early identification, diagnosis, and assistance for students with problems with mathematics, and the provision of instructional strategies and practices to benefit the development of mathematics skills for all students;
- Required the School Performance Report Card to include Standards of Learning test results disaggregated by student subgroups;
- Specified that provisions be made to facilitate the transfer and appropriate grade placement of students from other public schools, nonpublic schools, and home instruction;

- Required that parents of secondary students be notified of the number of standard and verified credits needed for graduation, as well as the subject area requirements;
- Required local school boards to provide teachers and principals with professional development in effective classroom management;
- Clarified that the strategies for improving student achievement focus attention on the achievement of educationally at-risk students;
- Specified that the Student Conduct Policy be made available to the public; and
- Required that school divisions' policies be posted on their Web sites.

The Board's staffing changes that were not adopted by the 2007 General Assembly would have required:
- One mathematics specialist for every 1,000 students in K-8;
- A data manager-test coordinator for every 1,000 students in K-12; and
- Instructional positions for students who are blind or vision impaired.

The Board's recommendations for intermediate implementation options were adopted by the 2009 General Assembly:
- For the recommendation to require one data coordinator for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12 to support data management and the utilization and administration of state assessments, provide flexibility to school divisions to use the instructional technology resource teacher funding currently in the Standards of Quality to hire a data coordinator position, an instructional technology resource teacher position or a data coordinator/instructional resource teacher blended position.
- For the recommendation to require one reading specialist for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12, provide flexibility to school divisions to use Early Intervention Reading Initiative (EIRI) funding to hire reading specialists to provide the required intervention.
- For the recommendation to require one mathematics teacher specialist for each 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through eight, provide flexibility to school divisions to use Algebra Readiness Intervention (ARI) initiative funding to hire mathematics teacher specialists to provide the required intervention.
- To supplement the instructional services provided by the current Standards of Quality staffing standard of 17 teachers per 1,000 students who are English Language Learners (ELL), allow school divisions the flexibility to use funds from the Standards of Quality Prevention, Intervention, and Remediation account to hire additional teachers to provide instruction to identified ELL students.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and approve the plan to review the Standards of Quality. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

The proposed plan to review the Standards of Quality would include the following actions:

April 29 and 30, 2009
Standards of Quality Committee meeting and Board of Education meeting:
- Review background information and the charge from the General Assembly.
- Approve the work plan.
- Set two public comment periods.

The first public comment period could be set for May 1 through July 31, 2009, during which time there would be three public hearings at the three SOQ committee meetings. The second public comment period could be set for September 14, 2009 through October 2, 2009, during which time there could be four public hearings.

Department of Education staff will contract for a consultant to conduct research and collect data from all Virginia school divisions during the summer.

May 27, 2009
Standards of Quality Committee meeting:
- Invite specified stakeholders to give their recommendations.
- Invite the public to give their recommendations.
- Department of Education staff or the consultant will report on the research and data collection efforts.

June 24, 2009
Standards of Quality Committee meeting:
- Invite specified stakeholders to give their recommendations.
- Invite the public to give their recommendations.
- Department of Education staff or the consultant will report on the research and data collection efforts.

July 22, 2009
Standards of Quality Committee meeting:
- Invite the public to give their recommendations.
- Department of Education staff or the consultant will report on the research and data collection efforts.

September 17, 2009
Board of Education meeting:
- Review proposed recommendations, including statutory language and the fiscal impact.
- Set the public hearing dates and locations.

The second public comment period could be set for September 14, 2009 through October 2, 2009, during which time there could be four public hearings.

October 22, 2009
Board of Education meeting:
- Approve the recommendations.
- Submit the proposal to the Governor and the General Assembly.

First Review of Approval of Local Division Remedial Plans

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director of the office of school improvement, presented this item. Dr. Smith said that the department has provided divisions with a template for planning for remediation programs that indicate research-based strategies. These strategies include clear standards for quality that put priority on student mastery of reading and mathematics skills, program length, and scheduling of classes; pre- and post-tests used to determine student gains; and low adult/child ratio.

Type of Program to be Offered in Summer 2009	Percentage of 129 Localities* K-8	Percentage of 129 Localities* Secondary
Remedial elementary summer school*	96%	78%
Intersession program for year-round school	4%	1%
Frederick County, King and Queen County, and Loudoun County will not offer a remedial summer program in 2009.		

Dr. Brewster made a motion to waive first review and approve the report on school division remedial plan. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Report from the Petersburg City School Board on the Virginia Board of Education's Request to Begin Planning for the Implementation of the Restructuring Contingency Plan for the 2009-2010 School Year

Dr. Smith presented this item. Dr. Smith said that in 2004, recognizing the need for technical assistance, the Petersburg City School Board requested a division-level review and assistance from the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE). Petersburg City Public Schools and the VBOE signed an initial memorandum of understanding (MOU) detailing the review process on April 21, 2004. Petersburg City Public Schools has been in division-level review status since 2004 and has reported to the VBOE regularly on the status of implementing the corrective action plan and the terms of the initial MOU. The VDOE has provided ongoing technical assistance and monitored the implementation of the division's corrective action plan.

Based on 2005-2006 assessment results and the resulting accreditation and federal adequate yearly progress (AYP) ratings of the division and its schools, Petersburg City Public Schools entered into a second MOU on November 20, 2006. This MOU with the VBOE required Petersburg Public Schools to continue in division-level academic review status and participate in an academic review process prescribed by the VBOE.

Additionally, Section 8 VAC 20-131-300 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA), adopted by the Board in September 2006, requires school divisions with Accreditation Denied schools to enter into a MOU with the VBOE and implement a corrective action plan to improve student achievement in the identified schools. Since Petersburg City Public Schools have schools in accreditation denied status for the 2007-2008 academic year based on 2006-2007

results, the VBOE determined that the MOU for division-level academic review would also serve as the MOU to satisfy Section 8 VAC 20-131-310.   As a part of this MOU, a corrective action plan was developed.

The MOU specifies that a contingency plan be developed if the schools do not meet school accreditation targets. Although the development of the contingency restructuring plan was implemented one year later than planned in the MOU, a committee of outside experts from universities, community-based organizations working in Petersburg, the CAO, and department staff met during the 2007-2008 year after assessments given in 2006-2007 resulted in the division not meeting accountability goals of the MOU for two consecutive years. This committee developed an instructional intervention to be led by an outside entity for middle school students to begin in 2009-2010. On June 18, 2008, the plan was presented to the Accountability Committee for Schools and Divisions. This plan meets the following conditions agreed upon by the VBOE and Petersburg City Public Schools:

1. Alternative governance.
2. Choice option for middle school students and parents.
3. Research-based focus on core content.
4. Recruitment, selection, and supervision of highly qualified personnel by an independent entity.
5. Proven track record of educational success.

On November 20, 2008, the VBOE requested that the Petersburg City School Board plan for the implementation of the contingency restructuring proposal in the 2009-2010 school year and authorized the VDOE to assist Petersburg City Public Schools in such planning by providing available federal resources.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept Petersburg City Public Schools report on progress planning for the implementation of the contingency restructuring plan in the 2009-2010 school year. A Vendor will be selected no later than August 15, 2009, and implementation for students will occur no later than beginning of the semester of January 2010. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

Report on the Alternative Education Programs in Petersburg City Public Schools

Dr. Smith presented this item. Dr. Smith said that the department conducted a third review of the alternative programs in Petersburg City Public Schools on March 30, 2009. The report and findings are as follows:

Align Horizon's curriculum with the skills necessary for transition to a regular diploma seeking program and GED program (ISAEP).
Teachers are utilizing the Contemporary GED Exercise Book during instruction. School staff members have developed a GED study plan and timeline to be used as tools for monitoring preparation for testing. There is ample evidence that students are successfully transitioning from the Horizons program to the ISAEP program. During the initial visit in December, there was one student enrolled; however, during this follow-up visit, 17 active students have enrolled in the program.

Adhere to procedures for student placement in a timely manner which allows for parent input.
School staff members have developed a checklist for student entrance into Blandford Academy. The ISAEP folders contained the appropriate parent/guardian notification of enrollment and subsequent documentation.

There was ample evidence of compliance with ISAEP enrollment requirements. Furthermore, the Blandford staff members have collaborated with the staff members of students' home-schools to streamline entrance procedures for prospective students.

Secure the needed resources and materials for students and teachers (i.e., textbooks).
Classroom observations and interviews revealed that Horizons, CPP, and Choices teachers have been provided with adequate materials such as textbooks and computer-based programs such as Voyager and Odyssey. In addition, school administrators have ensured that teachers receive appropriate access to diagnostic tools.

Provide access to the Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs to the students enrolled in the CPP program.
Interviews with students and teachers revealed that ISAEP, Horizons, and CPP students participate in the CTE programs at the high school twice a week after school. These programs are not certified CTE programs. The reviewed ISAEP plans contained evidence of participation in the career and technical education program at the high school. This practice was implemented during the start of the second semester. Two orientation programs for parents of Blandford Academy students were conducted to introduce the seven course offerings for the CTE program at Petersburg High School.

Current enrollment of Blandford Academy students who are participating in the CTE program after school:
- three students are enrolled in the carpentry program (one student is scheduled to begin on March 30, 2009);
- three students are enrolled in the childcare program (three students are scheduled to begin on March 30, 2009);
- two students will enroll in the personal care aide beginning on March 30, 2009;
- one student will enroll in the automotive program beginning on March 30, 2009; and
- one student is enrolled in the culinary arts program.

Provide early intervention in elementary and middle school programs to reduce the need for alternative programs.
Document reviews revealed evidence of ongoing efforts to address instructional and behavioral issues contributing to the need for an alternative program. Early intervention continues to be a key concern of addressing student behavior.

Recommendations based on the follow-up review.
The committee recommended the following essential actions:

- Expand the GED study plan to include goals, objectives, and evaluation methods. Students should be actively involved in the development of the GED study plan.
- Provide certified CTE programs to students during the regular school day.

Petersburg City staff reported that the ISAEP program at Blandford Academy has met the minimum requirements for a functioning program. Document reviews, interviews, and classroom observations revealed that substantive efforts have been implemented to address the essential actions.

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to accept the findings of the review of alternative education programs in Petersburg City Public Schools and request the department to complete a follow-up visit in the fall of 2009 to ensure that students are receiving certified CTE courses as described in the essential actions based on the follow-up review. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Bridging Business and Education for the 21st Century Workforce—A Strategic Plan for Virginia's Career Pathways system

Mr. Lan Neugent, assistant superintendent for technology and career education, Mrs. Jean Bankos, senior advisor to the Governor for educational projects, and Liz Povar, business development director, Virginia Economic Development Partnership, presented the report.

In July 2007, the Commonwealth of Virginia received a Workforce Investment Act Incentive Grant based upon Program Year 2005 performance. The Governor's Senior Advisor for Workforce, the Secretary of Education, and the Chancellor jointly submitted an application to the U.S. Department of Labor Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training outlining the planned activities under the grant award. Consistent with the Governor's vision to create a well-trained, well-educated and globally competitive skilled workforce, the list of planned activities included the development and implementation of a statewide career pathways model and communication plan.

The goal of the plan is to address the means by which career pathways, at all education and training levels, can be used to link the education, workforce, and economic development systems. In November 2007, the Governor's Taskforce on Career Pathways System Development consisting of staff from the VCCS, Virginia Department of Education, the Secretary of Education's Office, the State Council of Higher Education, Virginia Department of Labor and Industry, Virginia Economic Development Partnership, and the Governor's Office for Workforce Development was formed to assist with the development of the plan. The taskforce issued a RFP and designated Workforce Strategy Center to develop the plan.

The report, released in December 2008, recommends that the Commonwealth undertake efforts to improve our performance in the following areas:

- Coordination of education and training
- Use and analysis of Labor Market Information (LMI)
- Connections to the business community
- Counseling and support for students/workers
- Access to postsecondary education

Actions to improve the career pathways system in Virginia include:

- Charging the Virginia Workforce Council to serve in an advisory and leadership capacity to Virginia's career pathways system development

- Creating a LMI advisory group to inform both policy and practice
- Setting a policy goal for improving student transitions
- Increasing retention and completion rates among Virginians enrolled in workforce training and education
- Establishing sustainability of Virginia's career pathways system

The action plan outlines specific deliverables that align with the recommendations of the report. In the coming year, the Governor's Taskforce on Career Pathways System Development will be implementing the plan based on the timeline identified. The Taskforce will provide updates on the implementation process periodically to appropriate boards and stakeholders.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept the *Bridging Business and Education for the 21st Century Workforce—A Strategic Plan for Virginia's Career Pathways System* report for review and monitoring. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and carried unanimously.

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. Mrs. Castro seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. The Board adjourned for the Executive Session at 11:04 a.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 11:55 a.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:

Virginia McLaughlin – Yes	Isis Castro – Yes
Kelvin Moore – Yes	Eleanor Saslaw – Yes
Thomas Brewster – Yes	David Johnson – Yes
Ella Ward – Yes	K. Rob Krupicka – Yes
Mark Emblidge – Yes	

The following motions were made:

In Case SWD-2008, the Board voted to revoke the license of Mr. Stanley William DeLoach, Jr.

In Case FRW-2008, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Mr. Felix Ray Whitley.
In Case TCW-2008, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Mr. Thomas Cole Williams.

In Case 1, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Mr. Matthew McGuire.

In Case 2, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Ms. Tysa Alexander.

In Case 3, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Mr. Lloyd Alston.

In Case 4, the Board of Education voted to deny the renewal of the license of Ms. Weily Bokel.

In Case 5, the Board of Education voted not to take action against the license.

In Case 6, the Board of Education voted to revoke the license of Mr. Peter Harris.

In Case 7, the Board of Education voted to issue a Provisional (Special Education) License.

In Case 8, the Board of Education voted to issue a Collegiate Professional License.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Emblidge adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

_____
        President