

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

September 26, 2013

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

Mr. David M. Foster, President  
Mrs. Betsy D. Beamer, Vice President  
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson  
Dr. Oktay Baysal  
Mr. Christian N. Braunlich

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.  
Mrs. Darla M. Edwards  
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears  
Mrs. Joan E. Wodiska

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

Mr. Foster called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

***MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE***

Mr. Foster asked for a moment of silence, and Dr. Wright led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Mrs. Beamer made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 25, 2013, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and approved with eight 'yes' votes and one abstaining from Mrs. Sears. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

***RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITION***

- A Resolution of Recognition was presented to the following:

2013 Outstanding High School Principal of Virginia

Mrs. Gracie Agnew, Principal, Magna Vista High School, Henry County Public Schools

2013 Outstanding Middle School Principal of Virginia

Mr. Steven Parker, Principal, Cedar Lee Middle School, Fauquier County Public Schools

2013 Outstanding Secondary School Assistant Principal of the Year

Dr. Paula Johnson, Principal, Bayside Middle School, Virginia Beach City Public Schools

## ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Dr. Betsy Roberson spoke on SOA proposed changes
- Laura Murphy spoke on instructional materials
- Dr. Susan Pehrsson spoke on instructional materials
- Patty Rothwell spoke on instructional materials
- Kristin Zauel spoke on instructional materials
- Emily Griffey spoke on Virginia Preschool Initiative
- Amy Morgan spoke on instructional materials
- Dr. Alan Seibert spoke on overhaul of assessment and accountability system
- Gladys Brenner spoke on assessments
- Nicole Dooley spoke on Virginia Preschool Initiative
- Stephen Staples spoke on meeting high expectations policy
- Kate Thurgood spoke on instructional materials
- Kevin Hazzard spoke on A-F School Grading Formula

## **Consent Agenda**

Mrs. Beamer made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

### ***Final Review of Proposed Board of Education Meeting Dates for the 2014 Calendar Year***

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the meeting dates for the 2014 calendar year. The dates are as follows:

January 16, 2014  
February 27, 2014  
March 27, 2014  
April 23-24, 2014  
May 22, 2014  
June 26, 2014  
July 24, 2014  
September 18, 2014  
October 23, 2014  
November 20, 2014

## ***Action/Discussion Items***

### **First Review of Proposal to Place Franklin City Public Schools Under Division-Level Review Status**

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director of school improvement, presented this item. Attending from Franklin City Public Schools were Dr. Michelle Belle, superintendent, and Mrs. Edna King, chair of the school board.

Dr. Smith's presentation included the following:

- The Standards of Quality (SOQ) require local school boards to maintain *Fully Accredited* schools and to take corrective actions for schools that are not *Fully Accredited*. Further, when the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) has obtained evidence through the academic review that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division level failure to implement the SOQ, the VBOE may require a division-level academic review.
- As described in the *Division-Level Academic Review Process: Monitoring School Compliance with Certain Standards of Quality Related to Increasing Academic Performance*, the VBOE may direct the Department of Education to conduct division-level academic reviews in school divisions meeting the following criteria:
  1. The school division has not met federal benchmarks (annual measurable objectives) for any of the proficiency gap groups or the school division has schools identified as priority or focus schools as indicated in *Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*;
  2. The percent of students attending warned schools in the division is higher than the statewide percent of students attending warned schools; and
  3. The Board of Education has obtained evidence through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division level failure to implement the Standards of Quality, consistent with 221.-253.13:3.F of the *Standards of Quality*.
- All schools in Franklin City Public Schools have been *Accredited with Warning* for two consecutive years, and have federal sanctions due to not meeting the federal annual measurable objectives (AMOs). For this reason, the division meets criteria 1 and 2 described above. Academic reviews have been completed at each of the three schools in Franklin City Public Schools.
- As demonstrated by the essential actions and recommendations indicated in each of the academic review findings and subsequent follow-up, the school academic review process revealed evidence that the failure of the schools within the division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the SOQ, consistent with Section 221.-253.13:3 of the SOQ.

#### **Academic Review Findings Related to Division-Level Failure to Implement the Standards of Quality (SOQ)**

<b>Code Citation</b>	<b>Text from Standards of Quality</b>	<b>Regulation Citation from Standards of Accreditation</b>	<b>Academic Review Findings</b>
22.1-253.13:1.C	"Local school boards shall also develop and implement programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation for students who fail to achieve a passing score on any Standards of Learning assessment in grades three through eight or who	8 VAC 20-131-310.C 8 VAC 20-131-310.G	S.P. Morton Elementary School—no remediation or intervention programs in place for 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students during initial visit; after-

Code Citation	Text from Standards of Quality	Regulation Citation from Standards of Accreditation	Academic Review Findings
	fail an end-of-course test required for the award of a verified unit of credit required for the student's graduation"		school tutoring subsequently offered
22.1-253.13:1.D	"Local school boards shall also implement .... Programs based on prevention, intervention, or remediation designed to increase the number of students who earn a high school diploma ...provision of instructional strategies and reading and mathematics practices that benefit the development of reading and mathematics skills for all students."	8 VAC 20-131-310.B 8 VAC 20-131-310.C	Franklin High School—no evidence of supplemental support during the school day during initial visit; supplemental assistance for mathematics subsequently offered
22.1-253.13:2.C	"Each school board shall assign licensed instructional personnel in a manner that ..."	8 VAC 20-131-131-240.A 8 VAC 20-131-210.B	Concerns noted at all schools. See personnel audit.
22.1-253.13:3.A	"Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards of accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education."	8 VAC 20-131-80.C 8 VAC 20-131-90.D 8 VAC 20-131-110.A 8 VAC 20-131-110.C 8 VAC 20-131-150 8 VAC 20-131-210.B 8 VAC 20-131-310.G	All schools rated <i>Accredited with Warning</i> .
22.1-253.13:5.E	"Each local school board shall provide a program of high quality professional development (i) in the use and documentation of performance standards and evaluation criteria based on student academic progress and skill for teachers and administrators; (ii) as part of the license renewal process; (iii) in educational technology for all instructional personnel; (iv) for administrative personnel designed to increase proficiency in instructional leadership...In addition, each local school board shall also provide teachers and principals with high quality professional development programs each year in (i) instructional content; (ii) the preparation of tests.... (iii) methods for assessing the progress of individual students...(iv) instruction and remediation techniques...(v) interpreting test data...and; (vi) technology applications..."	8 VAC 20-131-20.A 8 VAC 20-131-210.B 8 VAC 20-131-310.G	Lack of targeted and job-embedded professional development noted in all schools, lack of monitoring and follow-up noted in all schools.  Lesson plans did not reflect use of student performance data in instructional planning. J.P. King, Jr. Middle—concerns noted with teachers' lack of knowledge of instructional content and no evidence of professional development was indicated.

State and Federal Accountability Ratings

Franklin City Public Schools' state and federal accountability ratings from 2004-2005 until present are provided below.

State Accreditation Ratings (Based on assessments in the previous year)

School	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>S. P. Morton Elementary</b>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> – English	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> – English, Mathematics
<b>J. P. King, Jr. Middle</b>	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> –Mathematics	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> – Mathematics	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> –Mathematics	<i>Accredited with Warning</i> –English, Mathematics

<b>Franklin High</b>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning – Mathematics</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning – Mathematics</i>				
----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

Federal Accountability Ratings (Based on assessments in the previous years)

School	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>S. P. Morton Elementary</b>	Made AYP	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Focus School	Priority School
<b>J. P. King, Jr. Middle</b>	Did Not Make AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Priority School	Priority School
<b>Franklin High</b>	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Made AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Did Not Make AYP	Did Not Meet AMOs	Did Not Meet AMOs

Student Achievement

Student achievement for assessments given in 2005-2006 until present at all three schools is indicated below.

S. P. Morton Elementary School

Subject Area	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
English: Reading	77%	78%	80%	82%	78%	75%	67%	48%
English: Writing	84%	84%	67%	76%	80%	69%	63%	38%
History and Social Science	83%	86%	86%	88%	87%	83%	75%	78%
Mathematics	79%	82%	87%	77%	87%	82%	41%	39%
Science	79%	84%	74%	75%	81%	78%	74%	63%

J. P. King, Jr. Middle School

Subject Area	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
English: Reading	63%	72%	76%	82%	83%	82%	78%	52%
English: Writing	70%	69%	71%	81%	84%	71%	78%	52%
History and Social Science	63%	66%	65%	70%	81%	73%	64%	63%
Mathematics	48%	58%	62%	69%	70%	63%	42%	45%
Science	74%	67%	66%	70%	81%	84%	91%	61%

Franklin High School

Subject Area	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
English: Reading	82%	89%	92%	90%	89%	89%	58%	82%
English: Writing	98%	96%	93%	83%	91%	93%	77%	98%
History and Social Science	76%	67%	76%	87%	86%	64%	41%	76%
Mathematics	70%	93%	85%	74%	73%	63%	23%	70%
Science	70%	77%	72%	83%	78%	87%	61%	70%

Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rate and Graduation and Completion Index

The *Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rate* and *Graduation and Completion Index* for Franklin High School are provided below.

Cohort Group	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rate	78%	79%	85%	77%	71%
Graduation and Completion Index	78	81	89	80	82

Personnel Audit

Turnover among teachers, school- and division-level leaders has contributed to difficulty in Franklin City Public Schools hiring and retaining highly-effective teachers. Since 2007-2008, J. P. King, Jr. Middle School has had five principals; Franklin High School has had four principals; and S. P. Morton Elementary School has had two principals. In addition, three superintendents and one interim superintendent have led the division over the past decade.

In the initial academic review, there was an indication that teachers were not licensed or teaching in their endorsed areas. As part of the follow-up to the academic review, the Office of School Improvement (OSI) completed a thorough review of personnel practices within the division.

Technical Assistance

The OSI has supported Franklin City Public Schools through the academic review process and the federal accountability model. A state-assigned contractor has been provided at the building and division level since 2006-2007 as indicated below.

Franklin City Schools – Technical Assistance Provided by VDOE

Year	OSI Support by VDOE
2006-2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided academic review to J. P. King Middle School</li> <li>• Provided assistance with carrying out identified goals: Improving Literacy Instruction; Improving Math Instruction; Use of Curriculum (Written, Taught, and Tested); Building Leadership of the Principal</li> <li>• Assisted with VDOE grant funding oversight</li> <li>• Assisted principal with development and implementation of the school improvement plan</li> <li>• Observed classroom instruction with principal and debriefed findings (S. P. Morton Elementary School and J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Assisted principal on leadership development – schoolwide organization and classroom instruction (S. P. Morton Elementary School and J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Assisted with process development and implementation of classroom “best practice look-fors” at J. P. King Middle School</li> <li>• Assisted with the implementation and oversight of the school remediation plan at S. P. Morton Elementary School</li> <li>• Attended and assisted principal with grade-level team meetings – focus on curriculum alignment, and student subgroup needs</li> </ul>
2007-2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted assistance through academic review (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Provided assistance with follow-up: Improving Literacy Instruction; Improving Mathematics Instruction; Use of Curriculum (Written, Taught, and Tested); Building Leadership of the Principal</li> <li>• Designed and implemented a Shared Planning and Implementation Team comprised of school and division personnel with a primary purpose of addressing the essential actions identified from the targeted assistance review – met monthly (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Assisted with ensuring that the targeted review essential actions were embedded in the school improvement plan with ongoing monitoring of level of implementation (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Assisted with development and implementation of schoolwide processes, structures, and procedures (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Observed classroom instruction with principal and debriefed findings (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Provided assistance with organizing and running team meetings; attended and provided assistance with grade-level team best practices; provided template for principal to use for facilitating effective team meetings (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Reviewed and provided summer “Principal To Do List” to principal (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Monitored implementation of VDOE-delivered professional development (J. P. King Middle School)</li> </ul>

Year	OSI Support by VDOE
2008-2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted assistance through academic review (J. P. King Middle School)</li> <li>• Teacher Leader Training at Christopher Newport University to address differentiation for students</li> <li>• Funding for mathematics coaching provided through the University of Virginia</li> <li>• Funding for <i>I Can Learn Math</i></li> </ul>
2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted assistance through federal programs</li> <li>• Fiscal Year 2008 1003(g) funding for J. P. King Middle School – \$104,879.90</li> <li>• 2009 Summer Institute in Charlottesville, Virginia               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Breaking Ranks in the Middle (BRIM)</li> <li>○ Teacher Leader Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2010-2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2010 Summer Institute (Franklin High School and S. P. Morton Elementary School)</li> <li>• Teacher Leader Training (four days) all schools</li> <li>• Fiscal Year 2009 1003(g) funding for Franklin High School (Tier III) – \$537,501.00 over a three-year period to improve graduation rate</li> <li>• Webinars regarding the <i>Rapid Improvement School Indicators</i> – Monthly</li> <li>• Division Leadership Support Team Project with The College of William and Mary               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Program evaluation</li> <li>○ Division improvement planning</li> <li>○ Formative assessments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2011-2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division Leadership Support Team Project with The College of William and Mary               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Visible learning training provided</li> <li>○ Quarterly data reviews</li> <li>○ Needs sensing interviews</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 1003(a) funding for S. P. Morton Elementary School – \$81,300.00</li> <li>• Fiscal Year 2009 1003(g) funding continuation for Franklin High School – \$537,501.00 over a three-year period</li> </ul>
2012-2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division Leadership Support Team Project with The College of William and Mary               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mathematics SOL resources</li> <li>○ English SOL resources</li> <li>○ Science SOL resources</li> <li>○ Response to Intervention (RtI) training</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Differentiated Technical Assistance               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mathematics</li> <li>○ Student engagement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Academic review visits – J. P. King Middle School, S. P. Morton Elementary School, and Franklin High School</li> <li>• Fiscal Year 2009 1003(g) funding continuation for Franklin High School – \$537,501.00 over a three-year period</li> <li>• September 2013 Focus Schools Conference in Richmond, Virginia – S. P. Morton Elementary School</li> <li>• Lead Turnaround Partner (EdisonLearning) for J. P. King Middle School – (\$211,550)</li> <li>• Transformation Toolkit for school improvement planning</li> <li>• October 2012 – May 2013 Priority Schools Conferences in Richmond, Virginia – J. P. King Middle School</li> </ul>

**School Improvement Funding**

Over the past six years, Franklin City Public Schools has received \$1,329,183.00 in school improvement funding. The majority of support has been designated for J. P. King, Jr. Middle School, which has received \$495,716.00. The funds have been used to support improvement in reading and mathematics at the elementary and middle schools, and to increase the graduation rate and incentivize a teacher evaluation pilot at the high school.

**Franklin City OSI Federal Funding**

Year	School	Fund Source	Amount	Purpose
2007-2008	J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(a)	\$3,000.00	Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) for 20; Focus – number

Year	School	Fund Source	Amount	Purpose
				and number sense
2008-2009	J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(a)	\$100,000.00	Purchase I Can Learn Math; UVA mathematics coaching (Read to Succeed initiative)
2009-2010	J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(g)	\$104,879.90	School Improvement coach; UVA Reading and mathematics coaching (Read to Succeed initiative)
2009-2010	J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(a)	\$61,000.00	Reading coaching (Read to Succeed initiative)
2010-2011	Franklin High	1003(g)	\$537,501.00	Improve graduation rate: Cohort teacher; Coach; New Beginnings
2010-2011	S. P. Morton Elementary	1003(a)	\$13,350.00	Part of iStation, DRA kits, additional tutors for tiered reading intervention (Read to Succeed initiative)
2011-2012	Franklin High	1003(g) ARRA	\$158,166.00	Teacher Evaluation Pilot
2011-2012	S. P. Morton Elementary J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(a)	\$133,237.00	SPM: \$36,650 Additional tutor hours for reading tiered intervention (Read to Succeed initiative); differentiated lesson development. SPM: \$81,300 Reading tutor hours; iStation; Summer Academy for teachers to develop differentiated lessons (Read to Succeed initiative) \$15,287: JPK mathematics coaching with UVA (Read to Succeed)
2012-2013	J. P. King, Jr. Middle	1003(a)	\$211,550.00	Priority school funding for year 1 (LTP)
2012-2013	S. P. Morton Elementary	State set-aside from federal funds	\$6,500.00	iStation
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,329,183.90</b>	

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson identified the following as division-level issues: (1) lack of professional development on the new standards; (2) lack of intervention for students; and (3) vertical movement between grades.
- Mrs. Sears noted that a majority of the current school board members have served on the Board since 2009 when these issues were first identified.
- Mrs. Beamer requested that information on team members participating in the division-level academic review process be made available to Board members before the October board meeting.
- Mrs. Edwards expressed concern regarding the many duties of principals, and that some teachers were not concerned with low math scores.
- Mr. Braunlich urged the Superintendent of Franklin City to take advice from the academic review team.

The Board accepted for first review the proposal to require Franklin City Public Schools to undergo a division-level academic review.

**First Review of Memorandum of Understanding for Norfolk City School Board for Lindenwood Elementary School as Required for Schools Denied Accreditation**

Dr. Kathleen Smith also presented this item. Dr. Smith noted that she will take questions from Board members back to Dr. Samuel King, superintendent of Norfolk City Public Schools, to be addressed at the October board meeting.

Dr. Smith's presentation included the following:

Section [8 VAC 20-131-315](#) of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) requires certain actions for schools that are denied accreditation:

- |  |
|--|
| <p>A. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-300 shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and shall provide parents of enrolled students and other interested parties with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;</li><li>2. A copy of the school division's proposed corrective action plan, including a timeline for implementation, to improve the school's accreditation rating; and</li><li>3. An opportunity to comment on the division's proposed corrective action plan. Such public comment shall be received and considered by the school division prior to finalizing the school's corrective action plan and a Board of Education memorandum of understanding with the local school board.</li></ol> <p>B. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with <a href="#">8 VAC 20-131-300</a> shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and affirmed through a memorandum of understanding between the Board of Education and the local school board. The local school board shall submit a corrective action plan to the Board of Education for its consideration in prescribing actions in the memorandum of understanding within 45 days of the notification of the rating. The memorandum of understanding shall be entered into no later than November 1 of the academic year in which the rating is awarded. The local board shall submit status reports detailing implementation of actions prescribed by the memorandum of understanding to the Board of Education. The status reports shall be signed by the school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board. The school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board may be required to appear before the Board of Education to present status reports.</p> <p>The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Undergoing an educational service delivery and management review. The Board of Education shall prescribe the content of such review and approve the reviewing authority retained by the school division.</li><li>2. Employing a turnaround specialist credentialed by the state to address those conditions at the school that may impede educational progress and effectiveness and academic success.</li></ol> |
|--|

- Lindenwood Elementary School is in *Accreditation Denied* status for 2013-2014 and is subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through a MOU between the VBOE and Norfolk City School Board.
- Lindenwood Elementary School in Norfolk City was previously identified as a persistently low-achieving Tier 1 school as defined by U. S. Department of Education (USED) for the 2010 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) federal funding. For the purposes of federal funding available under 1003(g) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, a persistently lowest-achieving Tier 1 school is defined as a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group in reading/language arts and mathematics combined and the school has not reduced its failure rate in reading/language arts and/or mathematics by 10 to 15 percent each year for the past two years.

- In 2011, Norfolk City Public Schools selected Pearson Education as its lead turnaround partner (LTP) for Lindenwood Elementary School and as such met the requirements of reconstitution as a change in governance. The school selected to implement the Transformation Model, one of four approved USED models. The Norfolk City Public Schools was awarded 1003(g) SIG funds for a three-year total of \$1,758,099. The school's current comprehensive school improvement plan that meets the requirements of the USED Transformation Model and will serve as a basis for the school's corrective action plan is available at [http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school\\_improvement/priority\\_schools/cohort\\_applications/board\\_review/lindenwood.pdf](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/priority_schools/cohort_applications/board_review/lindenwood.pdf).
- Lindenwood Elementary School was granted the rating of *Conditionally Accredited* in 2011 and 2012 based on the school's reconstitution efforts and their implementation of the USED Transformation Model. Based on assessment data from 2012-2013, Norfolk City Public Schools has decided to not request to continue in the status of *Conditionally Accredited* in 2013.

State Accountability- Accreditation Designation

**Accreditation Ratings for Lindenwood Elementary School**

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Areas of Warning
2008-2009	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2007-2008	English, Mathematics, Science
2009-2010	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2008-2009	English
2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2009-2010	English, History, Science
2011-2012	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2010-2011	English
2012-2013	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accreditation Denied</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics, Science, History

Federal Accountability

**Federal Accountability Sanction for Lindenwood Elementary**

Year	Based on Assessments in	Federal Status
2009-2010	2008-2009	Did not make AYP – Mathematics - Year 1
2010-2011	2009-2010	Did not make AYP – Mathematics - Year 2
2011-2012	2010-2011	Did not make AYP – Mathematics - Year 3
2012-2013	2011-2012	Identified as a Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Identified as a Priority School

Federal Accountability Pass Rates

**Lindenwood Elementary School**

Assessment Type	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Reading	69%	65%	72%	80%	45%
Writing	68%	59%	78%	35%	63%
Mathematics	71%	71%	67%	32%	26%
Science	76%	68%	69%	75%	39%
History	80%	69%	81%	81%	55%

Technical Assistance

Lindenwood Elementary School implemented the USED Transformation Model with Pearson as its LTP as a part of the SIG program in their first and second year of *Conditionally Accredited* rating status. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has assigned a contractor to work with the LTP, school transformation team, principal, and the division to increase student achievement. In the upcoming year, technical assistance will be provided in core content areas, in teacher evaluation, and in other areas identified by VDOE that will assist the principal and teachers as needed throughout the year. As part of the Transformation Model requirements, the school will continue to provide quarterly reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI). The VDOE contractor will review the quarterly reports and provide

feedback to the transformation team.

The Board's discussion included the following questions for Dr. King to address at the October board meeting:

- Mr. Foster asked for an explanation of the disparity of accreditation ratings within Lindenwood Elementary.
- Mrs. Sears asked how many of the current staff will be retained. Dr. Wright said that the superintendent will bring a profile of the current staff indicating whether teachers are licensed and endorsed.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked for results of performance evaluations such as how many teachers are rated highly qualified and what action was taken. Mrs. Wodiska also suggested that the superintendent, school board chair, principal, and teacher leader for the building attend the October state board meeting, if possible.
- Dr. Cannaday said it would be helpful to know what may be contributing to significant swings in accreditation ratings.
- Mrs. Edwards asked if the team will include parents and members of the community. Dr. Smith said parents and stakeholders are included in meetings that do not involve the academic review team.

The Board accepted for first review the Memorandum of Understanding with Norfolk City Public Schools.

**First Review of Request for a Continued Rating of Conditionally Accredited from Northampton County School Board for Kiptopeke Elementary School**

Dr. Kathleen Smith presented this item. Dr. Smith recognized Dr. Walter Clements, superintendent of Northampton County Public Schools. Dr. Smith's presentation included the following:

- 8 VAC 20-131-300.C states that a school shall be rated *Accreditation Denied* based on its academic performance and its failure to achieve the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index required to be rated *Fully Accredited* or *Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate*, for the preceding three consecutive years or for three consecutive years anytime thereafter.
- As outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-315, as an alternative to the memorandum of understanding required for schools rated *Accreditation Denied*, a local school board may choose to reconstitute the school and apply to the Board of Education for a rating of *Conditionally Accredited*. The application shall include specific responses that address all areas of deficiency that resulted in the *Accreditation Denied* status.
- If a local school board chooses to reconstitute a school, it may annually apply for an accreditation rating of *Conditionally Accredited* as provided for in 8 VAC 20-131-300 C 5. The *Conditionally Accredited* rating may be granted for a period not to exceed three years if the school is making progress toward a rating of *Fully Accredited* in accordance with the terms of the Board of Education's approval of the reconstitution application. The school will revert to a status of *Accreditation Denied* if it fails to meet the requirements to be rated *Fully Accredited* by the end of the three-year term or if it fails to have its annual application for such rating renewed.
- Kiptopeke Elementary School in Northampton County was previously identified as a persistently low-achieving Tier 1 school as defined by U. S. Department of Education (USED) for the 2010 1003(g) School Improvement

Grant (SIG) federal funding. For the purposes of federal funding available under 1003(g) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, a persistently lowest-achieving Tier 1 school is defined as a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring based on the academic achievement of the “all students” group in reading/language arts and mathematics combined and the school has not reduced its failure rate in reading/language arts and/or mathematics by 10 to 15 percent each year for the past two years.

- In 2011, Northampton County Public Schools selected Edison Learning as its lead turnaround partner (LTP) for Kiptopeke Elementary School and as such met the requirements of reconstitution as a change in governance. The school selected to implement the Transformation Model, one of four approved USED models. The Northampton County Public Schools was awarded 1003(g) SIG funds for a three-year total of \$2,368,132. The school’s current comprehensive school improvement plan that meets the requirements of the USED Transformation Model is available at [http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school\\_improvement/priority\\_schools/cohort\\_applications/board\\_review/kiptopeke.pdf](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/priority_schools/cohort_applications/board_review/kiptopeke.pdf).
- Kiptopeke Elementary School was granted the rating of *Conditionally Accredited* in 2011 and 2012 based on the school’s reconstitution efforts and their implementation of the USED Transformation Model.

State Accountability- Accreditation Designation

**Accreditation Ratings for Kiptopeke Elementary School**

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Areas of Warning
2008-2009	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2007-2008	English, Mathematics, Science
2009-2010	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2008-2009	English
2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2009-2010	English, History, Science
2011-2012	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2010-2011	English
2012-2013	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accreditation Denied</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics

Federal Accountability

Federal Accountability Sanctions for Kiptopeke Elementary School

Year	Based on Assessments in	Federal Status
2009-2010	2008-2009	Did not make AYP – English and mathematics - Year 2
2010-2011	2009-2010	Did not make AYP – English and mathematics - Year 3
2011-2012	2010-2011	Did not make AYP – English and mathematics - Year 4
2012-2013	2011-2012	Identified as a Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Identified as a Priority School

Federal Accountability Pass Rates

**Kiptopeke Elementary School Federal Accountability Pass Rates**

Assessment Type	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Reading	80%	69%	73%	76%	60%
Writing	62%	55%	66%	69%	65%
Mathematics	66%	69%	69%	59%	57%
Science	64%	66%	73%	79%	73%
History	67%	72%	60%	76%	88%

**Kiptopeke Elementary School Pass Rates by Test**

Test Level	Subject Area	School Pass Rate 2011-2012	Statewide Pass Rate 2011-2012	School Pass Rate 2012-2013	Statewide Pass Rate 2012-2013
Grade 3	English: Reading	62%	86%	66%	72%
Grade 4	English: Reading	70%	88%	46%	70%
Grade 5	English: Reading	82%	89%	55%	73%
Grade 6	English: Reading	90%	89%	71%	73%
Grade 5	English: Writing	69%	87%	65%	71%
Grade 3	Mathematics	40%	64%	49%	65%
Grade 4	Mathematics	49%	70%	49%	74%
Grade 5	Mathematics	79%	67%	45%	69%
Grade 6	Mathematics	69%	74%	88%	77%
Grade 3	Science	80%	90%	82%	84%
Grade 5	Science	78%	88%	66%	76%
Grade 3	History and Social Science	71%	87%	82%	87%
	US History I	69%	81%	91%	83%
	Virginia Studies	89%	89%	94%	87%

Technical Assistance

Kiptopeke Elementary implemented the USED Transformation Model as a part of the SIG program in its first and second year of *Conditionally Accredited* rating status. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has assigned a contractor to work with the Lead Turnaround Partner, school transformation team, principal and the division to increase student achievement. In the upcoming year, technical assistance will be provided in core content areas, in teacher evaluation, and other in areas identified by VDOE to assist the principal and teachers as needed throughout the year. As part of the Transformation Model requirements, the school will continue to provide quarterly reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI). The VDOE contractor will review the quarterly reports and provide feedback to the transformation team.

During the Board’s discussion, Board members complimented Dr. Clements on his presentation and thanked him for doing the right thing for children. Board members also suggested that Dr. Clements continue working with department staff.

The Board accepted for first review the request for a continued rating of *Conditionally Accredited* for Kiptopeke Elementary School from the Northampton County School Board.

**First Review of Updated Corrective Action Plan as Required by Petersburg City School Board’s Memorandum of Understanding with the Virginia Board of Education**

Dr. Kathleen Smith presented this item. Representatives from Petersburg Public Schools included: Dr. Joseph Melvin, division superintendent; Mr. Kenneth Pritchett, school board chair, and Ms. Stephanie Bassett, assistant superintendent. Dr. Smith’s presentation included the following:

- 8 VAC 20-70-40 requires the Board of Education to monitor the progress of school divisions under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). On November 17, 2009, the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) revised the MOU for Petersburg City Public Schools. This MOU will remain in effect until all schools are *Fully*

*Accredited.* As required by the MOU, Petersburg City Public Schools developed a corrective action plan beginning in the 2009-2010 school year.

- At the June 27, 2013, VBOE meeting, Petersburg City School Board provided an update on the revisions to the corrective action plan, specifically, revisions that impact teacher licensure, teacher retention strategies, and teacher recruitment strategies. The VBOE requested that the Petersburg City School Board provide an update on the final revisions to the corrective action plan following the release of data from 2012-2013 Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments.
- Petersburg City Public Schools has revised the corrective action plan (Attachment A) based on data from the 2012-2013 SOL assessments, the Career and Technical audit, and the Human Resources Management audit. Both audits were completed at the request of the Superintendent of Petersburg City Public Schools.
- As part of the annual update on the MOU to the Virginia Board of Education, the following data is provided for each of the seven Petersburg City Public Schools.

Accreditation Status

School	2009-2010 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2008-2009)	2010-2011 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2009-2010)	2011-2012 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2010-2011 and 2011 Graduation and Completion Index)	2012-2013 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2011-2012 and 2012 Graduation and Completion Index)	2013-2014 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2012-2013 and 2013 Graduation and Completion Index)
A. P. Hill Elementary	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning– Warned in English and Science</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning– Warned in English and Science</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning– Warned in English and Mathematics</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied Warned in English, Mathematics and Science</i>
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in Mathematics and Science</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in English</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Warned in English and Mathematics</i>
Peabody Middle	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in English, Mathematics, and History</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in English, Mathematics, and History</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in Mathematics</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in Mathematics</i>	<i>Accreditation Denied Warned in English and Mathematics</i>
Petersburg High	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Graduation Index (78)</i>	<i>Fully Accredited Graduation Index (85)</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Warned in Mathematics and Graduation and Completion Index (84)</i>
Robert E. Lee Elementary	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Warned in English and Mathematics</i>
Vernon Johns Junior High	<i>Accreditation Denied – Warned in English and Science</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning – Warned in English and History</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning – Warned in History</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Warned in English</i>

School	2009-2010 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2008-2009)	2010-2011 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2009-2010)	2011-2012 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2010-2011 and 2011 Graduation and Completion Index)	2012-2013 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2011-2012 and 2012 Graduation and Completion Index)	2013-2014 (Based on SOL Assessments in 2012-2013 and 2013 Graduation and Completion Index)
Walnut Hill Elementary	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning – Warned in Mathematics</i>	<i>Accredited with Warning Warned in English and Mathematics</i>

Federal Annual Measurable Objectives (FAMO)

FAMO (Based on SOL Assessments in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 and Federal Graduation Indicator)

School Name	Title I School	Federal AMO Status	Federal Sanction	Federal AMO Status	Federal Sanction
A.P. Hill Elementary	Yes	Did Not Meet	Priority School	Did Not Meet	Priority School
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	Yes	Met All	Priority School	Missed Higher Expectations	Priority School
Peabody Middle	Yes	Did Not Meet	Priority School	Did Not Meet	Required Improvement Plan
Petersburg High		Did Not Meet FGI 65%	Required Improvement Plan	Did Not Meet FGI 66%	Required Improvement Plan
Robert E. Lee Elementary	Yes	Met All		Missed Higher Expectations	
Vernon Johns Junior High	Yes	Met All	Priority School	Met All	
Walnut Hill Elementary	Yes	Met All		Did Not Meet	Required Improvement Plan

Federal Accountability Pass Rates on Statewide Assessments from School Report Card

Reading

School	Based on Assessments in 2008-2009	Based on Assessments in 2009-2010	Based on Assessments in 2010-2011	Based on Assessments in 2011-2012	Based on Assessments in 2012-2013
A. P. Hill Elementary	81%	60%	62%	72%	44%
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	76%	64%	78%	81%	56%
Peabody Middle	64%	67%	76%	75%	46%
Petersburg High	90%	91%	84%	83%	76%
R. E. Lee Elementary	81%	77%	78%	81%	45%
Vernon Johns Junior High	62%	73%	76%	87%	48%
Walnut Hill Elementary	85%	78%	73%	79%	55%

Writing

School	Based on Assessments in 2008-2009	Based on Assessments in 2009-2010	Based on Assessments in 2010-2011	Based on Assessments in 2011-2012	Based on Assessments in 2012-2013
A. P. Hill Elementary	82%	67%	59%	61%	44%
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	66%	77%	68%	63%	67%
Peabody Middle	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Petersburg High	84%	82%	90%	76%	77%
R. E. Lee Elementary	92%	76%	75%	68%	50%
Vernon Johns Junior High	60%	74%	58%	83%	42%
Walnut Hill Elementary	85%	86%	76%	72%	55%

Mathematics

School	Based on Assessments in 2008-2009	Based on Assessments in 2009-2010	Based on Assessments in 2010-2011	Based on Assessments in 2011-2012	Based on Assessments in 2012-2013
A. P. Hill Elementary	80%	66%	62%	42%	36%
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	64%	77%	84%	61%	56%
Peabody Middle	47%	58%	49%	43%	41%
Petersburg High	86%	84%	87%	52%	51%
R. E. Lee Elementary	83%	86%	90%	59%	54%
Vernon Johns Junior High	89%	86%	85%	66%	69%
Walnut Hill Elementary	81%	84%	75%	48%	45%

Science

School	Based on Assessments in 2008-2009	Based on Assessments in 2009-2010	Based on Assessments in 2010-2011	Based on Assessments in 2011-2012	Based on Assessments in 2012-2013
A. P. Hill Elementary	74%	54%	64%	77%	61%
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	59%	74%	80%	83%	69%
Peabody Middle	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Petersburg High	84%	91%	93%	91%	84%
R. E. Lee Elementary	88%	83%	84%	78%	72%
Vernon Johns Junior High	68%	78%	79%	87%	66%
Walnut Hill Elementary	73%	83%	73%	81%	68%

History

School	Based on Assessments in 2008-2009	Based on Assessments in 2009-2010	Based on Assessments in 2010-2011	Based on Assessments in 2011-2012	Based on Assessments in 2012-2013
A. P. Hill Elementary	81%	73%	64%	72%	76%
J.E.B. Stuart Elementary	89%	79%	86%	92%	82%
Peabody Middle	63%	63%	71%	72%	71%
Petersburg High	91%	94%	72%	69%	75%
R. E. Lee Elementary	90%	89%	82%	82%	84%
Vernon Johns Junior High	70%	75%	56%	65%	72%
Walnut Hill Elementary	85%	87%	75%	76%	81%

Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rate and Graduation and Completion Index

Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rate

School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Petersburg High	62%	76%	75%	85%	80%

Graduation and Completion Index (GCI)

School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Petersburg High	67	79	78	85	84

Dr. Melvin gave a brief summary of Petersburg's updated corrective action plan as required by the Memorandum of Understanding.

During the discussion, Board members complimented Petersburg for the progress made and actions taken by the school board and superintendent. Board members urged Petersburg to continue to execute and hire qualified people.

The Board accepted for first review Petersburg City Public Schools' updated corrective action plan.

**First Review of Proposed A-F School Grading Formula Developed in Response to the 2013 Acts of Assembly**

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, presented this item. Dr. Loving-Ryder recognized Dr. Deborah Jonas, department staff, for her assistance in developing the formula. Mrs. Loving-Ryder's presentation included the following:

- The 2013 Acts of Assembly requires the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) to develop an A-F school grading system. By October 1, 2014, the Board must make both the grading system and individual school grades available to the public and provide a summary report to the General Assembly.

- The Virginia School Grading System will assign a letter grade, A-F, to Virginia public schools that are part of the state accreditation system. The individual school grade will accompany the state accreditation and federal accountability ratings, both of which identify schools that need extra support to meet minimum proficiency standards in English (reading and writing), mathematics, science, and history and social science. The Virginia School Grading System will incorporate legislative requirements into the A-F grading scale by combining three primary focus areas that are important for students' long-term school and life success:
  1. Proficiency of a school's students in core content areas of mathematics, English (reading and writing), science, and history and social science as measured by passing rates on statewide assessments
  2. Growth or learning gains of an elementary or middle school's students in reading and mathematics as measured by year-to-year ("growth") on state assessments
  3. College and career readiness of a high school's students as measured by indicators that students have graduated with college and career ready credentials, or are progressing on a pathway to graduating from high school prepared for college and careers

The Board's discussion included:

- Dr. Wright thanked staff and Mrs. Atkinson, chair of the Board's accountability committee, for their work on the grading system model.
- Mrs. Atkinson thanked Board members and shared the following feedback from the Board's Accountability Committee meeting: (1) the possibility of using a gap closing metric as part of the bonus points; (2) using the three-year average in the proficiency component of the formula; (3) weighting of the bonus points to ensure they are not used to mask deficiencies; (4) observing other states' policies; (5) giving stakeholders an opportunity for input; (6) the possibility of using attendance as part of the definition for at-risk high schools.
- Mr. Foster explained the reasons for his suggestion of adding bonus points for achieving AMOs objectives and using the three-year averaging on the proficiency-based level.
- Mr. Braunlich asked staff to respond to Mr. Hazzard's questions during public comment.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked for more information on the timeline, what will be the grade point scale, how bonus points are treated, and what will be the implications for those points.
- Mrs. Beamer emphasized that the grading formula must be communicated in a way that is easy to understand.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that when developing the grading formula, the Board must comply with what is required by the law.
- Mrs. Sears requested a frequently asked questions document to include how stakeholders have been involved with the grading formula. Mrs. Atkinson noted stakeholders expressed during the legislative session that they do not support the grading formula, and she does not want to over characterize their involvement. Mrs. Sears said her issue is with how they were involved, not whether they support the grading formula. Mr. Foster suggested a description of the process used by the Board to develop the formula.
- Mrs. Sears also asked Dr. Wright about other states' school grading policies.
- Dr. Wright indicated that easy to understand communications will be developed.

- Mr. Braunlich clarified that the General Assembly determines the timeline for the Board to develop a grading formula.
- Mrs. Wodiska expressed caution regarding the timeline and noted she would like more data.
- Dr. Cannaday said issues regarding the school grading formula should be included in the *Annual Report on Conditions and Needs of Schools in Virginia*.
- Mr. Foster supported attendance being included in the at-risk definition but not disciplinary referrals.
- Dr. Cannaday asked if data is available to correlate what attendance looks like with proficiency levels. Dr. Wright said the data is available and staff will prepare a definition that is consistent with the research.
- Mrs. Edwards supported using attendance in the definition.

The Board accepted for first review the proposal for an A-F school grading formula.

### **First Review of Revisions to Criteria for the Virginia Index of Performance**

Dr. Kathleen Smith presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) requires the identification of reward schools as part of the accountability system.
- The VIP incentive program was designed to measure the extent to which students are progressing towards advanced proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, science, and history and social science recognize achievement and student progress based on other key indicators, and encourage schools' and divisions' efforts to provide Virginia's students with excellent educational opportunities.
- On October 25, 2012, additional revisions were approved by the VBOE to modify certain provisions of VIP guidelines to meet Section 22.1-253.13:9 of the Standards of Quality (SOQ) and *Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA).
- The VIP program uses a weighted methodology to calculate a VIP achievement index based on assessment results in each content area (English, mathematics, science, and history and social science), and provides opportunities for schools and school divisions to apply additional or "bonus" points to the content area indices by meeting additional VIP indicators.
- The purpose of this item is to modify certain criteria of VIP guidelines approved by the VBOE in order to include all schools that are not required to write a plan of improvement under Virginia's ESEA waiver in the methodology to calculate a VIP achievement index and to provide additional points for students that score proficient on the recently implemented, more rigorous state assessments. In addition, technical edits to clarify other criteria have been made.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if schools requesting waivers from SOL testing will be allowed to

participate in the VIP program. Dr. Wright said requesting a waiver from SOL testing does not limit a school from being eligible for an award.

- Mrs. Wodiska asked how VIP aligns with the grading bill. Dr. Wright said many of the indicators from the VIP are embedded within the grading system.

The Board accepted for first review the modifications to the *Virginia Index of Performance* to be effective for the 2013-2014 academic year.

**First Review of Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for Amendments to the Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions (8 VAC 20-720) Regarding Use of Controversial or Sensitive Instructional Materials**

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- In February 2013, the Virginia Board of Education amended the *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions (8 VAC 20-720)* to address local school division approval of textbooks not included on the Board of Education's list of approved textbooks. During and following this action, the Board received public comment expressing concern about content and language used in some instructional materials other than textbooks that were in use in some school divisions in the Commonwealth. The Board then discussed whether or not the section of the same regulations that addresses local school board selection and approval of instructional materials should be amended to require parental notification, alternative materials, and/or opt-out provisions.

[8VAC20-720-160](#). Instructional materials.

- A. Local school boards shall be responsible for the selection and utilization of instructional materials.
- B. Local school boards shall adopt policies and criteria for the selection of instructional materials that shall include, at a minimum:
1. The rights of parents to inspect, upon request, any instructional materials used as part of the educational curriculum for students, and the procedure for granting a request by a parent for such access, in accordance with the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, 20 USC § 1232H, and its implementing regulation, 34 CFR Part 9;
  2. The basis upon which a person may seek reconsideration of the local school board's selection of instructional materials, including but not limited to materials that might be considered sensitive or controversial, and the procedures for doing so; and
  3. Pursuant to § [22.1-253.13:7](#) of the Code of Virginia, clear procedures for handling challenged controversial materials.

- Following this discussion, the Board of Education requested the Department of Education to collection information from school divisions regarding their policies on selecting and utilizing instructional materials, with specific reference to:
  - ✓ Advance parental notification of sensitive or controversial materials, and
  - ✓ Opportunities for parents to request alternative materials for their children.
- The Department also sought input from the membership of the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA), the Virginia Education Association (VEA), the Virginia Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), the Virginia Association for Elementary School Principals (VAESP) and the Virginia Association for Secondary School

Principals (VASSP) regarding policies within their school divisions on selecting and utilizing instructional materials, especially related to the same two items.

- The results of the survey were reported to the Board on June 27, 2013 revealed that while many school divisions have policies in place to address the use of sensitive or controversial instructional materials, not all do. Following the report, President Foster asked the Department of Education to develop some options for the Board to consider in determining if there should be further action on the matter of statewide regulations on parental notification, opt-out provisions, and provisions for use of alternate materials as they relate to the use of sensitive or controversial materials in the classroom.
- Proposed options discussed at the Board meeting in July 2013 included amendments to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (8VAC 20-131 et seq.) (Standards of Accreditation or SOA) as well as to the *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions* (8 VAC 20-720). The SOA are currently under review, and the following language has been proposed for consideration in the SOA in Section [8 VAC 20-131-270](#). School and community communications, Item B.1:
  1. The learning objectives developed in accordance with the provisions of [8 VAC 20-131-70](#) to be achieved at their child's grade level; or, in high school, a copy of the syllabus for each of their child's courses, including a notice to parents about any sensitive or sexually explicit materials that may be included in the course, the textbook, or any supplemental instructional materials; and a copy of the school division promotion, retention, and remediation policies.
- The Board of Education requested that a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) be issued to add language to the *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions* (8 VAC 20-720) regarding procedures school divisions must have in place to address the use of sensitive or controversial instructional materials in the classroom.

The Board approved for first review the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for the *Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions* (8 VAC 20-720).

***First Review of Amendments to the Regulations Governing Driver Education (8 VAC 20-340) and the Repeal of Regulations Governing the Approval of Correspondence Courses for Home Instruction (8 VAC 20-60) (Final Stage)***

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The 2008 General Assembly adopted amendments that removed the requirement in § 22.1-254.1 of the *Code of Virginia* for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to approve correspondence courses for parents who home school their children. As a result of this action, the [Regulations Governing the Approval of Correspondence Courses for Home Instruction](#) would no longer be necessary – except that § [22.1-205](#) of the *Code* requires that the Board of Education approve correspondence courses for driver education, and that provision of the law was not changed.
- Instead of having two sets of regulations, one governing correspondence courses and another governing driver education, this proposal would simply add a new section about driver education correspondence courses to the [Regulations Governing Driver Education](#), and repeal the [Regulations Governing the Approval of Correspondence Courses for Home Instruction](#).
- The Board has received no public comment on the proposed regulations, and there are no changes from the proposed stage.

The Board accepted for first review the proposed *Regulations Governing Driver Education*.

**First Review of Revisions and Updates to the Virginia Board of Education's Student Conduct Policy Guidelines Consistent with Actions by the 2013 General Assembly**

Dr. Cynthia Cave, director of student services, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The recommended changes support the Board of Education's strategic goals of creating sound policies for student success and promoting safe and secure schools. The Board of Education's *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines* are intended to aid school boards in developing and implementing standards and policies for student behavior and accountability. School boards are required to adopt and revise regulations for codes of student conduct that are consistent with, but may be more stringent than, the guidelines. They were first developed in 1994 in response to the 1993 General Assembly action requiring the Board to establish such guidelines, according to § 22.1-279.6.A of the *Code of Virginia*. The guidelines were revised in 2001, 2004, 2006 and 2009 to reflect changes in federal and state laws. The 2013 General Assembly enacted [HB 1864](#) (Robinson), [HB 1871](#) (McClellan), and [HB 2344](#) (Cole), which necessitate further revisions to the *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines*.
- [HB 1864](#) (Robinson) amended § 22.1-279.3:1.D of the *Code* to state that when a student commits a reportable offense (as enumerated in § 22.1-279.3:1.A) on a school bus, school property, or at a school-sponsored activity, that may constitute a criminal offense:  
*"...Nothing in this section shall require delinquency charges to be filed or prevent schools from dealing with school-based offenses through graduated sanctions or educational programming before a delinquency charge is filed with the juvenile court...."*
- [HB 1871](#) (McClellan) amended § 22.1-276.01 of the *Code* by adding a definition for bullying as follows:  
*"'Bullying' means any aggressive and unwanted behavior that is intended to harm, intimidate, or humiliate the victim; involves a real or perceived power imbalance between the aggressor or aggressors and victim; and is repeated over time or causes severe emotional trauma. 'Bullying' includes cyber bullying. 'Bullying' does not include ordinary teasing, horseplay, argument, or peer conflict."*
- In addition, the bill amended § 22.1-279.6. to add subsection D as follows:  
*"Each school board shall include in its code of student conduct, by July 1, 2014, policies and procedures that include a prohibition against bullying. Such policies and procedures shall be consistent with the standards for school board policies on bullying and the use of electronic means for purposes of bullying developed by the Board pursuant to subsection A."*
- [HB 1871](#) also added § 22.1-291.4 to the *Code* requiring the following:  
*"Each school board shall implement, by July 1, 2014, policies and procedures to educate school board employees about bullying, as defined in § [22.1-276.01](#), and the need to create a bully-free environment.*  
*2. That the Board of Education shall develop, by January 1, 2014, model policies and procedures for use by each school board to educate school board employees about bullying, as defined in § [22.1-276.01](#), and the need to create a bully-free environment."*
- [HB 2344](#) (Cole) amended the *Code* by adding § 22.1-79.4 dealing with school threat assessment teams and oversight committees. The bill requires the following:  
*"A. Each local school board shall adopt policies for the establishment of threat assessment teams..."*

*B. The superintendent of each school division may establish a committee charged with oversight of the threat assessment teams...*

*C. Each division superintendent shall establish...a threat assessment team [to serve one or more schools to] ...provide guidance...regarding recognition of threatening or aberrant behavior that may represent a threat to the community, school, or self....”*

- As shown in the revised *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines*, amendments to reflect 2013 legislative changes have been made as summarized in the table below. Content was added to the section on *Related Policy Issues, Reporting of Certain Offenses to Law Enforcement Authorities*, on page 32, to state that nothing prohibits school boards from requiring school-based graduated sanctions or educational programs before a delinquency charge is filed against a student who has committed a school-based offense that may be considered criminal with the juvenile courts. The bullying definition in the *Code* replaces the description of bullying in section III, *Standards of Student Conduct*, page 21. The legislative directives to provide policies and procedures to educate school board employees about bullying prevention and to provide guidance through threat assessment teams to students, faculty, and staff in recognition of threatening or aberrant student behavior is placed in section II, *In-Service Training of School Personnel*, page 16.
- Other updates have been made to the guidelines, including the deletion of outdated information, the inclusion of current resources and publications, and minor edits.
- The following table provides brief descriptions of the 2013 changes to the *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines*.

Page Number	Brief Description
Cover page and page 1	Current dates provided
Acknowledgments	Removed “Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program”; added “and 2013”; corrected telephone number
Table of Contents	Updated
2	Added Code reference for bullying prohibition policies and procedures
7	Added bullying and threat assessment policies to section 3. <i>Relationship to Existing Policies</i>
13	Added hyperlink to the <i>Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities</i>
16	Added provision of education of staff on bullying prevention and threat assessment team guidance on recognition of threatening and aberrant student behavior; Added substance abuse prevention and intervention training at the discretion of the school board
17	Under the section <i>Range of Correction Disciplinary Action</i> , changed “child study process” to “disability determination process”
21	Added the <i>Code</i> definition of “bullying” and updated the content on this page; Added “cyberstalking”; Referenced model policy guidelines to address bullying in schools
26	Added hyperlinks to internet safety guidelines and other resources
30	Added language that nothing prohibits school boards from imposing school-based graduated sanctions or educational programs before a delinquency charge is filed with the juvenile courts for a student who has committed an offense that may be criminal
32	Added a footnote to reference the new <i>Model Policy to Address Bullying in Virginia’s Schools</i>
33	Added hyperlink to the Center for School Safety
35-44	Added amended language to Appendix A: <i>Code of Virginia</i> § 22.1-279.6 and included new 2013 <i>Code</i> changes affecting

	student conduct
45	Provided the current review date of the <i>Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia</i> .
51-53	Updated guidelines, Web sites, publications, and titles under Appendix D: Related Resources

Mrs. Atkinson suggested that the title at the top of page 35 be changed to “Applicable Sections of the *Code of Virginia*.”

The Board accepted the updated guidelines for first review.

**First Review of Board of Education’s Model Policy to Address Bullying in Virginia’s Schools**

Dr. Cynthia Cave also presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- HB 1871 (McClellan), enacted in 2013, amended § 22.1-276.01 of the *Code* to provide a definition of “bullying” as follows:  
*“...any aggressive and unwanted behavior that is intended to harm, intimidate, or humiliate the victim; involves a real or perceived power imbalance between the aggressor or aggressors and victim; and is repeated over time or causes severe emotional trauma. ‘Bullying’ includes cyber bullying. ‘Bullying’ does not include ordinary teasing, horseplay, argument or peer conflict.”*
- The bill also added a new *Code* § 22.1-291.4 to require that “Each school board shall implement, by July 1, 2014, policies and procedures to educate school board employees about bullying, as defined in § 22.1-276.01, and the need to create a bully-free environment.”
- The new § 22.1-291.4 requires:  
*“That the Board of Education develop, by January 1, 2014, model policies and procedures for use by each school board to educate school board employees about bullying, as defined in § 22.1-276.01, and the need to create a bully-free environment.”*
- Virginia school boards have been required to include bullying prevention as a part of character education since 2005 (§ 22.1-208.01 of the *Code of Virginia*). School boards are expected to include bullying as a prohibited behavior in their student codes of conduct (§ 22.1-279.6.D. of the *Code*) and to implement policies and procedures to educate school board employees about bullying and the need to create a bully-free environment (§ 22.1-291.4 of the *Code*). The proposed *Model Policy to Address Bullying in Virginia’s Schools* incorporates findings and recommendations of a study of the nature and effectiveness of Virginia school divisions’ antibullying policies conducted by the Virginia Department of Education in response to the 2011 Virginia General Assembly’s Joint Resolution 625.
- The proposed model policy addresses:
  1. a definition of bullying;
  2. examples of behaviors indicative of bullying;
  3. communication and education with staff, students and parents about bullying;
  4. expectations of staff and students in preventing and addressing bullying; and
  5. reporting, investigating, and responding to bullying incidents.
- The proposed policy has been developed with consultation and review by school division professionals and Dr. Catherine Bradshaw, an expert in the subject of bullying, of the University of Virginia.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked staff to consider speaking with advocacy groups involved with students.
- Mrs. Atkinson said she has several editorial notes and will work with staff before final review.
- Mrs. Wodiska complimented staff and suggested they contact the Virginia School Boards Association for its model policy on bullying prevention.

The Board accepted the proposed model policy for first review.

**Report of the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee to the Virginia Board of Education on Updates to the 2014 Tests of General Education Development (GED)**

Dr. Susan Clair, director/acting GED administration, office of adult education and literacy, and Dr. Thomas Brewster, chair of Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Significant changes have been in development to both content and delivery for the 2014 GED<sup>®</sup> test on computer. Test delivery will only be available at approved Pearson VUE Authorized Testing Centers (PVTC). The cost of the GED<sup>®</sup> test on computer will increase from \$58 in Virginia to \$30/section (\$120 total). Those who have incomplete and non-passing results on the current test version will lose those scores when the 2014 test is released. Professional development for teachers, examiners, and administrative staff occurred last year continuing into this year. Adult education and literacy programs have initiated outreach campaigns to alert those who have taken one section or all sections of the test but who have not passed to finish the test.
- This report highlights information about the 2014 GED<sup>®</sup> test on computer. Test-takers can register to take the test online 24/7 and receive instant score results. The GED<sup>®</sup> offers two score reports, the GED<sup>®</sup> Score and the GED<sup>®</sup> Score with Honors. The four content areas of the test include: reasoning through language arts, mathematical reasoning, science, and social studies. The skills and knowledge on the new test are aligned with the College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education. Several adult education and literacy programs in Virginia have established Pearson VUE Authorized Testing Centers and are currently able to deliver the test on computer. Other adult education programs are in various stages of implementation and should be ready by January 1, 2014. The OAEL, in collaboration with the Virginia Adult Learning Resource Center, continues to offer professional development on the new GED<sup>®</sup> 2014 test for adult educators. Waivers were provided to correctional facilities to continue with the GED<sup>®</sup> 2002 paper-based test until a transition to computer-based testing is complete.
- The GED<sup>®</sup> 2014 computer-based test costs \$30/section (\$120 total) and will remain through 2015. GEDTS<sup>®</sup>/Pearson VUE has established this test-taker fee. Testing centers will receive payment from GEDTS<sup>®</sup> of \$5 per scheduled hour. Virginia's adult education and literacy programs may be able to offset the cost of the test through priorities identified in state funding and payment from GEDTS<sup>®</sup>. The impact of the new test fee on Virginia's adult learners will be evaluated in 2014.

Mrs. Wodiska recused herself from discussions and consideration of the GED because her employer owns the trademark and license.

Mrs. Atkinson noted that Pulaski County Public Schools has a Blue Ribbon School at Snowville Elementary.

The Board received the report of the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee.

The report is as follows:

The 2014 GED® Test on Computer

For the majority of test takers, the 2014 GED® test will be available only as a computer-based test. It will not be an online test. Test takers will report to a Pearson VUE authorized testing center in order to take the test. They will register and pay for the test using an online system. The computer skills that test takers will need to employ on the test include basic typing and manipulation of on-screen items using a mouse. This includes using drop-down menus and drag-and-drop activities, selecting or de-selecting an item by clicking on it, scrolling, and opening and closing embedded items such as the calculator.

Prospective test takers can register online to take the GED® computer-based test. They can schedule to take one or more of the four content-area tests at times that are most convenient for them. Adults without access to the Internet can contact the GED Testing Service® (GEDTS) phone support line to register for the test.

Test takers can also receive instant (unofficial) score results the same day they take the test. Score reports will incorporate a personalized study plan with correlation to test preparation curricula. The GED® test offers two score levels. The GED® Score is measured at or higher than the minimum needed to demonstrate high school equivalency-level skills and abilities. The GED® Score with Honors is measured at or higher than the minimum needed to demonstrate career and college readiness (CCR). The GED® Score with Honors indicates that the tester will likely be able to go into credit-bearing classes or be successful in a job training program.

The 2014 GED® test will be made up of four tests: Science, Social Studies, Math, and Reasoning through Language Arts. Reasoning through Language Arts (RLA) combines the former Language Arts Reading and Language Arts Writing tests into a single test. RLA will be 150 minutes (including a 10-minute break), Mathematical Reasoning 90 minutes, Science 90 minutes, and Social Studies 90 minutes. The maximum score on each test will be 200, with a minimum passing score of 150. Six hundred points will be required to pass the entire GED® test battery and earn a credential.

College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education

The 2014 GED® test meets the higher standards for high school completion as set by the College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education produced by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), the Common Core State Standards, and standards used by Texas, Virginia, and other states. Expectations for student performance will be aligned with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK), measuring task complexity as opposed to difficulty. Eighty percent of the test will be at DOK levels 2 and 3, while 20 percent will be at DOK level 1. There will be no items at DOK level 4.

Pearson VUE Authorized Testing Centers Operated by Virginia Adult Education Programs

To offer the GED® test on computer, Virginia adult education and literacy programs must become Pearson VUE Authorized Testing Centers (PVTC). To maintain a high level of test security, Pearson VUE testing centers require the use of a Web camera and digital signature pad to ensure the integrity of the test and the credential. The average cost to Virginia's adult education programs to convert to a Pearson VUE authorized GED® testing center is \$5,600. Funds for the conversion of these test centers were provided through Race to GED state grants. Ten adult education and literacy programs in Virginia have established Pearson VUE Authorized Testing Centers and are currently delivering the test on computer. Forty one adult education programs are in various stages of implementation and should be ready by January 1, 2014.

Cost of the GED® 2014 Test on Computer

The cost for the total battery of tests will remain at \$120, or \$30 per test module. The \$120 includes \$40 of compensation that is paid directly to test centers. Included in the \$120 cost are test center compensation, test registration and scheduling, provision of testing accommodations, test scoring, and data management. Beginning January 1, 2014, the GED Testing Service® will waive 100 percent of the fees for up to two retakes per failed content area test, provided those retakes occur within 12 calendar months.

#### Professional Development

The Office of Adult Education and Literacy and the Virginia Adult Learning Resource Center (VALRC) at Virginia Commonwealth University continue to provide regional workshops for teachers and program administrators on the 2014 GED<sup>®</sup> test. The OAEL provided professional development for adult educators at the Virginia Institute for Lifelong Learning at Radford University in July 2013. The VALRC provides online instruction to prepare teachers for the new content on the test. In addition, instructional videos; webinars; and a Teacher's Guide, an eight-week, self-paced course, are accessible on the GED Testing Service<sup>®</sup> Web site.

#### Waivers for Correctional Facilities to Continue with the 2002 Paper-based GED Test

GED Testing Service<sup>®</sup> has granted waivers to correctional facilities that allow the facilities to continue to use the 2002 paper-based test for a limited time while the facilities transition to computer-based testing.

### **Report on Rebenchmarking of the Direct Aid to Public Education Budget for the 2014-2016 Biennium**

Mr. Kent Dickey, deputy superintendent for finance and operations, presented this item. His presentation included the following:

- The Direct Aid to Public Education budget provides state funding to school divisions for prekindergarten through grade 12 and adult education programs. Rebenchmarking begins the biennial budget development process that involves the Board of Education, the Governor, and the General Assembly. In each odd-numbered year, the cost of the Direct Aid to Public Education budget is rebenchmarked for the next biennium. The rebenchmarked budget represents the state cost of continuing the existing Direct Aid to Public Education programs with biennial updates in the input data and formulas used to determine the cost of the programs.
- The cost projections presented in this item represent changes in funding based on standard technical revisions made to Direct Aid accounts for each year of the 2014-2016 biennium. These cost projections do not reflect any changes in policy or technical methodology. The projections are based strictly on currently approved methodologies or directives specifically approved and directed by the General Assembly and the Governor. The budget figures presented in this item represent the state cost of continuing the current Direct Aid programs in the 2014-2016 biennium with the required technical revisions and updates to input data using the approved funding methodologies. Over 30 Direct Aid accounts, both SOQ and non-SOQ, are impacted by the technical updates of the rebenchmarking process.
- The current fiscal year 2014 Direct Aid budget enacted by the 2013 General Assembly (i.e., Chapter 806) is the starting base budget against which the rebenchmarking updates are made. The rebenchmarking updates change the costs of programs off of this starting fiscal year 2014 budget base. Rebenchmarking also impacts the cost of the required local share that localities must fund for the SOQ and other Direct Aid programs with a required local match.
- The rebenchmarked 2014-2016 Direct Aid budget will be sent to the Governor for action and ultimately for inclusion in his budget for the 2014-2016 biennium. This budget will establish the level of state funding required by the foundation program established in the Standards of Quality (SOQ), as well as other Direct Aid programs. The final state cost of the 2014-2016 Direct Aid budget is dependent on final technical updates to be completed in fall 2013 and any funding policy changes affecting cost.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked for clarification of update #1 on page 7 of report.
- Mrs. Wodiska complimented Mr. Dickey and his staff. Mrs. Wodiska also noted the attachment for free lunch eligibility indicates the number has grown over the years.
- Mrs. Sears asked if there are issues the Board needs to be aware of for the future. Mr.

Dickey replied that the data is consistent from previous years and that the Virginia Retirement System will be a key cost driver in the future.

The Board received the proposed budget projections that continue current Direct Aid programs in the 2014-2016 biennium rebenchmarked for standard technical revisions. The department will update and revise costs as additional technical revisions are completed consistent with current funding methodologies.

Below is a summary of the Report on Rebenchmarking the Direct Aid to Public Education Budget for the 2014-2016 Biennium:

#### Rebenchmarking Process

- State funding for school divisions is provided through the Direct Aid Public budget to Education budget.
- Since 90% of state Direct Aid funding is for the SOQ) programs Standards of Quality (programs, most rebenchmarking impact is in the SOQ; however, Lottery, incentive, and categorical funding is also impacted.
- SOQ funding is driven primarily by the instructional staffing *Code of Virginia* and the salary standards in the and fringe benefit costs for the required instructional positions. Basic Aid also includes funding for support positions and non-personal support costs on a “prevailing cost” basis.

#### Rebenchmarking Process

- The Direct Aid budget is “rebenchmarked” each biennium to recognize changes in costs over the preceding biennium.
- The rebenchmarked budget represents the state cost of continuing the current Direct Aid programs into the next biennium with updates to input data used in the formulas.
- Rebenchmarking updates are technical in nature and do not involve changes in policy or funding methodology.
- Costs are projected forward for projected changes in enrollment, salaries, inflation, and other factors.
- The cost of the rebenchmarked budget is built off of the base Direct Aid budget from the previous biennium. The current FY14 budget (Chapter 806) is the base against which the rebenchmarking cost for each year of the 2014-2016 biennium (FY15 & FY16) is calculated.
- The process updates the cost of SOQ and other Direct Aid accounts step-by-step using the latest data available, isolating the cost of each update in incremental fashion. It involves 25 or more steps, each which can increase or decrease cost.
- Rebenchmarking also impacts the required local share that localities must fund for the SOQ and other Direct Aid programs with a local match.

#### State Cost to Date

- The state cost (above the FY14 base) of the rebenchmarking updates completed to date is \$165.5 million in FY15 and \$185.2 million in FY16, for a 2014-2016 biennial total of \$350.6 million. The state cost of the 2012-2014 rebenchmarking at this stage was \$226.1 million.
- The cost of rebenchmarking for 2014-2016 is higher due to: higher funded salaries by recognizing the FY14 2% increase; lower federal revenue deduct per pupil; less one-time spending removed; higher pupil transportation costs; smaller decrease in CTE enrollment and special education child; and higher ADM/Fall Memb.

Pending Updates

- Several data updates to Lottery-funded and Categorical accounts are pending and are likely to increase costs further.
- Also, the following updates will be completed this fall and included in the Governor's 2014-2016 introduced budget released in December:
  - ✓ Revised composite index for 2014-2016
  - ✓ Additional revisions to enrollment projections
  - ✓ Revised Sales Tax and Lottery revenue projections
  - ✓ Revised VRS rates

**Report on Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning and Resources to Support Early Learning in Virginia**

Mrs. Cheryl Strobel, associate director of early childhood education, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- In 2001, the Department of Education developed the document, *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning: Guidelines for Literacy and Mathematics*. The purpose of the document was to provide early childhood educators a set of guidelines for literacy and mathematics with indicators of success for entering kindergarten students. A committee of Department of Education specialists, literacy and mathematics professors from Virginia universities, and public and private preschool teachers and administrators developed the guidelines using current scientifically-based research. The guidelines reflected a consensus of children's conceptual learning, acquisition of basic knowledge, and participation in meaningful and relevant learning experiences.
- During the 2004 session of the Virginia General Assembly, language was added to the Appropriation Act for the At-Risk Four-Year-Old Program (The Virginia Preschool Initiative) requiring the Department of Education to establish academic standards that are in accordance with appropriate preparation for students to be ready to successfully enter kindergarten. The additional language required that these standards be established in such a manner as to be measurable for student achievement and success. In order to comply with these requirements, the Department of Education convened a committee of Department of Education specialists and preschool teachers and administrators to review and update *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning for Literacy and Mathematics*.
- During the spring and summer of 2005, the Department of Education convened a committee of department specialists and preschool teachers and administrators to develop preschool standards for four-year-olds in the areas of science, and history and social science. The result of their work was the document *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning: Standards for Science, and History and Social Science*. In 2006, the Department of Education developed preschool standards for four-year-olds in the areas of physical and motor and personal and social development.
- While *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning* are often referred to as "preschool standards," they are not considered Standards of Learning and do not require action from the Board.
- During the winter of 2012 and spring of 2013, the Department of Education developed the final standards for four-year-olds in the areas of music and visual arts. They were developed and reviewed by Department specialists, preschool and kindergarten teachers, school administrators, parents, stakeholders, and professors of higher education. The other content areas were also reviewed and updated to align with the revised kindergarten Standards of Learning (SOL) in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and history and social science.
- The preschool standards align with *Virginia's Kindergarten Standards of Learning*. *Virginia's Preschool*

*Curriculum Review Rubric and Planning Tool* was updated to include music and the visual arts. The purpose is to help early childhood teachers identify and choose curricula that are based on scientific research and that align with *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning*. *Virginia's Quality Indicators for Responsive Teaching* is a new technical assistance tool that complements the preschool standards and the rubric. The purpose of the indicators is to help teachers and parents design environments, materials, and interactions that will support children's learning. Each section correlates with *Virginia's Foundation Blocks for Early Learning*. All three documents are available online at [http://www.doe.virginia.gov/instruction/early\\_childhood/index.shtml](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/instruction/early_childhood/index.shtml).

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Edwards expressed disappointment to hear during public comment that 30 percent of the Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) funds go unused.
- Mrs. Atkinson and Mrs. Wodiska indicated their appreciation of the report.
- Mrs. Edwards asked if Virginia will apply for the Race to the Top Grant, discussed during public comment. Dr. Wright said the decision will be made by the Governor's office.
- Mr. Foster noted that during public comment, one of the reasons for nonparticipation of VPI was described as lack of school space. Mrs. Strobel clarified that each school division can choose where to house VPI programs, and that they can be nonschool spaces.
- Mr. Braunlich requested a copy of the study mentioned during public comment, "The Differential Effects of Preschool: Evidence from Virginia" by Francis Huang, Marcia Invernizzi, Allison Drake and UVA's Curry School of Education.
- Mr. Braunlich asked how many providers participate in the VPI program. Mrs. Strobel indicated there are 115 private providers and less than a dozen school divisions participating in the VPI program.

The Board accepted the report.

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

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, September 25, 2013, at the Crowne Plaza Richmond Downtown with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mrs. Beamer, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Edwards, Mrs. Sears, and Mr. Foster. Dr. Patricia Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction, also attended the meeting. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:00 p.m.

### ***ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Foster adjourned the meeting at 1:46 p.m.



---

President