

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

January 22, 2015

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:

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Dr. Oktay Baysal
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.

Mr. James H. Dillard
Mrs. Darla Edwards
Mr. Sal Romero, Jr.
Mrs. Joan Wodiska

Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Braunlich asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2014, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

RESOLUTION/RECOGNITION

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to Virginia Superintendent of the Year, Dr. Patrick Murphy, Arlington County Public Schools.

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to Virginia's 2015 Regional Teachers of the Year and Virginia Teacher of the Year:

- Region I, Tara Brunyansky, Chesterfield County Public Schools
- Region II, Bevin Reinen, Virginia Beach City Public Schools
- Region III, Jennifer Worrell, Gloucester County Public Schools
- Region IV and Virginia Teacher of the Year, Jaclyn Roller Ryan, Shenandoah County

Public Schools

- Region V, Gerin Martin, Lynchburg City Public Schools
- Region VI, Matthew Newton, Roanoke City Public Schools
- Region VII, Mark Merz, Smyth County Public Schools
- Region VIII, Kelly Jones, Greensville County Public Schools

A Resolution of Appreciation for Outstanding Leadership and Service to Public Education was presented to Winsome E. Sears, Virginia Board of Education Member, 2011-2015 and vice president, 2014-2015.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Meg Gruber, spoke on *Computer Science Standards of Learning*
- Murali Balaji, spoke on *History Standards of Learning* revisions
- Nicole Dooley, spoke on *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines* revisions
- Ben Kiser, spoke on VASS Blueprint for the Future of Public Education
- Chris Dovi, spoke on *Computer Science Standards of Learning*
- Sandra Brooks, spoke on prayer in schools
- Sarah Finley, spoke on *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*
- Cathy Hix, spoke on *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*
- Meredith Rapp, spoke on *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*
- Lynne Bland, spoke on *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*
- Adam Wallach, spoke on *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Cannaday made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the Literary Fund as of September 30, 2014

Final Review of Proposed Guidelines for Using Supplementary Written Materials to Teach the Documents of Virginia History and the United States Constitution as Required by HB 197 of the 2014 General Assembly

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the Guidelines for Using Supplementary Written Materials to Teach the Documents of Virginia History and the United States Constitution. The guidelines will be communicated to school divisions and used in instructional planning this school year.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Final Review of Memoranda of Understanding as Required of Schools in Accreditation Denied Status for Newport News City Public Schools and Norfolk City Public Schools

Mrs. Beverly Rabil, director for school improvement, presented this item. Dr. Samuel King, division superintendent, represented Norfolk City Public Schools. Mrs. Rabil’s presentation included the following:

- The following schools are in *Accreditation Denied* status for the first time in 2014-2015 and are subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through an MOU between the VBOE and the local school boards (Attachments A1-A3).

Name of Division	Name of Schools in Accreditation Denied Status
Newport News City Public Schools	Newsome Park Elementary School
Newport News City Public Schools	Sedgefield Elementary School
Norfolk City Public Schools	Booker T. Washington High School

- The following schools, newly identified as Accreditation Denied, have also been identified as priority schools or a persistently low-achieving Title I school in reading/language arts and mathematics combined as defined by the U. S. Department of Education (USED) Flexibility Waiver for the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*.

Division	School	Year Identified based on Assessment Data in the Previous Year	2014-15 Priority Status
Newport News City Public Schools	Newsome Park Elementary School	2012-2013	Year 3 Priority
Newport News City Public Schools	Sedgefield Elementary School	2012-2013	Year 3 Priority

- A corrective action plan for each of these schools must be submitted to the Board of Education by February 15, 2015.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the Memoranda of Understanding with the Newport News City School Board for Newsome Park Elementary and Sedgefield Elementary Schools and with the Norfolk City School Board for Booker T. Washington High School. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed History and Social Science Standards of Learning

Ms. Christonya Brown, history and social science coordinator, presented this item. Ms. Brown’s presentation included the following:

- New academic content *Standards of Learning* for history and social science were first developed in 1995. They were revised in 2001 and again in 2008. The *Standards of Quality* require the Board of Education to review the *Standards of Learning* on a regular schedule. The *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* are scheduled for review in 2015. In accordance with the plan, the Department of Education took

the following steps to produce a final draft of the *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* for the Board's final review:

- ✓ Received online comments regarding the 2008 *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators;
- ✓ Met with a teacher review committee on July 7 – 10, 2014, to review the public comments, consider other related resources, and develop a proposed draft of revised *Standards of Learning*;
- ✓ Met with a committee of external stakeholders representing institutions of higher education, museums, professional organizations, and other organizations with an interest in history and social science on August 21, 2014, to review and comment on the work of the teacher review committee;
- ✓ Received over 360 comments via the online mailbox for review and consideration to the proposed revised *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* presented to the Board on October 23, 2014, from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators summarized below. The majority of public comments related to the restructuring of the Kindergarten through Grade Three content and the alignment of the Essential Skills;
- ✓ The Virginia Board of Education held five public hearings to solicit comments on the proposed revised *History and Social Science Standards of Learning*. There were a total of 32 speakers and 24 written comments collected with an estimated attendance of 150 citizens. The public hearings were held at historical sites December 2 – 4, 2014 and January 6, 2015 at Thomas Jefferson's Monticello, Charlottesville; Edith Bolling Wilson Hotel, Wytheville; George Washington's Mount Vernon, Mount Vernon; Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg; and Virginia Union University, Richmond;
- ✓ The major elements of the proposed revised *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* include the following:
 - Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, rigor, alignment of skills and content, and to reflect current academic research and practice;
 - Addition of a specific skill set for the Kindergarten through Grade Three courses and realignment of essential skills to prepare students for college and career readiness;
 - Restructuring of the Kindergarten through Grade Three content to reflect a student's sphere of learning; and
 - Increase in international and global emphasis.

The discussion included:

- The Board was concerned that teachers will not have enough time to adjust to the new standards and asked for clarification of the implementation schedule. Dr. Staples said the goal is to have both the standards and curriculum framework to teachers by the fall of 2015 so items could be field-tested; and this will give teachers approximately a year and a half to begin to look at how lesson plans will change to accommodate the new expectations of the standards.
- Mrs. Sears asked how this will affect year-round schools. Dr. Staples said year-round schools will also receive field-test items by the fall of 2015.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that the implementation schedule will give school divisions only a year to prepare for the new standards.
- Mr. Braunlich asked for clarification of the training process for school divisions.
- Dr. Staples emphasized that TeacherDirect will be able to provide initial implementation information such as lessons and models of the new standards.
- Mr. Braunlich asked if Webinars will be available for teachers to utilize.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked staff to expound on the professional development that will be provided for the new standards and ongoing training.
- Mrs. Atkinson said public comments from the disability community made at the public hearing in Richmond were not included in the report on public hearings in the Board

notebooks. Mrs. Atkinson said representatives from the disability community requested the Board to include the movement related to disability along with discrimination and civil rights movements in that section of the document. Staff acknowledged that it is on page 52 of the document. Mrs. Atkinson suggested that education issues also be included with the American with Disabilities Act in the document.

- Mrs. Sears suggested using the word “impact” instead of “contribution” on page 18 of the document which will allow students to determine the nature of the contribution.
- Mrs. Sears noted that section VUS.15 on page 52 has not been relocated in the document as indicated.
- Mrs. Sears asked for an example of the curriculum framework for section CE.4, page 27, of the document.
- Mr. Dillard said the Committee on Civics Education saw a lack of skills in Political Science and participatory democracy in the state standards. Mr. Dillard said The Committee on Civics Education has worked with Department of Education staff to develop a set of government skills that will be helpful to teachers and students.
- Mr. Braunlich said the Board takes seriously the issue of government and civics education.

The Board agreed to delay voting on the proposed revised *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* for a month to allow additional editing of the document.

Final Review of Proposed Health Education, Physical Education, and Driver Education Standards of Learning

Mrs. Vanessa Wigand, health, physical education, and driver education specialist, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

On October 23, 2014, the Board of Education accepted the proposed revised standards for first review. The Board held five public hearings with approximately 150 citizens attending. A total of 19 individuals presented and provided written comments on the proposed revised *Health Education Standards of Learning, Physical Education Standards of Learning and Driver Education Standards of Learning*. In addition to the comments received at the public hearings, a total of 198 comments were received electronically. All comments were carefully considered and suggestions were incorporated into the draft standards as appropriate.

The feedback for all disciplines was largely positive and indicated that the standards reflected high-quality instruction and current best practice. The proposed health education standards were praised for being comprehensive and addressing the physical, mental, emotional, and social aspects of health. In addition, the following are concerns and priorities of constituents who submitted comments:

- ✓ Include sleep and sleep hygiene at every grade level;
- ✓ Add human trafficking;
- ✓ Emphasize emotional, mental, and behavioral disorders to reduce the stigma associated with these disorders;
- ✓ Add more suicide and bullying standards;
- ✓ Identify the three categories of drugs most commonly misused/abused as illicit, prescription, and over-the-counter;
- ✓ Include other tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes, hookah, and flavored products;
- ✓ Include physical activity as it relates to overall health at every grade level;
- ✓ Advocate for additional support for elementary health instruction; and
- ✓ Create companion documents, such as frameworks and pacing guides, to facilitate implementation.

The proposed physical education standards were praised for reflecting a comprehensive approach to learning, and more accurately describing the developmental nature of understanding human movement learning, and more accurately describing the developmental nature of understanding human movement concepts and attainment of skills. In particular, the following areas were commended:

- ✓ Thoroughness of the standards
- ✓ Emphasis on energy balance as essential to understanding energy intake and output for healthy body weight
- ✓ Skill progressions are progressive, age appropriate, and scaffold for success and enjoyment of lifelong activity
- ✓ Addition of personal training and other fitness industry certifications

The major elements of the proposed revised *Health Education Standards of Learning* include:

- ✓ Revisions to enhance clarity, specificity, and alignment of skill and content
- ✓ Revisions to reflect performance expectations that are sequential and developmental
- ✓ Revisions to organize the strand titles to reflect current academic research and practice
- ✓ Addition of standards for sleep
- ✓ Addition of preface

The major elements of the proposed revised *Physical Education Standards of Learning* include:

- ✓ Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, and alignment of skill and content
- ✓ Edits to reflect performance expectations that are sequential and developmental
- ✓ Edits to organize the strand titles to reflect current academic research and practice
- ✓ Addition of preface and safety sections
- ✓ Addition of personal training and other fitness industry certifications

The major elements of the proposed revised *Driver Education Standards of Learning* include:

- ✓ Revisions to enhance clarity, specificity, and alignment of skill and content
- ✓ Revisions to reflect performance expectations that are sequential and developmental
- ✓ Addition of intelligent handling and stability technology systems
- ✓ Addition of preface and safety sections

Dr. Baysal made a motion to adopt the proposed revised Health Education Standards of Learning, Physical Education Standards of Learning and Driver Education Standards of Learning and authorize the Department of Education to make clarifying and/or technical edits. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Revisions to Student Conduct Policy Guidelines Consistent with Actions by the 2014 General Assembly

Mr. John Eisenberg, assistant superintendent, division of special education and student services, presented this item. His presentation included the following:

- In response to public comment and the Board of Education’s review on November 20, 2014, the following changes were made.

Page Number	Brief Description
3	Added, “Section 22.1-254.2 of the <i>Code</i> , amended in 2014, requires that any program preparing students to pass a high school equivalency examination must be approved by the Board of Education”
12	Added “a school administrator, as directed by school board policy, or”

22	Edit outdated verbiage, deleted the sample conduct standard language
----	--

- As requested by the Board of Education, the Office of the Attorney General reviewed the changes to the *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines* regarding weapons and drug offenses. The Office of the Attorney General found the new language to be a correct interpretation of the amended § 22.1-277.07 *Expulsion of students under circumstances; exceptions* and § 22.1-277.08 *Expulsion of students for certain drug offenses*.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson thanked staff for referring the document to the Office of Attorney General for review regarding weapons and drug offenses.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve the revised *Student Conduct Policy Guidelines* with amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dillard and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Revisions to Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes, as Required by House Bills 410 and 1096, and Senate Bill 172 of the 2014 General Assembly

Mrs. Vanessa Wigand, health, physical education and driver education specialist, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- A wide variety of stakeholders and constituents assisted with the revision to the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes*. As specified in enactment clause three of § [22.1-271.5](#), the Board of Education worked with the Virginia High School League, the Department of Health, the Virginia Athletic Trainers Association, representatives of the Children’s Hospital of the King’s Daughters and the Children’s National Medical Center, the Brain Injury Association of Virginia, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Virginia College of Emergency Physicians and other interested stakeholders in conducting the research necessary for the development of attached proposed guidelines and definitions related to policies on concussion in student-athletes.
- On November 20, 2014, the Board of Education received the proposed revised guidelines for policies on concussions in student-athletes for first review. The attached version includes edits, highlighted using the double underline, double strikethrough method, that reflect input from the Board’s first review as well as public comments. The summary of proposed changes from first review includes: Provisions for instructional modifications for all students with a brain injury, whether an athlete or a non-athlete; Alignment of the definition for non-interscholastic youth sports programs with the language in the *Code*; and
Minor technical edits.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussion in Student-Athletes*. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed Guidelines for the Use of Computer Science Courses to Satisfy Graduation Requirements Developed in Response to House Bill 1054 of the 2014 General Assembly

Mr. Eric Rhoades, director of office of science and health education presented this item. His presentation included the following:

- The Virginia Department of Education conducted a review of existing options for computer science coursework and the role of this coursework in meeting graduation credits in mathematics, laboratory science, and career and technical education. Currently, Advanced Placement (AP) Computer Science A is approved by the Virginia Board of Education as a mathematics course (standard credit); however, the AP assessment is not a substitute assessment for a mathematics verified credit. AP Computer Science A has been historically grouped with mathematics courses due to the role of the high school mathematics endorsement in teaching those courses. In the area of career and technical education (since 2000), students scoring a three or above on the AP Computer Science A examination earn the equivalent of a career and technical education credential. AP Computer Science has no parallel standing in the Board-approved laboratory sciences due to it not being a biological or physical science.
- Since the proposed *Guidelines for the Use of Computer Science Courses to Satisfy Graduation Requirements* were reviewed at the November 20, 2014, meeting, the following changes were made:
A statement regarding the role of school counselors in advising students and parents.
Revisions that allow Computer Science A to satisfy mathematics, laboratory science, or career and technical education graduation requirements as a standard credit regardless of the diploma type.

The discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich and Mrs. Atkinson thanked staff for their work on the document.
- Dr. Baysal clarified the definition of computer science and lab science.

Dr. Cannaday made a motion to approve the proposed *Guidelines for the Use of Computer Science Courses to Satisfy Graduation Requirements*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

First Review of Recommendation to Discontinue State Review of Foreign Language Textbooks

Dr. Lisa Harris, foreign language specialist, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The Board of Education's authority for approving textbooks and other instructional materials is prescribed in the Virginia Constitution and the *Code of Virginia*.

Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, § 5 (d)

It [the Board of Education] shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.

Code of Virginia, § 22.1-238

- A. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public schools and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools. The Board shall publish a list of all approved textbooks on its website and shall list the publisher and the current lowest wholesale price of such textbooks.
- B. Any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board.
- C. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "textbooks" means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.

- The Board of Education's current textbook regulations state the following:

Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption, 8 VAC 20-220-30

Only those materials which are designed to provide basic support for the instructional program of a particular content area at an

appropriate level will be adopted.

- *Virginia's Textbook Review Process* was revised and approved by the Virginia Board of Education on March 24, 2011. The current document states in *Section II: Initiating the Textbook Review Process*:
- The Board will approve textbooks for, but not limited to, the four core subjects of English, mathematics, science, and history and social science.
- Prior to this change, the Board of Education approved the current list of state-approved foreign language textbooks in 2005 following revisions to the *Foreign Language Standards of Learning*. The Board of Education approves the textbook review process and determines the schedule for approval of specific content area textbooks. The Virginia Department of Education administers the review process on behalf of the Board of Education.
- Local school boards may approve textbooks that are not on the Board-approved list. In accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, §22.1-238, any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board. Local school boards that choose to approve textbooks that are not on the Board-approved list are required to engage in a process similar to the Board's new process, where they request certifications of accuracy from publishers.

The Board accepted for first review the discontinuation of state reviews of foreign language textbooks for the current review cycle. The Board will defer discussion and adoption of this item until the February meeting.

First Review of Revised Board of Education Meeting Dates for the 2015 Calendar Year

Mrs. Melissa Luchau, board relations director, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The Board of Education approved its meeting dates for the 2015 calendar year October 23, 2014, as follows:
 - Thursday, January 22
 - Thursday, February 26
 - Thursday, March 26
 - Wednesday-Thursday, April 22-23
 - Thursday, May 28
 - Thursday, June 25
 - Thursday, July 23
 - Thursday, September 17
 - Thursday, October 22
 - Thursday, November 19
- The proposed September 17, 2015, meeting date took into consideration both the UCI Road World Championships which will take place in Richmond September 19-27, 2015, and Rosh Hashana (starts sundown September 13, 2015) and Yom Kippur (starts sundown September 22, 2015). However, upon further exploration, overnight lodging cannot be secured at downtown Richmond hotels for the week of September 14, 2015, and roads may be closed in advance of the cycling race for teams to practice.
- Due to the travel disruptions for Board members and members of the public trying to attend the September 17, 2015, Board of Education meeting, it is proposed that the meeting date be moved to September 10, 2015.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to waive first review and approve the revised September 2015 meeting date as September 10, 2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dillard and carried

unanimously.

Annual Progress Report on Memoranda of Understanding for Alexandria City Public Schools and Norfolk City Public Schools as Required for Schools in Accreditation Denied Status

Mrs. Beverly Rabil, school improvement director, presented this item. Mrs. Rabil'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:

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:

1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;
 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
 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.
- B. 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 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.
- C. 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.

The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:

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.
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.

- Jefferson Houston Elementary School is in *Accreditation Denied* status for 2014-2015 and is subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the VBOE and the Alexandria City School Board.
- Lindenwood Elementary School and Ruffner Middle School are in *Accreditation Denied* status for 2014-2015 and are subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through an MOU between the VBOE and the Norfolk City School Board.

Technical Assistance

All schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will participate in the Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE) technical assistance from the Virginia Department of Education. The purpose of this technical assistance is to improve instruction and instructional leadership practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals included in teacher and principal evaluation and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools used as a part of the academic review for schools not fully accredited. Technical assistance will focus on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in selected Teacher and Principal Performance Standards. The sample evidence for each performance indicator will become a tool that can enhance the division's observation tools by providing specific samples of evidence that staff can look for in classroom observations and walkthroughs. Principals,

appropriate division staff, and state contractors will conduct inter-rater reliability monthly walkthroughs and/or formal observations three times between October and February. (Inter-rater reliability deals with consistency between the evidence-collection of two or more observers.) Division staff will support and monitor principals' delivery of professional development on the sets of sample evidence developed to appropriate school staff. Outcomes/next steps will be identified at each session. Contractors will be assigned to each school as a part of the AARPE technical assistance.

Using research-based indicators that lead to increased student achievement is imperative for school improvement. Schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will provide quarterly data reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI) on mutually determined school-level data points. Divisions will meet quarterly with the Office of School Improvement to review quarterly report data and collaboratively determine next steps.

Historically, the School Improvement Plan has served as the Corrective Action Plan for schools rated *Denied Accreditation*. Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, a new Corrective Action Plan template will be used by schools rated *Denied Accreditation* (Attachment D1). The Office of School Improvement will provide technical assistance to school divisions on developing the essential actions for each school's Corrective Action Plan. Asset mapping and selected Essential Actions resulting from Academic Reviews will be a part of each school's corrective action plan. The OSI staff will assist in reviewing Essential Actions to determine those needed in the corrective action plan. The OSI staff will provide technical assistance in using the asset mapping tool and in determining next steps.

Priority schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will participate in specified technical assistance delivered by the Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) in accordance with the school's contract with the LTP.

Dr. Alvin Crawley, superintendent, presented the progress report for Alexandria City Public Schools. Other representatives from Alexandria City included Dr. Terri Mazingo, chief academic officer, Clinton Page, chief accountability officer, Dr. Lisa Piehota, director of elementary programs, Natalie Mitchell, director of Title I, and Dr. Christopher Phillips, principal, Jefferson-Houston Elementary.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears questioned the data charts containing pass rates in the Board notebook. Mrs. Rabil clarified that the data charts used by Alexandria City during their presentation are from State Report Card and the data charts in the Board notebooks is federal accountability data. Mrs. Rabil said the discrepancy is that there is no recovery in the federal data and reading and writing data are combined. Mrs. Rabil verified that the data from the State Report Card is correct and the data in the Board notebook is federal accountability data and that they are two sets of data. Mrs. Rabil said in moving to full accreditation data in the State Report Card will be used. Mrs. Atkinson said she prefers their data because the Board allows for recovery. Dr. Cannaday said if they are going to use a growth model recovery becomes instrumental to that work.
- Mr. Dillard asked Alexandria City how they handle the issue of principles spending more time handling disciplinary problems versus in the classroom.
- Mrs. Sears asked what the school division is doing to engage students and parents during the summer months. Mrs. Sears commended Alexandria City Schools with their overall engagement with parents.
- Mrs. Edwards asked Alexandria City about their community outreach initiatives. Mrs. Edwards also encouraged the superintendent to apply for the National Family Engagement Contest in Virginia.

- Mr. Braunlich asked the superintendent how he plans to recover enrollment by bringing students back.
- Mr. Braunlich asked Alexandria City what they look for when hiring teachers and what is done to make them stay.
- Dr. Cannaday observed that the structure is aligned in a way that if they stay the course they will get to where they want to be. Dr. Cannaday noted that the superintendent has a new staff and asked him to report back to the Board on how teachers are doing, what was learned, and what worked for the school division.
- Mrs. Wodiska complimented Alexandria City on the clear focus of their activities, the alignment of those activities to their goal, the use of data, parental engagement, professional development and additional attention of after-school programs. Mrs. Wodiska asked what more could the State Board do to assist them. Dr. Crawley said they need resources to continue to do the work, continued state staff assistance, and support of OSI.

Dr. Samuel King, division superintendent, presented the progress report for Norfolk City Public Schools. Other representatives from Norfolk City included Dr. Sharon Byrdsong, chief of staff, Lauren Campsen, chief academic officer, and Dr. Sherrod Wilaford, executive director for home improvement.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears noted that several teacher performances were below proficiency but were returning to teach. Mrs. Sears asked if parents are aware of this information so they can have more content of what's going on in the school division.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked the percentage of students above proficient.
- Dr. Cannaday said cut scores vary based on the flexibility of the discipline and how many items you have to pass in order to be measured as proficient. Dr. Cannaday said to make sure the local assessment matches the state pass rate.
- Mr. Braunlich said the Board is looking for a sense of where students in Norfolk are, what is planned for students over the course of the next three years, and how this will help student achievement. Mr. Braunlich asked what programs Norfolk City is putting in place at the school level to get students where they need to be.
- Mr. Dillard requested an explanation of the pass rates at Ruffner Middle School because according to the federal accountability pass rate reading, writing, science, and history dropped whereas mathematics remained the same. Dr. King explained that the audit revealed that teachers were teaching from an old scoping sequence not the new. Dr. King said Norfolk is now training teachers by the new curriculum that is aligned with what students should know and be able to do. Dr. King said they are in the second year of implementation of the new curriculum.
- Mr. Braunlich noted that this is the kind of information that Board members are looking for—the problem was the scoping sequence, the answer was to revise the scoping sequence and that the training that will lead Board members to the conclusion that the outcome will be different from what they have been.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked what Norfolk is doing in terms of strategy and if it is not working

what is being done. Mrs. Wodiska encouraged Norfolk to look at other school districts in Virginia and other states that have been successful in turning schools around.

- Mrs. Sears noted that it seems as if a lot of people are making input into the decision-making going on in the schools in Norfolk and noted that the superintendent is the one held accountable.
- Mrs. Sears asked where Norfolk stands now based on assessments.

The Board received the annual progress report for Jefferson Houston Elementary School, Alexandria City Public Schools; William H. Ruffner Middle School and Lindenwood Elementary School, Norfolk City Public Schools as required for schools in *Accreditation Denied* Status.

Annual Progress Report on Memoranda of Understanding for Petersburg City Schools and Sussex County Schools as Required for Divisions Under Division Level Review

Mrs. Beverly Rabil presented this item. Mrs. Rabil'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:

- 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:
1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;
 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
 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.
- B. 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 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.

The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:

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.
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.

- In 2004, the Petersburg City School Board requested a division level academic review. Petersburg City Public Schools and the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) signed an initial MOU detailing the review process on April 21, 2004. Based on the 2005-2006 assessment results, Petersburg City Public Schools entered into a second Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on November 20, 2006. On November 17,

2009, the Virginia Board of Education 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. An updated corrective action plan was approved by the VBOE on October 24, 2013.

- Sussex County Public Schools was identified for division-level review status in 2004 and entered into an initial MOU with the VBOE. On September 17, 2009, Sussex County Public Schools appeared before the VBOE to enter into a second MOU for Sussex County Public Schools. This MOU was in effect until all schools were *Fully Accredited* or the VBOE released Sussex County Public Schools from the MOU.
- In 2013-2014, Sussex County Public Schools consolidated its elementary and middle schools and closed three schools. Sussex County Public Schools now has three schools on one campus: Sussex Central Elementary School, grades K-5; Sussex Central Middle School, grades 6-8; and Sussex Central High School, grades 9-12. Because of the change in school configuration, an updated corrective action plan and MOU were required

Technical Assistance

Sussex County Public Schools and Petersburg City Public Schools will participate in the Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE) technical assistance from the Virginia Department of Education. The purpose of this technical assistance is to improve instruction and instructional leadership practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals included in teacher and principal evaluation and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools used as a part of the academic review for schools not fully accredited. Technical assistance will focus on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in selected Teacher and Principal Performance Standards. The sample evidence for each performance indicator will become a tool that can enhance the division's observation tools by providing specific samples of evidence that staff can look for in classroom observations and walkthroughs. Principals, appropriate division staff, and state contractors will conduct inter-rater reliability monthly walkthroughs and/or formal observations three times between October and February. (Inter-rater reliability deals with consistency between the evidence-collection of two or more observers.) Division staff will support and monitor principals' delivery of professional development on the sets of sample evidence developed to appropriate school staff. Outcomes/next steps will be identified at each session. Contractors will be assigned to each school as a part of the AARPE technical assistance.

Using research-based indicators that lead to increased student achievement is imperative for school improvement. School divisions with a division MOU will provide quarterly data reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI) on mutually determined school-level data points. Divisions will meet quarterly with the Office of School Improvement to review quarterly report data and collaboratively determine next steps.

Asset mapping will be a part of each school's technical assistance. The OSI staff will provide technical assistance in using the asset mapping tool and in determining next steps.

Priority schools will participate in specified technical assistance delivered by the Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) in accordance with the school's contract with the LTP.

Dr. Joseph Melvin, superintendent, presented the progress report for Petersburg City Public Schools. Other representatives from Petersburg City Schools included Kenneth Pritchett, school board chairman, Stephanie Bassett, assistant superintendent, Dr. Shawnell Blackwell, director of federal programs, and Annie Harman, chief academic officer.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears noted that Petersburg City has teachers performing below proficient but are returning to the classroom. Dr. Melvin said those teachers are on an improvement

- plan for the current school year and if this does not work out they will not return.
- Mrs. Sears asked how a fully licensed teacher is not proficient. Dr. Staples clarified that having a license indicates the person is eligible to be hired but it does not mean they should be hired—the input requirements were met but having a license does not automatically make a teacher highly qualified. Dr. Staples said the evaluation of teacher skills determines proficiency rating.
 - Dr. Cannaday said school divisions use local assessments to show progress and as a predictor of how well they will likely do on SOL tests. Dr. Cannaday asked if state staff can assist school divisions by collecting data for them and do an analysis at the end of the academic term that would show the degree of a low, moderate, or high predictor. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that would be difficult because each school division uses a different type of benchmark. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said a better way is to assist school divisions in figuring out how to track a score on the benchmark assessments they use and determine whether or not it determines the success on the SOL test.
 - Mrs. Wodiska said this may be an opportunity for local school divisions to begin sharing information about benchmark assessments since each school division is using a different benchmark. Mrs. Wodiska said this may also be an opportunity for the state to act as a convener to note benchmarks that align well on predictors to state assessments. Dr. Staples said this is a great idea but staff would have to deal with the issue of each locality setting a different cut score within their own benchmarks.
 - Mrs. Sears said she thought the department was already in the process of investigating what is happening in school divisions since local assessments replace some SOL tests. Dr. Staples said staff is looking at the quality of local assessments replacing SOL tests but staff has not looked at locally implemented benchmarks that inform the locality as to how students are progressing as a predictor in the area where there is an SOL test.
 - Mrs. Sears asked if monies used for advertising Petersburg to attract qualified teachers is taking away from other areas that need these resources.
 - Mrs. Sears asked if there are areas where they will need assistance from Department of Education. Dr. Melvin said Petersburg has already met with state staff for assistance with science and mathematics and feel comfortable asking for help when needed.
 - Mrs. Wodiska complimented Petersburg on great leadership and congratulated them on being the first school division to receive free lunch for all students. Mrs. Wodiska asked Petersburg what Petersburg needs from the Board. Dr. Melvin said funding for schools *denied accreditation* is needed.
 - Mr. Braunlich commended Petersburg Board for staying the course.

Dr. Arthur Jarrett, superintendent, presented the progress report for Sussex County Public Schools. Other representatives from Sussex County Public Schools included M. E. Morris, school board chair, and Dr. Rodney Berry, director of instruction.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears commended Sussex on their improvement without the assistance of a lead turnaround partner.

- Mrs. Wodiska asked Sussex County their needs for professional development for teachers. Dr. Jarrett said they need state staff to identify and present a model for rigor.
- Mrs. Atkinson thanked Dr. Jarrett for the clarity of his presentation.

The Board received the annual progress report for Petersburg City Public Schools and Sussex County Public Schools as required for divisions under division-level Memorandum of Understanding.

Report on Virginia's Application for a Four-Year Renewal of Waivers from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent, division of student assessment and school accountability, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- In September 2011, the U.S. Department of Education (USED) offered states flexibility regarding specific requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction (ESEA flexibility). To be granted flexibility from ESEA requirements, states had to submit applications requesting waivers and outlining the state-developed plans to accomplish the goals above by implementing reforms aligned with the following principles:
Principle 1 – College- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments to ensure that every student graduates from high school college and career ready;
Principle 2 – Targeted and differentiated accountability systems, rigorous supports and interventions to the lowest-performing schools and schools with the lowest graduation rates, and identification of support to low-achieving students based on need; and
Principle 3 – Teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that provide teachers and principals with the feedback and support needed to improve practice and increase student achievement.
- Virginia submitted its original waiver request to USED in February 2012. After numerous amendments, [a revised ESEA flexibility application](#) was approved in March 2013. The terms of the waiver were effective for two years or through the end of the 2013-2014 school year.
- In November 2013, USED invited eligible states to request a one-year extension of ESEA flexibility through the end of the 2014-2015 school year. Virginia's [amended ESEA flexibility extension application](#) was submitted to USED in March 2014 and subsequently approved in July 2014.
- In November 2014, USED invited eligible states to request a renewal of ESEA flexibility for up to four years or through the 2018-2019 school year. A state seeking a renewal of ESEA flexibility must submit to USED a completed ESEA Flexibility Renewal Form and a redlined version of its ESEA Flexibility Renewal Application indicating: 1) updates to its implementation plan; 2) process for continuous improvement across the three flexibility principles; and 3) details of amendments to the plan, if applicable. The deadline to submit an ESEA flexibility renewal request to USED is March 31, 2015; however, Virginia is one of seven states eligible to submit its request by January 30, 2015. Virginia is opting to submit its application in January for the expedited review process, which affords the state the following critical advantages:
Establishes Virginia's position as a national leader in the development and implementation of ESEA flexibility provisions. The USED invited only those exemplary states which fully implemented the provisions of their ESEA flexibility plans according to the prescribed timelines to submit applications for an expedited review.
Ensures receipt of a fast-tracked response. The USED anticipates that states submitting ESEA flexibility renewal applications in January 2015 will receive status updates by late March 2015.

Secures Virginia's opportunity to continue implementing the ESEA waivers as approved in its ESEA flexibility application. All states not invited to participate in the January expedited review must submit renewal applications on March 31, 2015. States that fail to successfully negotiate the terms of their revised applications before the start of following school year may be forced to forfeit their ESEA waivers and renew implementation of the prescriptive requirements of NCLB.

Guarantees Virginia favorable circumstances for substantive amendments to the state's ESEA flexibility plan in the future. The review, negotiation, and approval of renewal applications from numerous states will likely strain the resources and attention of USED staff. It is in Virginia's long-term interest to wait until the ESEA flexibility renewal process has closed for all states before submitting amendments to its plan that will be carefully and intentionally designed and likely to be approved by the USED.

Positions Virginia to provide federal accountability results to school divisions in a timely fashion. Receiving approval of the ESEA flexibility renewal application in early 2015 will ensure the Virginia Department of Education is able to notify school divisions and schools as early as possible about 2015-2016 federal accountability provisions.

- In preparation to submit an ESEA flexibility renewal request, the Virginia Department of Education has completed the required ESEA Flexibility Renewal Form and redlined revisions to the ESEA Flexibility Renewal Application. Minor revisions were made to Virginia's renewal application to reflect programmatic and implementation updates across the three flexibility principles that have already been enacted. Revisions that qualify as amendments to the 2014 amended ESEA flexibility extension application are listed in the chart below:

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by the Amendment	Page Number(s) Affected in Redlined Request	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale
Update criteria for one reward school category: <i>Virginia Index of Performance (VIP) Incentives Program</i>	Page 75	Delete one award category, the Competence to Excellence Award, and add the Board of Education Distinguished Achievement Award.	These category changes reflect updates made to the VIP awards as approved by the Board of Education in 2013.
Criteria to determine if a school identified as a focus school has made sufficient progress to exit focus school status	Page 103	Delete the first exit criterion requiring that the proficiency gap group(s) for which the school was originally identified meet(s) the AMOs for two consecutive years. Maintain the criterion for the focus school to no longer fall in the bottom 10 percent of Title I schools with subgroup proficiency gaps.	Although conceptually sound, maintaining the first criterion to exit focus school status had the unintended consequence of keeping schools on the focus school list that had smaller subgroup proficiency gaps than other Title I schools demonstrating a greater need for support in this area. To be able to serve the Title I schools with the greatest gaps in subgroup proficiency, the state must use a one-step ranking method and select as focus schools those 10% with the highest gaps for subgroups as compared to the other schools.

- Additionally, Virginia is planning to begin using value tables as a measure of growth instead of student growth percentiles (SGPs) during the 2015-2016 school year. As compared to SGPs, value tables would more accurately recognize success in closing the achievement gap while providing teachers and principals with growth data more representative of the students being taught in their classroom and schools. A description of value tables and the rationale for replacing SGPs with value tables are available on pages 163-

164 of the renewal application.

- Approval by USED of Virginia's ESEA flexibility renewal request does not preclude additional amendments to the state's ESEA flexibility implementation plan. The Virginia Department of Education, on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education, will continue to engage stakeholders in discussions about continuous improvement to the state's federal accountability plan during appropriate opportunities in the future. Virginia may submit amendments to the state's federal accountability plan, as needed, following USED approval of state's ESEA flexibility renewal request.
- The Virginia Department of Education notified the public and stakeholders of the ESEA flexibility renewal process and the opportunity to provide comments on its ESEA flexibility renewal request via the distribution of a Superintendent's E-mail and posting on the Department's Web site. The public and stakeholders were also invited to provide comment at the January meetings of the Virginia Board of Education and its Committee on School and Division Accountability. Also, the Department held a meeting of the ESEA Committee of Practitioners on January 15, 2015, seeking input on its ESEA flexibility renewal request.

The discussion included:

- Dr. Staples said staff decision to go for an expedited waiver should not be confused with the belief that they like everything that is in the current waiver. Dr. Staples said the intent is to go for an expedited waiver because it makes more sense procedurally because it allows staff to get a waiver approved so that the default is not back to ESEA *No Child Left Behind* but the default is to the current waiver. Dr. Staples said The Council of Chief State School Officers and USED said to use this process to allow them time to hear substantive discussions regarding issues staff would like to see changed in the waiver. Dr. Staples said staff recommendation for change coincides with forty-three other state applications for waivers and are likely to be dispatched quickly with a "no" because USED cannot process it.
- Mrs. Atkinson clarified that once the expedited waiver is approved it will allow Virginia to request amendments to the waiver.

The Board accepted the report.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Mr. Braunlich noted that the Board has made decisions on several issues of concern. They are as follows:

- Issue #1 - restraint and seclusion in public schools in Virginia
The Board of Education passed regulations for private schools that take publicly placed students and made those regulations run parallel with the Department of Social Services. In addition, the Board issued voluntary guidelines to all school divisions. There is evidence from recent occurrences that these guidelines are not enough. Virginia is one of a handful of states that has guidelines and not regulations on the issue of restraint and seclusion. Although there is legislation working its way through the General Assembly that will direct the Board of Education to begin its process of regulations on the issues of restraint and seclusion, Board members asked Dr. Staples to begin the NOIRA (Notice of Intended Regulatory Action) process so the Board can

begin creating guidelines next month. The Board does not feel they should wait on the General Assembly and want to make certain regulations are effective, efficient and will work.

- Issue #2 - Revised *Standards of Accreditation* (SOA) issued in October 2013
The Board withdrew the revised *Standards of Accreditation* and will open it up again for discussion of changes at the April Retreat with the intention of having a document by June.

Mr. Braunlich asked Mrs. Atkinson, chairman of the Board of Education Accountability Committee, to outline future discussions of the Board with timelines. Mrs. Atkinson said she has asked Board members in the next few accountability committee meetings to have presentations that will inform the Board better about issues to be considered when revising the SOA in the terms of the accountability system and the Report Card. Mrs. Atkinson said in February the Board will look at the current Report Card including what is required by *Code of Virginia* and federal government and models from other states to make it a better communication tool for communities, teachers, parents, and students. In March the Board will look at how other states use growth measures, the original proposal of the SOA to decide whether to make more changes or eliminate certain proposals,

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, January 21, 2015, at the Crowne Plaza Richmond Downtown Hotel, with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Edwards, Mr. Romero, Mrs. Sears, and Mrs. Wodiska. Dr. Steven Staples, Superintendent of Public Instruction, also attended the meeting. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mrs. Sears made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* § 2.2-3711(A)(41), for the purpose of discussion and consideration of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses, and, under *Virginia Code* § 2.2-3711(A)(7), to consult with counsel and receive legal advice regarding the same, and that Wendell Roberts, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education, as well as staff members, Dr. Steven Staples, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, and Mark Saunders, participate in this closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 3:55 p.m.

Mrs. Sears made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkins and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 5.25 p.m.

Mrs. Sears 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 of the Freedom of Information Act were discussed and (2) only matters identified in the motion to have the closed session were discussed. The motion was seconded by Mrs.

Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mr. Dillard – Yes
Dr. Baysal – Yes
Mrs. Sears – Yes
Mr. Braunlich – Yes
Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Mrs. Wodiska – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Christopher James Brydge. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Jason Scott Chambers. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to revoke the license of Robert Stephen Bliley. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion not to revoke the license in Case #3. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to issue a license in Case #5 upon completion of all applicable licensure requirements. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and passed with five “yes” votes. Dr. Cannaday recused himself from voting and Mrs. Wodiska voted “no”.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to deny a license to Eric James Slater. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Braunlich adjourned the meeting at 5:52 p.m.



President