The Board of 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. Darla Edwards
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., Vice President  Mrs. Elizabeth Lodal
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson  Mr. Sal Romero, Jr.
Dr. Oktay Baysal  Mrs. Joan Wodiska
Mr. James H. Dillard  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

Dr. Baysal made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 22-23, 2015, meeting of Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITIONS

➢ A Resolution of Recognition was presented to the recipient of the 2015 Milken Family Foundation National Educator Award: Angie Wytovich, Buckland Mills Elementary School, Prince William County Public Schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

• Jennifer Carson, spoke on criteria for awarding the Seal of Biliteracy
• Randy O’Neill, spoke on K-12 health education
• Linda Szwabowski, spoke on criteria for awarding the Seal of Biliteracy
Final Review of Requests for Alternative Accreditation Plans from Arlington County Public Schools and Richmond City Public Schools

Mrs. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Rabil’s presentation included the following:

- The following school divisions are seeking renewal of the alternative accreditation plans for the following special purpose schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>2012-2013 Accreditation Status Based on Assessment Data 2011-2012</th>
<th>2013-2014 Accreditation Status Based on Assessment Data 2012-2013</th>
<th>2014-2015 Accreditation Status Based on Assessment Data 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington County Public Schools</td>
<td>Arlington Mill High School</td>
<td>Conditional-New School</td>
<td>*Accredited with Warning (GCI)</td>
<td>*Fully Accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City Public Schools</td>
<td>Amelia Street Special Education</td>
<td>Accredited with Warning (Mathematics)</td>
<td>Accredited with Warning (English, Mathematics)</td>
<td>Accredited with Warning (Mathematics, Science)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accreditation rating based on data submitted using a previous alternative accreditation plan.

- As part of their requests for the renewal of alternative accreditation plans for these schools, the school divisions are requesting waivers of the following sections of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) so that adjustments may be made to accreditation calculations and to the Graduation and Completion Index (GCI) for accountability purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>SOA Waivers Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City Public Schools</td>
<td>Amelia Street Special Education</td>
<td>8 VAC 20-131-280. Expectations for school accountability (B.1. Core Areas and B.2. Graduation Rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City Public Schools</td>
<td>Richmond Alternative School</td>
<td>8 VAC 20-131-280. Expectations for school accountability (B.1. Core Areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 VAC 20-131-100. Instructional program in secondary schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the requests for alternative accreditation plans from Arlington County Public Schools and Richmond City Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s Recommendation to Grant Approval to Add New Education (Endorsement) Programs at George Mason University

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item. Mrs. Pitts’ presentation included the following:
Colleges and universities that offer programs for the preparation of professional school personnel must obtain education program (endorsement) approval from the Board of Education. Requests to offer new education endorsement programs are submitted to the Department of Education. Personnel in the Division of Teacher Education and Licensure and program specialists within the Department of Education review the programs to ensure competencies and other requirements have been addressed. The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) reviews and makes recommendations to the Board of Education on approval of Virginia education programs for school personnel. Final authority for program approval rests with the Board of Education.

George Mason University submitted a request to add new endorsement programs in the areas noted on the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Endorsement Program Requested</th>
<th>Level of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>Music Education-Vocal/Choral PreK-12</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Education- Instrumental PreK-12</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program endorsement competencies, based on the Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia (8VAC20-542-10 et seq.), have been verified through the review of course descriptions and syllabi to determine alignment with each of the competencies required, including supervised classroom instruction. A review of the Request for New Endorsement Program application submitted by each institution evidenced written documentation of school division demand data, as well as institutional and school division support for the requested programs.

Section 8VAC20-542-40 of the Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia requires institutions seeking education program approval to establish partnerships and collaborations based on PreK-12 school needs. A copy of the Virginia Department of Education – Standards for Biennial Approval of Education Programs Accountability Measurement of Partnerships and Collaborations Based on PreK-12 School Needs (8VAC20-542-40.7.a) form for the requested program endorsement areas is attached in the Appendix. George Mason University will submit a biennial report for the education programs for the period of September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2017.

The discussion included:
- Mrs. Atkinson noted that it is common for colleges/universities not to have a written agreement with the partners and collaborators in place, and it will not keep the Board from approving the program.

The Board received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation to grant approval to add new education (endorsement) graduate programs in Music Education-Vocal/Choral PreK-12 and Music Education- Instrumental PreK-12 at George Mason University, including the accountability measurement of partnerships and collaborations based on PreK-12 school needs.

First Review of Revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8 VAC 20-22-10 et seq.) to Conform to General Assembly Legislation (Exempt Action)

Mrs. Patty Pitts presented this item. Mrs. Pitts’ presentation included the following:

- The 2015 Virginia General Assembly passed House Bill 1320 that amended requirements for renewal. Every person seeking renewal of a license shall complete all renewal requirements, including professional development in a manner prescribed by the Board, except that no person seeking renewal of a license shall
be required to satisfy any such requirement by completing coursework and earning credit at an institution of higher education.

- The 2015 Virginia General Assembly passed House Bill 2137 that amended Section 22.1-298.1 of the Code of Virginia to permit the Board of Education, upon request of the employing school division or educational agency, to issue a provisional license to a teacher seeking an initial license in the Commonwealth who has not attained an industry certification credential in the area in which the teacher seeks endorsement to allow time for the teacher to attain such required credential.

- Revisions from the 2013 Virginia General Assembly were incorporated into the proposed comprehensive revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel that are under executive review in the Administrative Process Act. The Licensure Regulations for School Personnel are requested to be amended to conform to House Bill 2084 and Senate Bill 1175 (identical bills) that established a Teach For America License. These bills became effective July 1, 2013, and have been implemented.

- Revisions from the 2013 Virginia General Assembly were incorporated into the proposed comprehensive revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel that are under executive review in the Administrative Process Act. The Licensure Regulations for School Personnel are requested to be amended to conform to House Bill 2151 and Senate Bill 1223 that eliminated the Local Eligibility License. These bills became effective July 1, 2013, and have been implemented.

- The Licensure Regulations for School Personnel must be amended to conform to General Assembly legislation.

The discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked about the prevalence of the local eligibility license. Mrs. Pitts responded that none of the licenses issued are still in effect, and they were rarely issued by local school divisions. Mrs. Pitts noted she has not heard any concerns from school divisions about its elimination. Mr. Braunlich noted the impact on individuals teaching one class a day as the local eligibility license would no longer be an option.

- Mrs. Lodal noted similar concerns about the local eligibility license given the difficulty filling some teaching positions. Mrs. Pitts discussed some other options for school divisions to help fill shortages.

- Mr. Dillard asked about the purpose of HB 1320 from the 2015 General Assembly. Mrs. Pitts noted that the legislation provides more flexibility in the renewal requirements.

The Board received for first review the proposed amendments to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (Exempt Action).

First Review of Proposed Amendments to the Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public School in Virginia (8 VAC 201-131) to Comport with Legislation Passed by the General Assembly (2012-2015 Sessions) under the Fast Track Provisions of the Administrative Process Act

This item was postponed until the June 25, 2015, Board meeting.
First Review of Report on Virginia’s Possible Participation in the 2018 Administration of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in Accordance with the 2015 Appropriation Act

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder’s presentation included the following:

- The 2015 Appropriation Act directed the Board of Education and the Secretary of Education to investigate the benefits and costs of Virginia participating in the 2018 Administration of the Program of International Student Assessments (PISA) as a “country” so that Virginia-specific results could be obtained.

Overview of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)
PISA, the largest international education study in the world, is a set of tests administered to students 15 years of age. PISA measures student performance in mathematics, reading, and science literacy. Conducted every three years, each PISA data cycle assesses one of the three core subject areas in depth (considered the major domain), although all three core subjects are assessed in each cycle. The other two subjects are considered minor subject areas for that assessment year. Assessing all three subjects every three years allows countries to have a consistent source of achievement data in each of the three subjects while rotating one area as the primary focus over the years. In 2018, the next year of administration for PISA, reading will be the subject area of focus. It is expected that PISA will be administered in October-November 2018, and results will be reported at the state level in December 2019. Results are not reported at the district, school or student level.

States can participate in PISA as independent educational systems. If Virginia chooses to participate as an educational system, results for Virginia students will be reported relative to other states and to the United States overall as well as to other participating countries. Participation in 2018 PISA administration requires a commitment by March 2016. Participants must have the technical expertise necessary to administer an international online assessment and must be able to meet the full costs of participation.

Advantages of Virginia’s Participation in PISA as an Independent Educational System
- Results would provide a comparison of Virginia students’ learning in reading, mathematics, and science to that of students in other countries, as well as a comparison to the performance of students in other states that choose to participate and to the United States overall. Subgroup performance comparisons will be reported if the sample is large enough to be statistically significant for gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.
- Participation is age-based rather than grade level or course so the results would provide a measure of the cumulative learning outcomes of Virginia students rather than attainment of a specific curriculum.
- PISA focuses on literacy or the use of mathematics in real-world situations. All problems are context-based and would provide information about Virginia students’ application of skills in contexts that are likely to be new for students.
- PISA is the only international assessment that offers an international comparison of students in the United States at the high school level. If Virginia participates as an independent educational system, state results relative to international results will be reported.

Disadvantages of Virginian’s Participation in PISA as an Independent Educational System
- Participation in PISA as an independent educational system requires a minimum sample of 50 schools and 1500 students. However, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the organization responsible for PISA, recommends larger sample sizes of approximately 4,500 students in order to get finer-grained breakouts.
- Funds must be appropriated for participation. The cost for participating in PISA 2015 was about $630,000. A final cost estimate will be available once the national contractual agreement is in place and the final
design for 2018 has been established. This information should be available toward the end of 2015 or in early 2016.

- PISA requires approximately 3 hours to administer and does not replace other required tests. As described above, at least 1500 students in a minimum of 50 schools must be tested so the impact on schools and divisions would be considerable.
- Results are not reported until a full year after the assessment is administered and are not reported at the division, school, or student level.
- Students are informed of their selection to participate on assessment day, and their participation is voluntary. Since student participation is voluntary, Virginia’s participation could be nullified (not reported) if less than 80% of those sampled participate.
- A percentage of the sample of tested students from each school will be required to respond to a 20 to 30 minute questionnaire providing information about themselves, their attitudes to learning, and their homes. Questions might include parent occupation, the highest level of parent education, and an index of home possessions related to family wealth and home educational resources. Some parents may object to the content of these questions.
- Age-based participation could result in involvement of students from more than one grade level making the test administration more logistically complicated. Loss of instructional time could impact many classes for a small group of students to be tested.

**Next Steps**

Participation in the 2018 administration of PISA would require a commitment by March 2016. Because existing funds are not available to cover the costs of Virginia’s participation in PISA, a budget request may be needed.

The discussion included:

- Dr. Baysal said foundations involved in globalization may volunteer to provide resources for Virginia to participate in the 2018 PISA.
- Mrs. Lodal said she agreed with Dr. Baysal and this would be an opportunity for a private/public partnership.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked how many states in the country participate as countries. Mrs. Loving-Ryder had information on the number of participants in 2012 but not 2015.
- Dr. Cannaday said the report to the General Assembly should suggest that there be opportunities in the future to include PISA as a way to globally benchmark Virginia against others in the nation.
- Mrs. Wodiska said she is disappointed the federal government has not done a better job of paying for and creating a path for states to participate in PISA assessments.
- Dr. Baysal suggested including PISA in the discussion at the Board’s Accountability Committee meeting.
- Mr. Braunlich asked if Virginia participated as a country would PISA results be disaggregated in the same way. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the level of disaggregation depends on how large the sample is.
- Mr. Braunlich suggested staff include a budget incorporating public and private partnerships and emphasize the value of the test to job producers in the state.
- Mr. Dillard noted the cost of the PISA test and asked for justification and background information. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the cost of the 2018 test has not been determined and she will get a breakdown of the cost when it becomes available.

The Board received for first review the report on Virginia’s possible participation as an independent educational system in the 2018 administration of the PISA.
First Review of Recommendations for Criteria for Awarding the Seal of Biliteracy

Dr. Lisa Harris, specialist for Foreign Languages, presented this item. Dr. Harris’ presentation included the following:

- In the 2015 legislative session, § 22.1-253.13:4 of the Code of Virginia was amended and directs the Board of Education to establish criteria for awarding a diploma Seal of Biliteracy. The final legislation contains a second enactment clause that requires the Board to establish criteria for awarding a diploma seal of biliteracy in time for any student graduating from a public high school in the Commonwealth in 2016 to be awarded such a diploma seal.

- In order to meet the timeline requirement of the legislation, and to allow the Board to consider the recommended criteria as part of the revisions to the Standards of Accreditation (SOA), the Department convened an Advisory Committee to review and make recommendations regarding the criteria. During the meeting, the Committee considered draft criteria proposed by the stakeholder organizations based on legislative requirements. Discussion included a review of the national guidelines, demonstrating proficiency in both English and a second language, equity of access, assessment options, and design of the Seal.

- The committee reached consensus as follows on guidelines for implementing the Seal of Biliteracy in Virginia:
  - Students should demonstrate proficiency in English by meeting state high school graduation requirements in English.
  - Students should demonstrate proficiency in a world language other than English through one of a range of approved language assessment options, including Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and other national or international assessments at a level comparable to Intermediate Mid on the ACTFL Proficiency Scale.
  - A list of approved assessments and target levels for the Seal should be approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and be published by the Virginia Department of Education.
  - School divisions should include a notation on the student’s official high school transcripts indicating attainment of the Seal of Biliteracy.

- Based on the Committee’s recommended guidelines, the Department recommends the following criteria:

  The Board of Education’s Seal of Biliteracy certifies attainment of a high level of proficiency by a graduating high school student in one or more languages in addition to English, and certifies that the graduate meets all of the following criteria:

  a) The Board of Education’s Seal of Biliteracy will be awarded to students who earn either a Board of Education-approved diploma and (i) pass all required End-of-Course Assessments in English reading and writing at the proficient or higher level; and (ii) be proficient at the intermediate-mid level or higher in one or more languages other than English, as demonstrated through an assessment from a list to be approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

  b) For purposes of this article, "foreign language" means a language other than English, and includes American Sign Language.

The discussion included:

- Dr. Baysal said he supports the Seal of Biliteracy and suggested replacing foreign languages with world languages.
- Mr. Dillard asked if efforts have been made to include American Sign Language (ASL). Dr. Harris responded that representatives from ASL were included in the
advisory committee meetings.

- Mrs. Atkinson complimented Dr. Harris for the packet of materials which helped Board members better understand the proposal. Mrs. Atkinson suggested the next presentation include a rationale as to why changes are being requested for what will be accepted as passing rates in the assessments.

- Dr. Cannaday said this will be an opportunity for the Board to recognize schools with students graduating with advanced skills, and suggested this be discussed at the Board’s Accountability committee meeting.

- Mrs. Wodiska was also appreciative of the packet of materials provided to Board members.

- Mr. Romero said the Biliteracy Seal is a great opportunity for ESL students to improve their literacy skills.

The Board received for first review the proposed criteria for awarding the Seal of Biliteracy.


Mr. Mark Saunders, educational technology specialist, and Ms. Jean Weller, educational technology specialist, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The Commonwealth’s first long-range technology plan was the 1988-1994 Six-Year Technology Plan for Virginia. Three long-range plans have been produced since then with the most recent plan being the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2010-2015 (the other two were 1996-2002 and 2003-2009). Generally, these plans have been developed apart from the Board’s Comprehensive Plan. Treating technology separately from other educational priorities made sense in the earlier days, when a specific focus on educational technology was needed to give technology a greater presence in the classroom environment. Educational technology meant that schools had a few computers, a couple of modems and a few enthusiastic teachers who used technology for special projects. It also made sense because technology demands a systemic view—one must consider a variety of things such as infrastructure, device compatibility, and professional development in order to support the use of technology in learning.

- However, since then technology has become more and more a part of every facet of schooling, from scheduling school buses to scheduling student classes, from learning how to play an instrument to learning how to communicate with other students around the world, from assessing students to introducing them to job skills. Technology is not a stand-alone focus anymore, and the systems that supported educational technology now support just about everything that school divisions do. It is part of how educational goals are met.

- The decisions made by the Board for their long-range technology plan impact the schools, as divisions must have a long-range plan which aligns to the state plan.


B. “The divisionwide comprehensive plan shall include, but shall not be limited to…(vii) a technology plan designed to integrate educational technology into the instructional programs of the school division, including the school division's career and technical education programs, consistent with, or as a part of, the comprehensive technology plan for Virginia adopted by the Board of Education…”

- The state technology plan is currently on an update schedule (2015-2021) that makes it difficult to align with
the Board’s comprehensive plan, which is to be updated in 2017. The development of the next state technology plan in concert with the next Board of Education Comprehensive Plan increases the chances that the two plans complement and support each other. This decision also provides an opportunity for the staff of the Department of Education to work closely with the Board to avoid the continued two year gap between the two plans. Considering the ever-changing nature of technology, two years is a significant time gap that can be erased with this decision.

- In the most recent state technology plan, school divisions were encouraged to ensure that their technology plans were tied to their comprehensive plans. In so doing, technology was approached as a tool for supporting broad educational goals rather than narrow technology-based ends. This by no means implies that schools do not need experts, both in overseeing/maintaining technology and mentors who can help their fellow educators to effectively use technology as a learning tool. It does mean that divisions should continue to approach their use and support for technology as a systemic issue.

- The addendum fills the two year gap (2015 - 2016 and 2016 - 2017) between the expiration of the current technology plan on June 30, 2015, and the start of a new technology plan on July 1, 2017. The state technology plan for 2010 through 2015 provides goals that are still viable. Some objectives need revising due to the ever-changing nature of technology and by creating an addendum to the 2010-2015 plan, we address necessary revisions.

- The integration of the goals of the Board of Education into educational technology goals, strategies, and objectives results in greater alignment among two critical plans. This alignment creates the potential for initiatives such as greater virtual course offerings and the operation of a virtual school to be addressed from a policy, instructional, and technical perspective with greater efficiency.

- Technology has a significant role in reaching at least five of the seven current Board of Education Goals.

  ✓ Goal 1: Accountability for Student Learning - Technology has a role in the use of accountability systems that measure academic progress. The focus is not on the technology, but technology has a relevant role in the delivery of assessment and the evaluation of the related data. Goal 5 of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia 2015 – 2017 provides more information on the significant role technology has in reaching this goal.

  ✓ Goal 3: Expanded Opportunities to Learn - Technology allows for expanded learning opportunities for students. Goals 3 and 4 of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia 2015 – 2017 provides more information on the significant role technology has in reaching this goal.

  ✓ Goal 4: Nurturing Young Learners - Technology can play a role in the work the Board takes on to work cooperatively with partners to promote new and innovative partnerships. Goals 1, 3, and 4 of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia 2015 – 2017 provides more information on the significant role technology has in reaching this goal.

  ✓ Goal 5: Highly Qualified and Effective Educators - Technology has an obvious role in the continued development of highly qualified and effective educators through professional development and the revision of the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel. Goals 1, 2, and 5 of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia 2015 – 2017 provides more information on the significant role technology has in reaching this goal.

  ✓ Goal 7: Safe and Secure Schools - Technology plays a role in creating safe and secure school environments. In addition to the Virginia Public School Authority grants provided to support the Standards of Learning Web-based Technology Initiative and Virginia e-Learning Backpack Initiative grants, state law authorized $6.0 million last year in school security equipment grants as part of Series XIV. Proceeds of these additional equipment notes will be used to help offset the related local costs associated with the purchase of appropriate security equipment that will improve and help ensure the safety of students attending public schools in Virginia.
School divisions must create a new technology plan to align with the state technology plan. In order to assist divisions in staying up-to-date but without going through the demanding process that a new technology plan requires, we would ask that they create an addendum to their existing plans for 2016-2018, along the same lines as the addendum to the state technology plan. School division addendum plans would be valid from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2018 because school divisions have one year to align to any new technology plan.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson said the evidence of impact for each strategy strengthens the *Educational Technology Plan* because it is a comprehensive way for schools to understand what they should see as a result of the plan.
- Dr. Baysal said he was appreciative to see the National Society for Technology Education criteria on communication and collaboration included in the plan.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked how information from the broadband project could be used with the *Educational Technology Plan*. Mr. Saunders noted that Objective 1.1 under Goal 1 of the *Educational Technology Plan* deals with technical infrastructure which includes broadband access.
- Mrs. Wodiska asked Dr. Staples what the Board could do in the future to assist and support staff to make sure information is being shared in a timely manner and there is cross-agency collaboration. Dr. Staples thanked Mrs. Wodiska and said staff is working on collaborating with other agencies on the broadband project. Dr. Staples said the Board can emphasize the importance of the broadband project in their *Annual Report on Conditions and Needs of Schools*.

The Board received for first review the proposed two-year addendum for the current 2010-2015 Virginia Educational Technology Plan.

*First Review of Proposal to Enact Special Provision in the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (8 VAC 20-131-280E) Related to Use of Test Scores in Calculating Accreditation Ratings for the 2015-2016 School Year*

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder’s presentation included the following:

- The 2014 Acts of Assembly eliminated the following Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments: Grade 3 Science, Grade 3 History, Grade 5 Writing, United States History to 1865 and United States History: 1865 to the Present. School divisions have expressed concern about the impact their elimination will have on the accreditation ratings for 2015-2016. While the Board is considering changes to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) that would recognize improvements in the pass rates for schools as well as student growth, these new ratings will not be available for the 2015-2016 accreditation cycle. This means that while the accreditation ratings have not changed, the number of tests used to calculate the ratings has changed considerably.

- The Board does have the authority under the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) to alter the inclusions and exclusions from the accreditation calculations by providing adequate notice to local school boards.
The Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (8VAC20-131-280E) provide the following authority:

The Board of Education may adopt special provisions related to the administration and use of any Virginia assessment program test in a content area. The Board of Education may adopt special provisions related to the administration and use of the graduation and completion index, as prescribed by the board. The Board of Education may also alter the inclusions and exclusions from the accreditation calculations by providing adequate notice to local school boards. The board may add new tests or discontinue the use of existing tests in the Virginia Assessment Program by providing adequate notice to local school boards.

- Based on the SOA requirements, currently schools are accredited primarily on the percentage of students passing the Virginia assessment program tests in the four core academic areas administered in the school. The accreditation ratings are based on a trailing three-year average that includes the current year scores and the scores from the two most recent years in each applicable academic area, or on the current year's scores, whichever is higher. In order to ameliorate the impact of the SOL tests eliminated by the 2014 Acts of the Assembly, the Board is asked to consider using a four-year average in calculating the accreditation pass rates for those areas in which SOL tests have been eliminated: English, science and history/social science for elementary schools and history/social science for middle schools. This change would provide an additional year in which the eliminated tests are included in the accreditation calculations and would be applicable to the 2015-2016 accreditation ratings only.

The discussion included:
- Mr. Braunlich asked about the impact on accreditation ratings if the Board took no action. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said it is difficult to predict because staff does not know the test scores for this year, however school divisions have expressed concerns.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked Mrs. Loving-Ryder to explain the rationale for this action.
- Mrs. Loving-Ryder’s response noted the following:
  - The impact of the eliminated tests was greatest at the elementary level with the elimination of Grade 3 Science and Grade 3 History. Traditionally, pass rates on those tests were fairly high which may have helped school divisions obtain accreditation.
  - The SOA allows LEP students to be exempt from Grade 3 Science, but students are required to take Grade 5 Science because of federal requirements. With the elimination of Grade 3 Science, pass rates now are based only on Grade 5 Science where all students must be tested.
  - At the elementary level, the Grade 5 Writing tests were eliminated. Previously the pass rate for English at the elementary school was calculated by combining the reading scores from Grades 3, 4, and 5 and the Grade 5 Writing test. With the elimination of the Grade 5 Writing test the pass rates are now calculated based on reading. The reading test is new and school divisions are continuing to struggle with those tests.
  - Previously the middle school history pass rates were based on a combination of three tests and now the accreditation for middle schools is based on a single test.
- Mr. Braunlich noted the Board’s policy is to provide flexibility to local school divisions, but the General Assembly fundamentally eliminated flexibility with the elimination of some SOL tests.

The Board received for first review the proposal to use a four-year average in those areas in which SOL tests have been eliminated: English, science and history/social science for
elementary schools and history/social science for middle schools.

**Report on the Virginia Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (VPI+)**

Dr. Mark Allan, coordinator, preschool expansion grant, Office of Humanities and Early Childhood, Division of Instruction, presented this item. Dr. Allan’s presentation included the following:

- On December 10, 2014, Governor Terry McAuliffe announced that the United States Department of Education had awarded Virginia a $17.5 million federal Preschool Expansion Grant that will allow the Commonwealth to serve additional at-risk four-year-olds in new, high-quality preschool classes and will fund enhanced services to children in existing preschool classes. The Preschool Expansion Grant, called VPI Plus (VPI+), will build on the success of the Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) that has supported school readiness of at-risk four-year-olds since 1996. The federal performance period for the VPI+ grant is January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2018.

- The VPI+ will meet and exceed every element of the VPI program. The VPI+ model includes use of evidenced-based curriculum and formative assessments, summative assessments, professional development and coaching for teachers, classroom-level evaluations, and community partnerships to provide comprehensive services. Eleven school divisions will participate in VPI+ allowing an opportunity to field test and refine VPI+ innovations throughout Virginia to ensure high-quality programs, appropriate flexibility tailored to local circumstances, and broad replicability.

- By the end of the grant period, approximately 5,200 four-year-olds at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Line will be served in new VPI+ classrooms, and approximately 8,028 four-year-olds will be served in existing preschool classrooms where increased services (e.g., community partnerships to provide systematic comprehensive services, family engagement for hard-to-reach and culturally and linguistically diverse families, professional development and coaching for staff) will be supported with grant funds.

- The participating school divisions are as follows:
  - Brunswick County Public Schools
  - Chesterfield County Public Schools
  - Fairfax County Public Schools
  - Giles County Public Schools
  - Henrico County Public Schools
  - Norfolk City Public Schools
  - Petersburg City Public Schools
  - Prince William County Public Schools
  - Richmond City Public Schools
  - Sussex County Public Schools
  - Winchester City Public Schools

- The Virginia Department of Education is the lead agency in VPI+; however, other partners include the Virginia Department of Social Services, the Virginia Health Department, the Virginia Early Childhood Foundation, University of Virginia’s Center for the Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), the Commonwealth Council on Childhood Success, and other key stakeholders across the Commonwealth that have an interest in improving learning experiences for young children.

The discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked for clarification about who is captured with the VPI plus
program. Dr. Allan noted the complexity because of blended programs.

- Mrs. Lodal noted the lasting impact of professional development.
- Mrs. Lodal asked for clarification regarding private partners. Dr. Allan provided examples.
- Dr. Cannaday asked about the percentage of unfilled slots for eligible students. Dr. Cannaday asked staff to provide the number of unserved students in the next report.
- Mr. Braunlich asked staff to also provide statewide totals in the next report.
- Mrs. Wodiska noted the additional need for high quality preschool across the state, and encouraged staff to put into perspective for Board members the severe need.
- Mrs. Edwards thanked staff for their work on this project because of the importance of early childhood education.
- Mr. Romero asked what criteria were used to select school divisions to participate in the grant.

The Board received the Report on the Virginia Federal Preschool Expansion Grant (VPI+).

**DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES**

Mr. Dillard noted the replica of the French tall ship that brought General Marquis de Lafayette from France to America in 1780 is set to arrive in Yorktown, Virginia, on June 5th as part of a 12-city tour along the East Coast. The following Web site gives background information of the ship and tour dates: [http://www.hermione2015.com](http://www.hermione2015.com).

Mrs. Wodiska announced that the Governor’s Council on Bridging the Nutritional Divide will meet on June 3rd and she will share information from the meeting at the next Board meeting.

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, May 27, 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, Mrs. Lodal, Mr. Romero, and Mrs. Wodiska. The following department staff also attended: Dr. Steven Staples, superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Cynthia Cave, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, and Melissa Luchau, director of board relations. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:00 p.m.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Dr. Cannaday 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, Mark Saunders, and officers Rendell Gary and Albert Cabonilas, participate in this closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 11:45 a.m.
Dr. Cannaday made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Braunlich 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:

Mrs. Lodal – Yes
Dr. Baysal – Yes
Mrs. Edwards – Yes
Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mr. Braunlich – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Mrs. Wodiska – Yes
Mr. Dillard – Yes
Mr. Romero – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to suspend the license of Khalid Amir Coleman for three years and require that any reinstatement of license be contingent upon Mr. Coleman appearing before the Superintendent’s Investigative Panel and the Board of Education and the Board approving the request for reinstatement. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to deny a license for John D. Lenwell. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lodal and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Baysal made a motion to issue a one-year Collegiate Professional License valid from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, in Case #3. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to deny a license for Chelsea Ann Charland. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to deny the license of Karrish Tiada Johnson. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to deny a license for Brandie Marie Speight. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to revoke the license of Kimberlee Ann Dietz. The motion as seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to revoke the license of Claire Lorraine Ogilvie. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal 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 3:31 p.m.

President