

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

February 23, 2017

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

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., President  
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson  
Ms. Anne Holton  
Dr. Jamelle Wilson

Mr. James H. Dillard  
Mr. Daniel A. Gecker  
Mrs. Elizabeth V. Lodal  
Mr. Sal Romero, Jr.

Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of  
Public Instruction

Dr. Cannaday called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

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

Dr. Cannaday led in the Pledge of Allegiance and asked for a moment of silence.

***ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM THROUGH JULY 2017***

Mrs. Lodal nominated Mr. Daniel Gecker to serve as Vice-President for the Board of Education. Mr. Dillard seconded the nomination. All members were in favor of the nomination and motion carried unanimously. Mr. Gecker will serve as Vice-President until the end of term.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2017, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lodal; six members were in favor, and two members abstained. The approval motion carried. Copies of the minutes were distributed in advance of the meeting.

***INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS***

Dr. Cannaday introduced new Board members, Ms. Anne Holton and Dr. Jamelle Wilson.

***RESOLUTIONS OF RECOGNITIONS***

Resolutions of Recognition were presented to Virginia School Divisions participating in the Community Eligibility Provision of the Health, Hunger-Free Kids Act.

The participating schools divisions recognized by the Board were:

- Charlottesville City
- Covington City
- Fredericksburg City
- Halifax County
- Hampton City
- Henry County
- Henrico County
- Lee County
- Martinsville City
- Newport News City
- Orange County
- Richmond City
- Scott County
- Tazewell County
- Waynesboro City
- Wise County
- Virginia Beach City

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to the Milken Family Foundation Educator Award Winner, Lindsay Seiler Murray, 4<sup>th</sup> grade teacher at W.E. Cundiff Elementary School in Roanoke County Public Schools. Each year, these national awards are presented to outstanding educators for the quality of their teaching and their professional leadership. Mrs. Murray was instrumental in the implementation of the Virginia Children's Engineering program, now part of the curriculum throughout the region's elementary schools. Mrs. Murray blends STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) with project-based learning to meet the requirements of the state standards and has launched several student research projects to encourage more hands-on learning.

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to Commemorate February 2017 as Black History Month. This Resolution was presented to Ms. Marilyn West, Chairwoman of the Board for the Black History Museum and Cultural Center of Virginia.

Mr. Dillard motioned to adopt the Resolution to Commemorate February 2017 as Black History Month, seconded by Mr. Gecker, and the motion carried.

### ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

- Dr. Marla Crawford spoke on the practices of educating youths with disabilities and their families.
- Kitty Boitnott, Career Makeover Coach, spoke on issues of teacher morale and teacher burnout.
- Lorraine Wright, parent, spoke on the state of public education and special education in Virginia schools.
- Jamie Liban, Executive Director of ARC of VA, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.

- Rachael C. Deane, Attorney, JustChildren Programs, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Mike Asip, President, Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Lori Buckingham, Behavior Specialist with Spotsylvania County, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Jim Livingston, President of the Virginia Education Association, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Dr. Juanita Matkins with the Virginia Association of Science Teachers spoke on the number of students in laboratory science classrooms.
- Jim Baldwin, Executive Director of Virginia Association of Advance Teachers, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Shelly Montante, parent, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- John Paul Cimino, Virginia Board of People with Disabilities, spoke on the Regulations Governing the use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Dr. Brian Matney, VASSP Past President and Virginia Beach Public Schools, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Randy Barrack, VASSP Executive Director, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Tichi Pinkney Eppes spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Kandise Lucas, Advocate, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Dr. Jeff Perry, Superintendent of Wythe County, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Steve Parker, Superintendent of Lancaster County, spoke on the Regulations Governing the use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Lisa Floyd, Department of Juvenile Justice, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Angela Neely, Special Education Director, Culpepper County, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Dr. Jane Strong, VCASE Legislative Committee Chairperson and Director of Special Education Procedural Support with Fairfax County Public Schools, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.
- Jenny Harbourne with the Disability Law Center, spoke on the Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Schools.

### ***ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS***

#### ***A. Final Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Passing Score for the Praxis Algebra I (5162) Test for the Mathematics – Algebra (ADD-ON) Endorsement***

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item for final review. The presentation included the following information:

Currently, the Board of Education requires the following licensure assessments:

- Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA)
- Praxis: Subject Assessments
- Reading for Virginia Educators (RVE)
- School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) – The SLLA is specific to the Administration and Supervision PreK-12 endorsement.
- Praxis Braille Proficiency Test – The Braille Proficiency Test is specific to the Special Education Visual Impairments PreK-12 endorsement.

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed the Praxis Algebra I (5162) test. The Algebra I test is designed to assess the mathematical knowledge and competencies necessary for a beginning Algebra I teacher.

The *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* require that individuals seeking the Mathematics – Algebra I (add-on) endorsement must hold a license endorsed in another teaching area. The Praxis Algebra I (5162) test is not a required assessment for the Mathematics – Algebra I (add-on) endorsement, but rather an option for individuals holding certain licenses who may wish to add the endorsement by testing.

Upon Board approval, an individual holding a Virginia license with a teaching endorsement (who has met initial subject assessment requirements) may be eligible for the Mathematics – Algebra I (add-on endorsement) by passing the Praxis Algebra I (5162) test. This testing option does not apply to individuals who hold a technical professional license, vocational evaluator license, pupil personnel services license, school manager license, or division superintendent license.

The Algebra I (5162) test will allow individuals with a teaching license to add the Mathematics – Algebra I (add-on) endorsement by testing in accordance with the licensure regulations. The rationale for ABTEL’s recommendation to set the passing score one CSEM below the multi-state panel’s recommended score is that the Algebra I (5162) test is a new assessment, and no performance data are available at this time. The Advisory Board also recommended that the passing score be reviewed after sufficient performance data become available for the test.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation to: (1) approve the use of the Praxis Algebra I (5162) test as a professional teacher’s assessment as an option to add the Mathematics – Algebra I (add-on) endorsement to a teaching license as prescribed by the licensure regulations; (2) set a passing score of 148 for the test; and (3) review the passing score after sufficient performance data become available.

Mrs. Atkinson moved to approve the ABTEL recommendation for a Passing Score for the Praxis Algebra I (5162) Test for the Mathematics – Algebra (ADD-ON) Endorsement. Mrs. Lodal seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

**B. Third Review of Proposed Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia (Proposed Stage)**

Mr. John Eisenberg, assistant superintendent for special education and student services presented this

item. Ms. Patricia Haymes assisted him in the presentation of this item. Their presentation included the following information:

In 2014, the Virginia General Assembly enacted HB 1443, amending the *Code of Virginia* by adding section number 22.1-279.1:1, relating to the use of seclusion and restraint in public schools. The bill requires the Board of Education to adopt regulations on the use of seclusion and restraint in public elementary and secondary schools in the Commonwealth that: (i) are consistent with its *Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Managing Student Behavior in Emergency Situations* and the *Fifteen Principles* contained in the U.S. Department of Education's *Restraint and Seclusion: Resource Document*; (ii) include definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training requirements, notification requirements, reporting requirements, and follow-up requirements; and (iii) address distinctions, including distinctions in emotional and physical development, between: (a) the general student population and the special education student population; and (b) elementary school students and secondary school students.

The proposed regulations are based on two foundational—and consonant—principles: that schools must be safe for all children and that school personnel must be equipped to address emergencies and disruptions effectively, while protecting the dignity of all students, the integrity of the classroom, and the safety of all persons in our public schools.

Staff requested guidance from the Board on certain matters of controversy. These issues were outlined in Attachment A.

Based on public comment received to date, staff made certain changes to the proposed regulations that are merely clarifying in nature, and on which commenters from both the parent and advocacy community and the school community were in consensus. Attachment B is a line numbered current draft of the proposed regulations.

Attachment C is a detailed summary of public comment received to date, including staff response.

Staff walked Board members through a series of Decision Points to help guide the continued drafting and revisions to the proposed regulations.

Decision Point 1 was relating to the prohibition of seclusion. “Seclusion” means the involuntary confinement of a student alone in a room or area from which the student is physically prevented from leaving until the student no longer presents an immediate danger to self or others. Parent and advocacy groups have urged that seclusion is so dangerous that it should never be used. The 15 Principles permit seclusion in circumstances where the student’s behavior poses an imminent threat to self or others.

The staff recommendation was to allow seclusion as per the draft language, as other provisions discussed below provide safeguards to children.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation.

Decision Point 2 was relating to the definition of seclusion. “Seclusion” means the involuntary confinement of a student alone in a room or area from which the student is physically prevented from leaving until the student no longer presents an immediate danger to self or others. The currently drafted option includes an exception from the definition of seclusion for confinement of a student in a room where the student is not free to leave during the investigation by school officials of a violation of the *Model Code of Student Conduct*. The reason the exception was included was that school representatives did not want to

be hamstrung in an instance where there is a drug issue or a fight and students need to be placed in separate rooms during the investigation.

The staff recommendation was to eliminate the draft language as students should not be left without adult supervision.

Board discussion: Board members are concerned that the *Model Code of Student Conduct* covers many areas of varying seriousness. They requested a copy of the *Model Code of Student Conduct*. Another concern expressed was placing elementary students in a room alone. It was suggested that there needs to be differentiation in the regulations based on the age of the student. Language needs to be added to clarify that the door must be unlocked when an older student is secluded while an investigation for a serious violation of the Code of Student Conduct is underway. Board members believed that seclusion should only be used in extreme circumstances.

There was consensus from the Board for staff to revise the language of Decision Point 2, based on Board discussion, to present for final review at the March Board meeting.

Decision Point 3 was relating to the definition of seclusion and the inclusion of certain exceptions to the definition of seclusion; one of the exceptions contains the caveat “so long as the student is not physically prevented from leaving.” Parents and advocacy groups believe that all of the exceptions to the seclusion definition should incorporate the concept that the student must be “free to leave.”

The staff recommendation was to expand the concept of “not physically prevented from leaving” to all exceptions.

There was consensus from the Board that this decision point was related to Decision Point 2. Staff will revise the language, based on Board discussion, to present for final review at the March Board meeting.

Decision Point 4 was related to the standards for Seclusion Rooms. The draft regulation includes specifications on size of room, ability to monitor space, light fixtures and controls, materials, contents, and so forth. Superintendents from Region 7 requested that schools be allowed to determine their own specifications. Other groups asked for flexibility on what types of items could be in the room, e.g., sensory items, and to eliminate the reference to a mattress being the only thing permitted in the room.

The staff recommendation was to maintain the current language, but modify to allow flexibility with regard to contents, so long as the items do not pose a danger to the student.

The Board discussed revising the entire section pertaining to this decision point to include components of limitations like time, age appropriate and circumstances, plus the ability to be able to visually monitor students. The Board also discussed including the difference between a seclusion room and a seclusion area or space.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation but to make modifications to the language to provide more flexibility and incorporate the suggestions from Board discussion.

Decision Point 5 was related to the use of prone and supine restraints. The current draft of the regulations bans both techniques. School representatives and representatives from one of the training organizations

involved in restraint and seclusion expressed concern that there may be instances in emergencies when such restraints are unavoidable. Alternatively, they urge that restraints that restrict the airway be banned. The 15 Principles state that “restraint or seclusion should never be used in a manner that restricts a child’s breathing or harms the child.”

The staff recommendation was to adopt the language from the 15 Principles.

The Board consensus is to modify the language to ban restraints that restrict the airway which is included in the 15 Principles.

Decision Point 6 was related to notification and reporting to the parent. The current draft regulations require that reasonable efforts be made to notify parents of an incident involving restraint or seclusion within one calendar day of the incident. Parents and advocacy groups argued for same day notification. School organizations believe that the requirement is too onerous and should be changed to one school day.

The staff recommendation was to modify the language to include same day notification.

The Board discussed when notifying parents that school personnel should make a reasonable effort as quickly as possible. If the parent cannot be reached, it is noted in a report and there should be additional attempts to reach them. Contact to parents also can also be made through multiple avenues.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation and include language related to “reasonable effort.”

Decision Point 7 was related to notification and reporting of the Incident Report. The draft language requires a written report within two school days. Superintendents’ groups indicate that the timeline is impractical. Special Education administrators urged changing the time to five school days. Some parents want a written report within one calendar day.

The staff recommendation was to retain the current language of a written report within two school days.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation.

Decision Point 8 was related to the content included in the Incident Report. The draft language requires that the incident report address fifteen items. Special Education administrators urged that the following items be deleted as not necessary for thorough reporting:

- A detailed description of the physical restraint or seclusion method used; the student behavior that justified the use of restraint and seclusion; description of prior events prompting the behavior, if known; description of any less restrictive interventions attempted; when the student has an IEP, a Section 504 plan, a behavior intervention plan or other plan.

The staff recommendation was to retain the current draft language.

The Board discussed suggestions pertaining to decision point 7 and 8, incident report timing and addressing fifteen items to the report.

Ms. Holton suggested removing “at a minimum” on page 12 of the draft regulations and instead include, “the written incident report shall include information on the incident sufficient to inform the parent fully

including typically the following:”

Mr. Eisenberg stated that guidance can be developed, after the regulations have passed, that include a draft form that includes all 15 report items but may be modified by the local school divisions.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation and include the suggested language from Ms. Holton.

Decision Point 9 was related to student debriefing. The draft regulations require that the student and principal or designee meet to debrief about the incident. Parents and advocacy groups have requested that the debriefing include individuals other than the student and the principal or designee. More specifically, a number of groups and individuals requested the regulations require that the parent be invited.

The staff recommendation was to retain current language.

The Board discussed the inclusion of the parent in the student debriefing.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation and allow for the option of the parent to be included in the debriefing meeting.

Decision Point 10 was related to the prevention of use of multiple instances of restraint and seclusion for Non IEP/504 students. The draft regulations require that a school team convene after two incidents to consider, among other things, behavioral supports and the possibility of a referral for evaluation. Parent and advocacy groups have requested that, for students with IEPs or Section 504 plans, any instances of restraint or seclusion automatically trigger an evaluation.

The staff recommendation was to retain current language. Existing law already provides for requirements that a child should be evaluation if the eligibility team suspects a disability.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation.

Decision Point 11 was related to the prevention of the use of multiple instances of restraint and seclusion. The current language requires a debriefing after two instances of restraint and seclusion. School commenters believed that there should be more flexibility with regard to when a review would be triggered; noting that students with the most challenged behaviors might be restrained multiple times in a day.

The staff recommendation was to retain current language. An early review point serves the purpose of encouraging the use of evidenced-based positive behavioral inventions.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation.

Decision Point 12 was related to training. The draft language requires training for all school personnel in de-escalation, and the restraint and seclusion regulations; and requires advanced training for personnel employed in self-contained special education setting. One advocacy group proposed replacing advanced training for personnel in self-contained settings with advanced training for a school-based crisis team. School groups expressed concerns about the lack of specificity regarding the training, and about the cost.

The staff recommendation was to retain the current language but provide that VDOE will develop and provide the Tier I training module.

There was consensus from the Board to move forward with the staff recommendation and allow staff to further refine the language.

The Board of Education received for third review the proposed Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia.

**C. First Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Revise the Definition of At-Risk of Becoming Low-Performing and Low-Performing Institutions of Higher Education in Virginia as Required by Title II of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA)**

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item for first review. The presentation included the following information:

On July 1, 2013, the De Facto Consolidation of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) created the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). CAEP is now the unified national accrediting organization for educator preparation. Based on Virginia's 2016 signed partnership agreement with CAEP and changes made to accreditation program review decision designations by CAEP, the definitions for "at-risk of becoming low-performing" and "low-performing" institutions of higher education in Virginia need to be realigned.

On January 23, 2017, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure unanimously approved the following recommendation to revise the definitions of "at-risk of becoming low-performing" and "low-performing" institutions of higher education in Virginia as required by Title II of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA).

If an institution's accreditation is **revoked or denied**, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) will be notified for appropriate action. The *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*, (8VAC20-542-20), effective September 21, 2007, and amended January 19, 2011, stipulate that "If a professional education program fails to maintain accreditation, enrolled candidates shall be permitted to complete their programs of study. Professional education programs shall not admit new candidates. Candidates shall be notified of program approval status."

Under the Title II regulations, all states are required to implement a system to assess the quality of each teacher preparation program. New federal regulations, effective November 30, 2016, require that each state must differentiate programs using at least three performance levels, no later than October 31, 2019. The federal regulations include a new performance level of "effective," as well as definitions of "at-risk of becoming a low-performing institution of higher education" and "low-performing institution of higher education." However, to comply with current reporting requirements, the definitions must be aligned with the accreditation option for CAEP.

The Board of Education received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation to revise the definitions of "at-risk of becoming low-performing" and "low-performing" institutions of higher education in Virginia as required by Title II of the Higher Education

Opportunity Act (HEOA).

Mrs. Lodal is the ABTEL representative for Board of Education and invited members to attend one of the upcoming meetings, which are held throughout the year.

**D. First Review of Process for State Approval of Textbooks for K-12 History and Social Science.**

Ms. Christonya Brown, history and social science coordinator, presented for first review the process for State approval of textbooks for K-12 History and Social Science. The presentation included the following information:

In March 2015, the Board adopted new standards for history and social science and approved the curriculum framework in January 2016, with full implementation of those standards in place fall of 2018.

The Board of Education approved the current list of state-approved history and social science textbooks following revisions to the History and Social Science Standards of Learning in 2008 and to the Curriculum Framework in 2009. The current list of history and social science textbooks were approved by the Board in 2010.

VDOE staff proposed to use the state review process and criteria approved in March 2011 as outlined in Attachment B. Following the Board's approval of the textbook review process for history and social science, the Department will invite publishers to submit textbooks for review. It is the primary responsibility of publishers to ensure the accuracy of textbooks they submit for review. The Department will work to ensure that publishers have accomplished this by establishing the following evaluations for each textbook submitted: 1) an accuracy review based on the Textbook Publisher's Certification and Agreement; 2) a review for correlation to the Virginia Standards of Learning, content, bias, and suitable instructional planning and support based on the evaluation criteria used by review committees; and 3) a public examination of materials during a public review and comment period.

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.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that the Board waive first review and grant approval for the Department of Education to proceed with the review of K-12 History and Social Science textbooks beginning in March 2017.

Dr. Wilson made motion to waive first review and approve the process for the review of K-12 History and Social Science textbooks. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dillard and was approved unanimously.

**E. First Review of Process for State Approval of Textbooks for K-12 Mathematics.**

Ms. Tina Mazzacane, mathematics and science specialist, presented for first review the process for state approval of textbooks for K-12 mathematics. The presentation included the following information:

The Board of Education has the responsibility under the state constitution to approve textbooks for use in Virginia's public schools. The alignment of textbooks and instructional materials with the state's academic standards provides a foundation for student success. With the assistance of experienced classroom teachers

and other educators, the Virginia Department of Education reviews textbooks and instructional materials for alignment with the Standards of Learning and makes recommendations to the Board of Education on state adoption.

VDOE staff proposed to use the state review process and criteria approved in March 2011 as outlined in Attachment B. Following the Board's approval of the textbook review process for mathematics, the Department will invite publishers to submit textbooks for review. It is the primary responsibility of publishers to ensure the accuracy of textbooks they submit for review. The Department will work to ensure that publishers have accomplished this by establishing the following evaluations for each textbook submitted: 1) an accuracy review based on the Textbook Publisher's Certification and Agreement; 2) a review for correlation to the Virginia 2016 Mathematics Standards of Learning, content, bias, and suitable instructional planning and support based on the evaluation criteria used by review committees; and 3) a public examination of materials during a public review and comment period.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that the Board waive first review and grant approval for the Department of Education to proceed with the review of K-12 mathematics textbooks beginning in March 2017.

A Board member asked if online instructional materials will be available in addition to hard copy versions. Ms. Mazzacane stated that it was the publisher's decision.

The Board also discussed the overlap of computer science and math. A Board member asked if computer science textbooks were included in this review. Ms. Mazzacane stated that they would not be looking at computer science with this particular textbook review. Currently, computer science instruction falls under the virtual learning and Career and Technical Education departments. However, the standards will be reviewed to see how computer science may be integrated with math.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to waive first review and approve the process for the review of K-12 mathematics textbooks. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson and was approved unanimously.

## **REPORTS**

### **F. Report on the Timeline for the Development of the Computer Science Standards of Learning**

Mr. Mark Saunders, director of technology and virtual learning, presented the timeline for the development of the Computer Science Standards of Learning. The presentation included the following information:

Computer Science falls under the Office of Virtual Learning in the Division of Instruction so that it can be integrated across all content areas.

The timeline for the development of the Computer Science Standards of Learning begins in February 2017 and will conclude in November 2017. A detailed timeline for the development of the Computer Science Standards of Learning can be found online at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/02-feb/agenda-items/item-f.pdf>.

The Board accepted the report on the timeline for the development of the Computer Science Standards of Learning and thanked Mr. Saunders for his hard work.

**G. Report on the Timeline and First Draft Outline for the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2017-2022**

Mr. Mark Saunders, director of technology and virtual learning, presented the timeline and first draft outline of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia. The presentation included the following information:

This item addressed the requirement in the Board's Comprehensive Plan that includes a long-range plan for technology integration. The Department will develop an educational technology plan that will provide guidance to the school divisions as they develop their own local technology plans.

In the most recent state technology plan and its addendum, 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. School divisions should continue to approach their use and support for technology as a systemic issue.

The timeline for the development of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia begins in February 2017 and will conclude in October 2017. A detailed timeline for the development of this plan can be found online at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/02-feb/agenda-items/item-g.pdf>.

The Board accepted the report on the timeline and first draft outline of the Educational Technology Plan for Virginia and thanked Mr. Saunders for his hard work.

**H. Legislative Report: 2017 General Assembly**

Dr. Cynthia Cave, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented the Legislative Report from General Assembly.

This report provided a summary of K-12 legislation before the 2017 General Assembly that will require action by the Board of Education or the Virginia Department of Education or otherwise relates to the work of the Board or impacts local school divisions.

Dr. Cave highlighted legislation of particular interest to the Board. A detailed report, which is updated weekly during the General Assembly session, can be found online at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/legislation/2017/bills.shtml>.

The Board accepted the legislative report on the 2017 General Assembly and thanked Dr. Cave and all of the staff in the policy office for their hard work.

***DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES***

Mr. Romero shared a concern that he was seeing in his school division related to President Trump's executive order on immigration. He is seeing many students living in fear; many of those students not knowing if they will have a home or family to go to when they released from school. Mr. Romero stated that as a Board Member, he wants every student to have a quality education that allows them to grow academically, socially and emotionally. Mr. Romero asked whether the Board has a responsibility to provide guidance to local school divisions on how to support students and families during the difficult time.

Dr. Staples responded by saying that he has heard from several superintendents in Region 5 about guidance from the Board or the Department about: 1) the legal responsibilities and requirements on school staff; and 2) the obligations and protections offered to staff and students. Department staff has reached out to AASA (the School Superintendent Association) and the Office of the Attorney General to inquire about how to provide guidance to local school divisions.

Ms. Holton commended Mr. Romero for sharing his concerns and agreed that it would be helpful to school divisions to provide guidance on this issue. Mrs. Atkinson recommended reaching out to the Virginia School Boards Association to suggest that they provide guidance and training to local school board. Dr. Cannaday suggested that a Superintendent's Memo be issued about supports available to local school divisions. Mrs. Lodal commended Mr. Romero for being on the front lines during this challenging time and for his continued support of students.

Dr. Staples stated that he would send out a Superintendent's Memo once appropriate information and guidance was available, and would provide an update to the Board.

### ***DINNER MEETING***

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, February 22, 2017 at 6:00 p.m., at the Berkley Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Lodal, Ms. Holton and Mr. Romero. The following department staff also attended: Dr. Steven Staples, superintendent of public instruction, and Ms. Emily Webb, director of board relations. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.

### ***EXECUTIVE SESSION***

Mr. Gecker 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 that Susan Williams and Mona Siddiqui, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education; as well as staff members Dr. Steven Staples, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, and John Brooks, whose presence will aid in this matter, participate in the closed meeting. The motion was carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 12:25 p.m.

Mr. Gecker made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session.

Mr. Gecker 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 under this chapter and; (2) only public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered.

Any member who believes there was a departure from these requirements shall so state prior to the vote, indicating the substance of the departure that, in his or her judgement, has taken place. The statement of the departure will be recorded in the minutes.

Board Roll call:

Dr. Wilson - Yes  
Mrs. Lodal – Yes

Mr. Dillard – Yes  
Mr. Gecker - Yes  
Dr. Cannaday – Yes  
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes  
Mr. Romero - Yes  
Ms. Holton – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to issue a licensure renewal in Case #1. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson and carried unanimously.

***ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION***

There being no further business of the Board of Education, Dr. Cannaday adjourned the meeting at 2:25p.m.



---

President