

**MINUTES**  
**Virginia Board of Education**  
**Committee on School and Division Accountability**  
**July 24, 2013**  
**3:00 P.M.**  
**Jefferson Conference Room, James Monroe Building**

**Welcome and Opening Comments**

Mrs. Diane Atkinson, chairman of the Committee on School and Division Accountability, convened the meeting with the following Board members present: Dr. Oktay Baysal, Betsy Beamer, Christian Braunlich, Dr. Billy Cannaday, Jr., Darla Edwards, and David Foster. Dr. Patricia Wright, superintendent of public instruction, was also present.

Mrs. Atkinson welcomed the Board members and guests to the committee meeting. She said they were here today to discuss two key items which are before the full Board for review at tomorrow's Board of Education meeting: first, final review of growth indicators for use in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA), teacher evaluation, and a school grading system, and second, proposed amendments to the SOA which will be on first review tomorrow.

Mrs. Atkinson stated that Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, had presented the proposed growth indicators to this committee and to the full Board in June following public comment and would follow-up today with proposed changes. Mrs. Atkinson emphasized that the school grading formula would not be included in today's review process. That formula which will result in the grading of schools will be before the committee and the Board for first review in September.

Mrs. Atkinson went on to say the Board approved emergency amendments to the SOA in June 2012 in response to legislation which strengthened post-secondary education and workplace readiness opportunities for students and consolidated the number of Board-approved diplomas. The emergency regulations became effective on June 5 of this year. Tomorrow the Board will take action on permanent regulations to replace the emergency regulations. So that the permanent regulations will not be delayed, it was decided to separate out the comprehensive review of the SOA. A NOIRA for that comprehensive review will be published in the Virginia Register August 12 and will kick off a thirty-day public comment period. Today Mrs. Wescott will present to the committee the proposed revisions to the SOA which the Board will discuss tomorrow on first review. The final review will not come back to the Board until sometime in the fall after the NOIRA public comment period.

**Public Comment**

At that point Mrs. Atkinson indicated that she had at least one person signed up for public comment: Nicole Dooley of Just Children. On behalf of that organization, Ms.

Dooley stated that the organization appreciates the emphasis on career and college readiness in the high school indicators, but also encouraged the Board to ensure that the performance of students in the earlier high school grades is not neglected. In addition, she stated that high school growth indicators should be applied rigorously yet equitably across districts with varying resources. As to the upcoming design of the school grading formula, she encouraged the Board to include student attendance and school disciplinary referrals in the formula. In addition, she encouraged the Board to include in the grading formula disaggregated math and reading assessment performance; graduation rates; and attendance and disciplinary referrals by race, economic disadvantage, limited English proficiency, and disability.

Once Ms. Dooley completed her comments, Mrs. Atkinson asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wanted to provide public comment. Since no one responded, she moved on the next agenda item.

### **Proposed Growth Indicators**

Next on the agenda was Shelley Loving-Ryder who presented an [overview](#) of the proposed growth indicators. Ms. Ryder stated that she would focus primarily on the changes that have been made since they were last reviewed in June. The changes include the following:

- The reference to the “percent of students” achieving each indicator has been removed to clarify that these are indicators that reflect growth for individual students. Language indicating the percent of students achieving the indicators may be used in the growth component of the grading formula.
- The introduction of the high school section has been revised to clarify the focus of the high school indicators on college and career readiness.
- The high school indicators have been revised to focus on individual students in the Virginia on-time graduation rate cohort (9<sup>th</sup> grade cohort) rather than on graduates. This change is intended to make clear that students who were in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade cohort and dropped out before graduating will be included in the growth component of the school grading formula.
- The high school indicator regarding the percent of students participating in an AP, IB, or dual enrollment course out of the total number of 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students (participants also include students in grades 9-10) has been removed to reflect the focus on student level indicators. This indicator may be used as a school level growth indicator in the grading formula.

There was some discussion of the changes. A Board member suggested a wording change; that is, where the language currently reads “The Board will establish the school grading formula by October 1, 2013....” it should be changed to read “The Board intends to establish the school grading formula by October 1, 2013.” There was also some discussion about the indicators, but a member was troubled by the dearth of references to two of the four core curricular areas: science and history and social science. There was quite a bit of discussion about this and related issues. However, it was decided that there is a rationale for restricting the growth indicator to reading and

math. Because there is annual testing in reading and math beginning with grade 3, children will have a previous year's score which will be reviewed with the current year's score to determine whether they can be credited with growth. Proficiency in science and history and social science will have to be factored in just as reading and mathematics and there will be additional indicators likely. It was acknowledged that in the proposal there is a sentence that allows the Board to approve additional student growth and college and career readiness indicators and additional assessments for measuring student growth. Tomorrow there will be new language to consider as the full Board looks at this.

### **Proposed Amendments to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA)***

Anne Wescott made a presentation regarding the proposed [amendments](#) to and the [comprehensive review](#) of the SOA. Among other issues, she included revisions to the purpose; the objectives; student achievement expectations, including language regarding expedited retakes of the SOL tests in grades 3-8 with such funds as may be appropriated and the policy for dropping courses; options for completing high school, including the new provisions regarding the Modified Standard Diploma; and the virtual course and CPR provisions for the Standard and Advanced Studies Diploma.

Ms. Wescott also said, as proposed, other states' end-of-course and exit tests required for graduation by a sending state would be accepted for verified credits, consistent with the interstate military compact. In addition, elementary schools would be required to provide reading intervention services to students in grade three who demonstrate deficiencies based on performance or testing and each school would be required to ensure that middle and secondary school students who need targeted mathematics remediation and intervention shall receive additional instruction. With reference to clock hours, the SOA would be revised to ensure, for middle schools, each student would be provided at least 560 clock hours of instruction for English, mathematics, science, and history/social science. For secondary school, the 140 clock hours have been struck and language regarding successful completion of the course requirements, and passing the end-of-the-course Standards of Learning test or a Board approved substitute test remains.

She stated that the language regarding teacher staffing requirements is out of date because it assumes the traditional six-period days. The proposal indicates that the middle and secondary classroom teacher's standard load shall be based on teaching no more than 5/6 of the instructional day, or the equivalent in minutes per week, with no more than 150 students per school year regardless of the configuration of the class schedules.

Board members and Dr. Wright discussed these issues as the revisions were reviewed.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.