

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

July 26, 2012

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

Mr. David M. Foster, President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Mr. Christian N. Braunlich
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.

Ms. Darlene D. Mack
Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears

Dr. Patricia I. Wright
Superintendent of Public Instruction

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Foster led in a moment of silence and Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Cannaday made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2012, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mack and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION/RECOGNITION

Resolutions of Recognition were presented to school divisions recently receiving the AdvancED/SACS District Accreditation. Ms. Hilda Kelly, state director of AdvancED-Virginia joined Mr. Foster in congratulating the following school divisions receiving recognition:

Chesapeake City Public Schools

Representatives: Dr. James Roberts, division superintendent; Mrs. Christie New Craig, school board vice chair; and Mrs. Penny Goodin, office of school improvement planning

Poquoson City Public Schools

The school division was unable to send a representative. The resolution will be mailed to the division superintendent.

Powhatan County Public Schools

Representatives: Dr. Margaret Meara, division superintendent; Mrs. Sandra Lynch, assistant superintendent for secondary instruction and gifted education; Mrs. Debbie Jones, school board chair; and Ms. Michele Wilson, public information officer

Radford City Public Schools

Representatives: Dr. Becky Greer, division superintendent; and Mr. Robert Graham, assistant superintendent of instruction

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

Mary Jo Fields
Wendell Roberts
Beth Turner
Dr. Barbara Gruber
Gloria Dalton Dunn
Brita Hampton

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to accept the following items on the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

- Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literary Fund Applications Approved for Release of Funds or Placement on a Waiting List

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the Literary Fund as of March 31, 2012.

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literary Fund Applications Approved for Release of Funds or Placement on a Waiting List

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board also approved the action described in the three applications listed below:

- Windsor Middle School—Isle of Wight County, totaling \$7,500,000, is eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List at Priority 37.
- Union High School—Wise County, totaling \$7,500,000, is eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List at Priority 38.
- Eastside High School—Wise County, totaling \$7,500,000, is eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List at Priority 39.

Action/Discussion Items

Final Review of Revisions to the Board of Education Criteria and Application for Establishing a College Partnership Laboratory School to Conform to SB 475, HB 765, and HB 577 Passed by the 2012 General Assembly

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

- Legislation passed in the 2010 Virginia General Assembly and signed by the Governor established college partnership laboratory schools. On January 13, 2011, the Board of Education approved the application for college partnership schools and the procedures for receiving, reviewing, and ruling on college partnership laboratory school applications. Senate Bill 475 (Locke), House Bill 765 (Peace), and House Bill 577 (Bell) were passed by the 2012 General Assembly and require revisions to the Board of Education's application and application process.
- Since the Board's first review of the application and application process, page 8 of the document was amended as follows:

The College Partnership Laboratory Schools Committee report will normally be ~~presented~~ considered for first review at the next regularly scheduled full Board meeting. The applicant will be requested to attend this meeting to answer questions or make comments on the application.

~~At this meeting~~ At the next regularly scheduled Board meeting following first review, the Board will normally consider the application for final review and will take one of the following actions....

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion to approve the recommended revisions to the Virginia College Partnership Laboratory School Application Process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Braunlich and carried unanimously.

Changes to the Code are noted below:

Section 23-299. Objectives; definitions.

B. As used in this chapter:

"At-risk pupil" means a student having a physical, emotional, intellectual, socioeconomic, or cultural risk factor, as defined in Board of Education criteria, which research indicates may negatively influence educational success.

"College partnership laboratory school" means a public, nonsectarian, nonreligious school established by a public *or private* institution of higher education that operates a teacher education program approved by the Board of Education.

"Governing board" means the board of a college partnership laboratory school that is party to the contract with the Board of Education, with the responsibility of creating, managing, and operating the college partnership laboratory school, and whose members have been selected by the institution of higher education establishing the college partnership laboratory school. The governing board shall be under the control of the institution of higher education establishing the college partnership laboratory school.

Section 23-299.2. Establishment and operation of college partnership laboratory schools; requirements.

C. Pursuant to a college partnership laboratory school agreement, a college partnership laboratory school shall be responsible for its own operations, including, but not limited to, such budget preparation, contracts for services, and personnel matters as are specified in the agreement. A college partnership laboratory school may *also* negotiate and contract with a school board, the governing body of a ~~public~~ *an* institution of higher education, or any third party for the use of a school building and grounds, the operation and maintenance thereof, and the provision of any service, activity, or undertaking that the college partnership laboratory school is required to perform in order to carry out the educational program described in its contract. Any services for which a college partnership laboratory school contracts with a school board or institution of higher education shall not exceed the school division's or institution's costs to provide such services.

D. A college partnership laboratory school shall not charge tuition *for courses required for high school graduation. However, tuition may be charged for courses for which the student receives college credit and for enrichment courses that are not required to earn a Board of Education approved high school diploma.*

E. An approved college partnership laboratory school shall be designated as a local education agency, but shall not constitute a school division.

F. College partnership laboratory schools are encouraged to develop collaborative partnerships with public school divisions for the purpose of building seamless education opportunities for all Virginia students, from preschool to postsecondary education. *An educational program provided to students enrolled in a public school division pursuant to a collaborative partnership between the college partnership laboratory school and the public school division shall be considered to be the educational program of the public school division for purposes of the Standards of Accreditation.*

Section 23-299.4. College partnership laboratory school application.

A. Any public *or private* institution of higher education operating within the Commonwealth and having a teacher education program approved by the Board of Education may submit an application for formation of a college partnership laboratory school.

31. Assurances that the college partnership laboratory school (i) is nonreligious in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations and (ii) does not charge tuition, *except as described in subsection D of § 23-299.2.*

The purposes of the college partnership laboratory school application are to present the proposed school's academic and operational vision and plans, demonstrate the applicant's capacities to execute the proposed vision and plans, and provide the Board of Education a clear basis for assessing the applicant's plans and capacities. An approved college partnership laboratory school application shall not serve as the school's contract. Within 90 days of approval of a college partnership laboratory school application, the Board of Education and the governing board of the approved school shall execute a contract that clearly sets forth the academic and operational performance expectations and measures by which the college partnership laboratory school will be judged and the administrative relationship between the Board of Education and the college partnership laboratory school, including each party's rights and duties. The performance expectations and measures set forth in the contract shall include but need not be limited to applicable federal and state accountability requirements. The performance provisions may be refined or amended by mutual agreement after the college partnership laboratory school is operating and has collected baseline achievement data for its enrolled students.

Section 23-299.8. Employment of professional, licensed personnel.

A. College partnership laboratory school personnel shall be employees of the institution of higher education establishing the school.

B. Teachers working in a college partnership laboratory school shall hold a license issued by the Board of Education or, in the case of an instructor in the higher education institution's Board-approved teacher education program, be eligible to hold a Virginia teaching license. Teachers working in a college partnership laboratory school shall be subject to the requirements of §§ ~~22.1-296.1~~ *and*, ~~22.1-296.2~~ *and* ~~22.1-296.4~~ applicable to teachers employed by a local school board.

C. Professional, licensed personnel of a college partnership laboratory school shall be granted the same employment benefits given to professional, licensed personnel in public schools in accordance with the agreement between the college partnership laboratory school and the Board of Education.

Section 23-299.9. Funding of college partnership laboratory schools.

E. *Any tuition, room and board, and any other* educational and related fees collected from students enrolled at a college partnership laboratory school shall comply with Board of Education regulations and shall be credited to the account of such school.

Final Review of the Consensus Report from the Board of Education Charter School Committee on the Proposed Loudoun Math and IT Academy Charter School Application

Mrs. Diane Jay, associate director for program administration and accountability, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- The Board of Education Charter School Committee met on May 23, 2012, to discuss the charter school application submitted by the Loudoun Math and IT Academy in Loudoun County and to meet with the applicant. The table below displays the committee's recommendation as to whether the components of the application meet the Board's approval criteria.

Required Application Components		Met the Criterion
II.	Mission Statement	Yes
III.	Goals and Educational Objectives	Yes
IV.	Evidence of Support	Yes
V.	Statement of Need	Yes
VI.	Educational Program	Yes
VII.	Enrollment Process	Yes
VIII.	Economic Soundness	Yes
IX.	Displacement	Yes
X.	Management and Operation	Yes
XI.	Employment Terms and Conditions	Yes
XII.	Liability and Insurance	Yes
XIII.	Transportation	Yes
XIV.	Residential Charter School	N/A
XV.	Disclosures	Yes

Board members noted concerns regarding the fiscal soundness of practices at Chesapeake Science Point Public Charter School in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, a school from which the Loudoun Math and IT Academy (LMITA) was modeled. LMITA founding members noted that the public charter school will have a business manager working day-to-day to manage finances of the school with assistance from a certified public accountant, finances will be reviewed monthly, Loudoun County Public Schools will receive financial information on a regular basis, and an audit will be conducted annually.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the Charter School Committee's recommendation that the application for Loudoun Math and IT Academy in Loudoun County meets all applicable Board of Education charter school application criteria. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Board of Education Criteria for Character Education

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

- Section 22.1-208.01. A. of the *Code of Virginia* requires each local school board to establish a character education program, and § 22.1-208.01. B. requires the Board of Education to establish criteria for character education programs consistent with the *Code*. On February 24, 2000, the Board of Education approved criteria for character education programs, which were developed by a committee of parents, teachers and administrators.
- On June 28, 2012, proposed revisions to the Board of Education's criteria for character education programs were presented for first review, in order that the criteria align with the *Code*, as a result of legislation from the 2012 General Assembly session. As part of this first review, the Board further proposed that its criteria specify that programs be implemented at the middle school level, as well as at the named elementary and secondary levels.

- The proposed revisions to the criteria for alignment with HB 1179 (2012) include the following:

Each local character education program shall:

1. Be developed in cooperation with the students, parents, and the community-at-large.
2. Specify those character traits to be taught, selecting from those which are common to diverse social, cultural, and religious groups and meeting the requirements of §22.1-208.01 of the *Code*.
3. Avoid indoctrination of any religious or political belief.
4. Be implemented at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels.
5. Complement the state Standards of Learning, be interwoven into existing curricula or established as a separate program, and taught primarily by example, illustration, and participation.
6. Provide for relevant professional development and adequate resources.
7. Include a method for program evaluation.
8. Be held during the regular school year and/or summer to include programming in a youth development academy, or both.

During the discussion, it was suggested that cyber bullying is addressed along with character education when posted on the Department's Web site and sent by Superintendent's Memorandum to school divisions.

Ms. Mack made a motion to approve the proposed amendments to the Board's criteria for character education programs to conform to HB 1179. The motion was seconded by Mr. Braunlich and carried unanimously.

Second Review of the Proposed Regulations Governing Unexcused Absences and Truancy

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

- On September 17, 2009, the Board of Education authorized a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to add new regulations governing reporting of student nonattendance and any concomitant policies and procedures. Staff worked with a statewide advisory committee of twenty-seven members to discuss attendance issues and to draft proposed regulations.
- On June 29, 2010, Executive Order 14 was issued, requiring that proposed regulations go forward by 180 days from the posting of the NOIRA on the Regulatory Town Hall. The NOIRA was resubmitted and approved by the Board on July 22, 2010, in order to comply with the new timeline of the Executive Order. On January 13, 2011, the Board of Education waived first review and authorized staff to proceed with the remaining steps required by the Administrative Process Act (APA).
- During the 2012 General Assembly session, HB 886 was enacted to require the Board of Education to promulgate regulations addressing truancy as follows:

That the Board of Education shall promulgate regulations by July 1, 2013, to address truancy. In promulgating these regulations, the Board shall address the following: (i) provisions for early intervention at the school level for repeated unexcused absences; (ii) identification of and a plan to address a student's academic, social, familial, and other barriers that impede attendance in school; and (iii) arrangement of conferences that may be necessary between school personnel, students, parents, and community services providers, as appropriate, to address plans and strategies to improve student attendance, including but not limited to, referrals to family assessment and planning teams.

- The Governor vetoed the bill because the Board of Education was in the final stages of the process of promulgating the proposed *Regulations Governing Unexcused Absences and Truancy*. His veto explanation follows:

While this Section I legislation has a worthy goal, it is not necessary since the Virginia Board of Education is currently in the process of promulgating Regulations Governing Unexcused Absences and Truancy [8 VAC 20 - 730]. These new regulations will govern the collection and reporting of truancy-related data and provide guidance on school attendance policy. The proposed regulations were initiated in 2010, and are in the final stages of the Administrative Process Act (APA). As the Board of Education completes the regulatory process, I will ask the Board via letter to address the criteria outlined in HB 886, and consider emphasizing the importance of working with the parents and the community organizations early in the process, before truancy becomes a serious problem for a student. I am confident the laudable intent of HB 886 can easily be addressed in the truancy regulations currently being promulgated by the Virginia Board of Education. Hence, HB 886 is not necessary.

- On March 22, 2012, a public hearing was held to receive comments about the proposed regulations. There were three submittals of public comments received during the continued APA process, with no comments received in opposition to the proposed regulations. Based on comments received and on the proposed HB 886 and the Governor's veto message, the proposed regulations have been amended to provide clarity and to increase specificity.

Part I of the regulations, 8VAC 20-730-10, which provides definitions of terms, has been amended as follows:

- Definition of "attendance plan" amended to specify participating school representatives, to include resolution of a student's nonattendance, and to include participation by the student
- Definition of "attendance conference" amended to remove "if appropriate" from attendance of student at the conference in order to align with the *Code* and to specify role of community representatives
- Definition of "court referral" amended to replace "referral...to intake worker" with "filing a complaint through petition" for clarity. "Records of interventions regarding the student's unexcused absences" added to list of materials provided for specificity
- Definition of "excused absence" amended to replace "excuse" with "reason" and to add "authority" to school administration for consistency. "Absences resulting from suspensions shall be considered excused" added for consistency and similar phrase stating that absences for suspensions shall not be considered unexcused removed from definition of "unexcused absence." "Expelled students continue to remain under the provisions of compulsory school attendance, *Code of Virginia*, § 22.1-254" added for clarity.
- Definition of "multidisciplinary team" amended to specify ability to participate in addressing student attendance. Reference to how work is done deleted
- Definition of "parent" amended to align with *Code*, "legal custodian(s)" added
- Definition of "unexcused absence" amended to delete references to missing "part of the scheduled instructional school day without permission from an administrator" as an unexcused absence. School division policies vary on how partial absences from school without acceptable reasons are counted. In some cases, a school division policy is different for how absences are counted in elementary schools (whole days) to how they are counted in high schools (specified hours for block schedules or class periods in high school.) Also, in some cases, records of an unexcused tardy or unexcused early dismissal are kept, and follow up occurs with the family and student; however, for purposes of truancy, unexcused absences are based on full days. To avoid potential complicating of division data reporting systems and overloading of court cases required by the *Code* after seven unexcused absences, the definition was changed to missing a full day only, with the recognition of the importance and goal of early intervention in attendance problems remaining in the regulations' Foreword. This proposed change also aligns the definition of "unexcused

absence” with that of the federal Uniform Data Set (UDS) guidelines supporting the No Child Left Behind Act, which is missing an entire school day. The definition of “unexcused absence” was also amended to replace “excuse” with “reason,” to add “authority” to “school administration,” and to replace school “administrator” with “administration” for consistency. A further amendment is the deletion of “absences resulting from suspensions shall not be considered unexcused” from this definition and adding similar phrasing to the definition of “excused absence.”

- Note that the proposed definition of truancy is “the act of accruing one or more unexcused absences.” This definition differs from the federal UDS guide supporting NCLB, which defines truancy as “a pattern of repeated unexcused absences from compulsory education.” The reporting requirement from the UDS is that states collect and report data on truancy rates. The “truancy rate” as defined by UDS is “the rate of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences per year per 100 students, with the definition of ‘unexcused’ based on local definition. Prior to the issuance of the federal guidance, the Virginia Department of Education had determined that a report of truancy rates be based on unexcused absences of seven or more. Reporting ten or more unexcused absences, instead of seven, can be easily achieved.

Part II, 8VAC 20-730-20, which provides process and responsibilities for addressing unexcused absences, has been amended as follows:

- Under A.(1), Sentence added to state “Early intervention with the student and parent(s) shall take place for repeated unexcused absences” to reinforce the timely identification of repeated unexcused absences and early intervention to address nonattendance reasons
- Under A.(2), “with the student and parent(s)” has been added after “attendance plan shall be made” to align with the *Code*
- Under A.(3), “fifteen” replaced with “15”
- Under A.(3), “calendar” added before “days” for clarity
- Under A.(3), “when applicable” after “student” deleted to align with the *Code*
- Under A.(4), addition of “all records of intervention regarding the student’s unexcused absences, such as” added before list of materials to accompany petition to Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for specificity
- Under A.(4), The phrase “presented to the intake worker” deleted and replaced with “attached to the petition” for specificity
- Under A.(4), Deletion of “The decision shall be made by the intake worker either to divert the case or to file the petition for presentation before the court.” because it is unnecessary.
- Under B., the phrase “This record does not become a part of the student’s permanent scholastic record” deleted for consistency with *Code* requirements for the student record

Part III, 8VAC 20-730-30, which provides requirements for data collection and reporting, has been amended as follows:

- Under “5,” the phrase “court referral” before “petition” deleted and “or if proceedings against parents were instituted, and the reason” added after “petition was filed” for specificity and consistency

The Board discussed the definition of excused absences as defined in VAC 20-730-20 and agreed to add a new subsection. The Board approved the following addition and revisions to the proposed regulations:

8VAC 20-730-20. Unexcused Absences Intervention Process and Responsibilities.

[A. Each local school board shall provide guidance regarding what would constitute an excused absence in order to address when the explanation provided by the parent will be determined to be reasonable and acceptable.]

[B. Each local school board shall develop procedures to ensure that appropriate interventions will be implemented when a student engages in a pattern of absences less than a full day the explanation for which, if it were a full-day absence, would not be deemed an excused absence.]

~~[A]~~ [C.] The following intervention steps shall be implemented to respond to unexcused absences from school and to engage students in regular school attendance.

[3. The school principal or designee, or the attendance officer, shall schedule a face-to-face attendance conference within ten school days from the date of the student's sixth unexcused absence for the school year. The attendance conference must be held within ~~[fifteen]~~ 15 calendar school days from the date of the sixth unexcused absence. The conference shall include the parent, student [(when applicable)], and school personnel (which may be a representative(s) from the multidisciplinary team) and may include community service providers.

The Board also approved the use of the phrase *school administration* in the document, instead of school administration authority. The Board also clarified that attendance conferences must be held within 15 school days from the date of the sixth unexcused absence, as opposed to 15 calendar days.

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion to accept for second review the proposed *Regulations Governing the Collection and Reporting of Truancy Related Data and Student Attendance Policies* and authorize an additional 30-day public comment period. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

First Review of Proposed State Approved Textbooks for K-12 Science

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, presented this item. Dr. Wallinger recognized Department staff, Eric Rhoades, science coordinator, and Barbara Young, science specialist, and thanked them for their work. Dr. Wallinger's presentation included the following:

- On March 24, 2011, the Board of Education authorized the Department to begin the process of the K-12 science textbooks review using a timeline approved by the Board. The Department of Education used the new textbook process approved by the Board in March 2011, to conduct the textbook review. In November 2011, the review committees received the science textbook samples along with K-12 *Science Standards of Learning* textbook correlations from publishers. Members of these committees conducted individual analyses of the materials prior to meeting with the full committee. In March 2012, the committees

convened in Richmond to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted materials. The consensus evaluations were shared with publishers, and publishers were given an opportunity to respond to the committees' reviews and recommendations. Requests by publishers for reconsideration were examined carefully by Department of Education staff members, as they prepared the list of proposed approved science textbooks.

- In all, 8 publishers are represented on the list of proposed recommended science textbooks. The list contains 56 proposed recommended science textbooks and includes the status of the Publisher's Certification and Agreement forms for each
- The science textbooks submitted for review may be reviewed at the following eight sites around the State: The College of William and Mary, George Mason University, James Madison University, Radford University, The University of Virginia's College at Wise, Longwood University, Old Dominion University, and J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College, Parham Road Campus.

The Board discussed rapid changes being made to digital textbooks and materials, and noted that publishers must notify the Department and school divisions who purchased the materials when changes are made. Members discussed the possible need for new regulations to hold publishers accountable when digital changes are made to textbooks, to provide legal protection for local school divisions.

The Board accepted for first review the list of proposed recommended K-12 science textbooks. The Department of Education will conduct a 30-day public comment period, and will present a final list of proposed approved textbooks for K-12 science in September 2012.

First Review of a Request for Increased Graduation Requirements from a Local School Board

Ms. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Ms. Wescott acknowledged Dr. Deran Whitney, superintendent, Suffolk City Public Schools. Her presentation included the following:

- Suffolk City Public Schools is requesting that the Board of Education approve an additional graduation requirement for the Standard and Advanced Studies Diplomas. This is proposed to become effective for first-time 9th grade students in the 2012-2013 school year. Students would be required to complete 50 hours of voluntary participation in community service or extracurricular activities. Activities that would satisfy this requirement would include the following:
 - ✓ Volunteering for a charitable organization that provides services to the poor, sick or less fortunate;
 - ✓ Participating in Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or similar youth organizations;
 - ✓ Participating in JROTC;
 - ✓ Participating in political campaigns or government internships, or Boys State, Girls State, or Model General Assembly; or
 - ✓ Participating in school-sponsored extracurricular activities that have a civics focus.
- Students would be required to complete at least 16 hours of community service by the end of the 9th grade, an additional 17 hours of community service by the end of the 10th grade, and an additional 17 hours of community service by the end of the 11th grade. School counselors will monitor students' progress in meeting these expectations.

- The division superintendent may waive the community service requirement when there are extenuating circumstances. Extenuating circumstances would mean student illness, death of a family member, student transfer to Suffolk Public Schools during their junior or senior year, homelessness, natural disaster, injury, or disability which would impact the student's ability to satisfy the community service requirement.
- It should be noted that the requirements for community service are virtually identical to the requirements for community service required to earn a Diploma Seal for Excellence in Civics Education.
- For the 2011-2012 school year, the Virginia On-Time Graduation Rate for Suffolk Public Schools was 81.2 percent, and the dropout rate was 10.8 percent. For the three high schools, the ratings were as follows:

High School	Graduation and Completion Index	Virginia On-Time Graduation Rate	Dropout Rate
King's Fork	82	78.6	13.4
Lakeland	83	78.3	12.5
Nansemond River	92	87.7	5.3

- The school division engaged parent representatives for feedback before the school board took action on this proposed requirement.

During the discussion, it was suggested that students decide which organizations to perform community service for. It was also suggested that the effective date is changed to the 2013-2014 school year.

The Board accepted the request from Suffolk City Public Schools for first review.

First Review of Modifications to the Academic Review Process

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director for school improvement, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

- Based on the approval of *Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, the academic review process guidelines must be modified to include provisions for schools designated as Title I *Priority* or *Focus* schools under this approved application. The criteria for identification as *Priority* or *Focus* school as described in the approved application are provided below.

Criteria for the Identification of Priority Schools

Based on 723 schools identified as Title I in school year 2011-2012, Virginia will identify a number of schools equal to five percent of the state's Title I schools, or 36 schools (5 percent of 723 schools), as priority schools for school year 2012-2013. Priority schools will be identified as Tier 4 schools. If identified as a priority school, the school must select a Lead Turnaround Partner and implement one of the four USED models as required in *Virginia's Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*. The state will identify any school meeting one or more of the criteria below as a priority school:

Criterion A	Schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds under Section 1003(g) of ESEA in Federal Fiscal Year 2009 (Cohort I) or 2010 (Cohort II) and identified and served as a Tier I or Tier II school
Criterion B	Title I high schools with a federal graduation indicator* of 60 percent or less for two or more of the most recent consecutive years
Criterion C	Title I schools based on the “all students” performance in reading and/or mathematics performance on federal AMOs
Criterion D	Title I schools failing to meet the 95 percent participation rate in reading and/or mathematics for three consecutive years

* The ESEA federal graduation indicator recognizes only Standard and Advanced Studies diplomas.

Criteria for the Identification of Focus Schools

For accountability purposes, *Title I schools* with one or more proficiency gap groups not meeting performance expectations in reading and mathematics will be considered for inclusion in the focus school category. Title I schools with one or more proficiency gap groups failing to meet the 95 percent participation rate in reading and/or mathematics will also be considered for inclusion in the focus school category. The department will identify from the list of schools ranked by proficiency gap points a number equal to 10 percent of the state’s total Title I schools (72 schools). Focus schools will be identified as Tier 3 schools. Virginia’s academic review process emphasizes the participation and continuous involvement of division-level administrators in the school improvement process as well as targeted interventions at the school level for students at-risk for not passing a grade-level assessment. The academic review process is aligned to the requirements for focus schools in the *Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*.

- The Department of Education is required to develop academic review guidelines to support schools that are *Accredited with Warning* (in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index) or *Provisionally Accredited–Graduation Rate* (8VAC 20-131-310). Concurrently, the Department of Education provides support to schools that are designated as *Priority* or *Focus* schools in accordance with Virginia’s approved waiver *Application for U.S. Department of Education Flexibility from Certain Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*. While some schools are designated for technical assistance because they fail to meet federal achievement thresholds, many schools fail to meet both state and federal thresholds. The proposed guidelines establish a differentiated academic review process to address academic and graduation issues for schools that are working to meet state and/or federal accountability achievement requirements. Below is the differentiated academic review process based on tier.

	School Tier/Accountability Status			
	Tier 1: Title I or non-Title I Schools Accredited with Warning or Provisionally Accredited that Meet Federal Benchmarks for Each of the Three Proficiency Gap Groups	Tier 2: Title I or non-Title I Schools Accredited with Warning or Provisionally Accredited that Do Not Meet Federal Benchmarks for Each of the Three Proficiency Gap groups	Tier 3: Title I Focus Schools Not Fully Accredited	Tier 4: Title I Priority Schools Not Fully Accredited
Year 1 of Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment of SEA contractor Needs sensing interview Formation of school and division support teams On-site review led by SEA contractor and LEA with participation by other LEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment of SEA contractor Needs sensing interview Formation of school and division support teams On-site review led by SEA with participation by other assigned SEA contractors and LEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment of SEA contractor Needs sensing interview Formation of school and division support teams Implement all requirements in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment of SEA contractor Implement all requirements of USED Turnaround Principles or USED Turnaround Model including the requirement to select a Lead Turnaround

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> representatives on the academic review team • Technical assistance and training on school improvement planning and monitoring tools • Development of school improvement plan and aligned division goals; quarterly progress monitoring reports • Differentiated technical assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> representatives on the academic review team • Technical assistance and training on school improvement planning and monitoring tools • Development of school improvement plan focusing on data from each of the three proficiency gap groups; development of aligned division goals; quarterly progress monitoring reports • Differentiated technical assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility Waiver • On-site review led by SEA contractor with participation by LEA representatives on the academic review team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner (LTP) • On-site review led by SEA contractor with participation by the LTP and other LEA representatives on the academic review team • Monthly data review required
Year 2 and Year 3 of Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued assignment of contractor • Division team and school team implement, monitor and modify the school improvement plan • Differentiated technical assistance provided by OSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued assignment of contractor • Division team and school team implement, monitor and modify the school improvement plan • Differentiated technical assistance provided by OSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued assignment of contractor • Implement all requirements in Flexibility Waiver • Differentiated technical assistance provided by OSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued assignment of contractor • Continue to implement all requirements of USED Turnaround Principles or USED Turnaround Model • Differentiated technical assistance provided by OSI • Monthly data review required
Year 4 of Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to Accreditation Denied status • Develop MOU with the Board of Education 			

The Board accepted for first review the proposed modifications to the academic review process.

First Review of Revised Individual Student Alternative Education Program Plan (ISAEP) Program Guidelines to Conform to HB 1061 and SB 489

Mr. Lan Neugent, assistant superintendent for technology, career and adult education, presented this item. His presentation included the following:

- The ISAEP program prepares certain secondary students to take the Tests of General Educational Development (GED®) while developing career and technical education skills. The *Individual Student Alternative Education Program Plan (ISAEP) Program Guidelines* were approved by the Board of Education in 2000 and revised in 2003 to more clearly and succinctly articulate the intent and components of the program.

Section 22.1-254 of the *Code of Virginia* states, in part, the following:

A. Except as otherwise provided in this article, every parent, guardian, or other person in the Commonwealth having control or charge of any child who will have reached the fifth birthday on or before September 30 of any school year and who has not passed the eighteenth birthday shall, during the period of each year the public schools are in session and for the same number of days and hours per day as the public schools, send such child to a public school or to a private, denominational, or parochial school or have such child taught by a tutor or teacher of qualifications prescribed by the Board of Education and approved by the division superintendent, or provide for home instruction of such child as described in § 22.1-254.1.

As prescribed in the regulations of the Board of Education, the requirements of this section may also be satisfied by sending a child to an alternative program of study or work/study offered by a public, private, denominational, or parochial school or by a public or private degree-granting institution of higher education. Further, in the case of any five-year-old child who is subject to the provisions of this subsection, the requirements of this section may be alternatively satisfied by sending the child to any public educational pre-kindergarten program, including a Head Start program, or in a private, denominational, or parochial educational pre-kindergarten program.

Instruction in the home of a child or children by the parent, guardian, or other person having control or charge of such child or children shall not be classified or defined as a private, denominational or parochial school.

The requirements of this section shall apply to (i) any child in the custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice or the Department of Corrections who has not passed his eighteenth birthday and (ii) any child whom the division superintendent has required to take a special program of prevention, intervention, or remediation as provided in subsection C of § 22.1-253.13:1 and in § 22.1-254.01. The requirements of this section shall not apply to (a) any person 16 through 18 years of age who is housed in an adult correctional facility when such person is actively pursuing a general educational development (GED) certificate but is not enrolled in an individual student alternative education plan pursuant to subsection E, and (b) any child who has obtained a high school diploma or its equivalent, a certificate of completion, or a GED certificate, or who has otherwise complied with compulsory school attendance requirements as set forth in this article.

...E. Local school boards may allow the requirements of subsection A to be met under the following conditions:

For a student who is at least 16 years of age, there shall be a meeting of the student, the student's parents, and the principal or his designee of the school in which the student is enrolled in which an individual student alternative education plan shall be developed in conformity with guidelines prescribed by the Board, which plan must include:

- a. Career guidance counseling;
- b. Mandatory enrollment and attendance in a general educational development preparatory program or other alternative education program approved by the local school board with attendance requirements that provide for reporting of student attendance by the chief administrator of such GED preparatory program or approved alternative education program to such principal or his designee;
- c. Mandatory enrollment in a program to earn a Board of Education-approved career and technical education credential, such as the successful completion of an industry certification, a state licensure examination, a national occupational competency assessment, or the Virginia workplace readiness skills assessment;
- d. Successful completion of the course in economics and personal finance required to earn a Board of Education-approved high school diploma;
- e. Counseling on the economic impact of failing to complete high school; and
- f. Procedures for reenrollment to comply with the requirements of subsection A....

- Legislative changes enacted during the 2012 General Assembly session impact ISAEP programs beginning with the 2012-2013 program year. Beginning July 1, 2012, all students enrolled in an ISAEP program must be enrolled in a program to earn a Board of Education-approved career and technical education credential and successfully complete the course in economics and personal finance required to earn a Board of Education-approved high school diploma in addition to preparing for and taking the GED® Tests. These additional requirements must be successfully completed prior to the students' completion of the ISAEP program.

Board members discussed the following data collected since 2000 on the ISAEP programs—Approximately 6,200 students are served each year through ISAEP funding; approximately 4,200 are enrolled yearly; the completion rate is approximately 28%; and the GED pass rate is approximately 3,900. Program participants include students that are unable to compete in the classroom; commonwealth challenge cadets who return to finish the program; seventeen and eighteen year-olds who are behind their peers; and those that have been incarcerated.

The Board accepted for first review the *Individual Student Alternative Education Program Plan (ISAEP) Program Guidelines*.

First Review of a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) to Revise the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8 VAC 20-22-10 et seq.) as Required by House Bill 578 of the 2012 Virginia General Assembly to Establish a License and Eligibility Criteria for Teachers Who Teach Only Online Courses

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

- House Bill 578 was approved during the 2012 General Assembly Session. The legislation became effective July 1, 2012. As amended by that bill, Section 22.1-298.1 of the *Code of Virginia* states:

The Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation the licensure requirements for teachers who teach only online courses, as defined in § 22.1-212.23. Such license shall be valid only for teaching online courses. Teachers who hold a five-year renewable license issued by the Board of Education may teach online courses for which they are properly endorsed.

- As the options available to Virginia's public school students through virtual learning programs continue to expand, requirements for teachers assigned to teach only online courses need to be addressed. The Board of Education's *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* do not specifically address requirements for teachers who teach only online courses. The legislation requires the establishment of a license and criteria for obtaining the license.
- The amendment to these regulations, as prescribed in HB578, will assure that the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* will address licensure for teachers assigned to teach only online courses, further ensuring educational quality for Virginia's public school students.

The Board accepted for first review the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action.

First Review of Revised Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Superintendents

Mrs. Patty Pitts also presented this item. Mrs. Pitts thanked the Department of Education staff, especially recognizing Dr. Mark Allan, director of licensure, and Dr. Wright; Dr. James Stronge and Jenny Tomlinson, College of William and Mary; and the work group members for helping to develop the revised *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards, and Evaluation Criteria for Superintendents*.

Mrs. Pitt's presentation included the following:

- The Virginia Department of Education established a work group to conduct a comprehensive study of superintendent evaluation in spring 2012. The work group included principals, teachers, superintendents, a human resources representative, a parent representative, and representatives from professional organizations (Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia Education Association, Virginia School Boards Association, and the Virginia Parent Teacher Association), expert consultants, and Department of Education personnel.
- The goals of the superintendent evaluation work group were to:
 - ✓ develop and recommend policy revisions related to superintendent evaluation, as appropriate;
 - ✓ compile and synthesize current research related to superintendent evaluation and superintendent performance standards;
 - ✓ examine existing state law, policies, and procedures relating to superintendent evaluation;
 - ✓ establish the use of multiple data sources for documenting performance, including opportunities for superintendents to present evidence of their own performance as well as student growth;
 - ✓ develop a procedure for conducting performance reviews that stresses accountability, promotes professional improvement, and increases superintendents' involvement in the evaluation process;
 - ✓ revise existing documents developed to support superintendent evaluation across Virginia, including the *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents* to reflect current research and embed student growth as a significant factor of superintendent evaluation protocols; and
 - ✓ examine the use of superintendent evaluation to improve student achievement.
- The *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Superintendents* sets forth seven performance standards for all Virginia superintendents. Pursuant to state law, superintendent evaluations must be consistent with the following performance standards (objectives) :

Performance Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Goals

The superintendent works with the local school board to formulate and implement the school division's mission, vision, and goals to promote student academic progress.

Performance Standard 2: Planning and Assessment

The superintendent strategically gathers, analyzes, and uses a variety of data to guide planning and decision-making consistent with established guidelines, policies, and procedures that result in student academic progress.

Performance Standard 3: Instructional Leadership

The superintendent fosters the success of all teachers, staff, and students by ensuring the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of effective teaching and learning that leads to student academic progress and school improvement.

Performance Standard 4: Organizational Leadership and Safety

The superintendent fosters the safety and success of all teachers, staff, and students by supporting, managing, and evaluating the division's organization, operation, and use of resources.

Performance Standard 5: Communication and Community Relations

The superintendent fosters the success of all students through effective communication with stakeholders.

Performance Standard 6: Professionalism

The superintendent fosters the success of teachers, staff, and students by demonstrating professional standards and ethics, engaging in continuous professional development, and contributing to the profession.

Performance Standard 7: Divisionwide Student Academic Progress

The superintendent's leadership results in acceptable, measurable divisionwide student academic progress based on established standards.

Board members noted the need for local school board members to receive training in the revised evaluation standards.

Board members appreciated the representation on the Virginia Superintendent Evaluation Work Group. The work group consisted of principals, teachers, superintendents, human resource representatives, parent representatives, and representatives from professional organizations (Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia Education Association, Virginia School Boards Association, and the Virginia Parent Teacher Association), expert consultants, and Department of Education personnel.

Dr. Wright acknowledged the revised guidelines as a consensus document, which was the result of inclusive discussions amongst members of the work group. She also acknowledged organizations in attendance who participated in the work group including Wendell Roberts, Virginia School Boards Association; Steve Staples, Virginia Association of School Superintendents; and Jim Baldwin, Virginia Association of Elementary School Superintendents.

The Board accepted for first review the *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Superintendents*, to become effective on July 1, 2014; however, school boards and divisions are authorized to implement the guidelines and standards prior to July 1, 2014

First Review of Proposed Revisions to the Advancing Virginia's Leadership Agenda Guidance Document: Standards and Indicators for School Leaders and Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision Endorsement

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

- On February 23, 2012, the Board approved revised *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Principals*. As a result of these Board approved revisions, the *Advancing Virginia's Leadership Agenda Guidance Document: Standards and Indicators for School Leaders and Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision Endorsement* document needs to be revised to align with the 2012 *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Principals*.
- The Virginia Department of Education established a work group to align the *Advancing Virginia's Leadership Agenda Guidance Document: Standards and Indicators for School Leaders and Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision Endorsement* document with the 2012 *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Principals*. The work group met on April 3, 2012, and included representatives from professional organizations (Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia Education

Association, and the Virginia School Boards Association), an expert consultant, and Department of Education personnel.

- The proposed revisions to the *Advancing Virginia's Leadership Agenda Guidance Document: Standards and Indicators for School Leaders and Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision Endorsement* document has three major components. They are as follows:

Performance Standards for School Leaders: The revised uniform performance standards for principals (principals and assistant principals) articulate the expectations of principals in the Commonwealth's schools. They describe the functions of the position that can be used to judge the effectiveness of principals and focus assessment efforts on self-growth, instructional effectiveness, and improvement of overall performance. There are seven performance standards: Instructional Leadership, School Climate, Human Resources Management, Organizational Management, Communication and Community Relations, Professionalism, and Student Academic Progress.

Performance Indicators: The performance indicators developed for each of the seven performance standards are based on the two-tiered endorsement model. Level I indicators reflect proficient performance for school leaders who serve in the roles of assistant principals and principals. Level II is an optional endorsement, and the indicators reflect examples of distinguished performance by principals.

The *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* set forth the requirements to achieve the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement. A building-level administrator may seek the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision preK-12 endorsement after successfully serving as a building-level administrator for at least five years in a public school or accredited nonpublic school and successfully completing a formal induction program as a principal or assistant principal. In order to earn the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement, the principal must meet two or more of the following criteria as specified by the Board of Education and documented in a Department of Education approved format and be recommended by the employing Virginia school division superintendent:

1. Evidence of improved student achievement;
2. Evidence of effective instructional leadership;
3. Evidence of positive effect on school climate or culture;
4. Earned doctorate in educational leadership or evidence of formal professional development in the areas of school law, school finance, supervision, human resource management, and instructional leadership; or
5. Evidence of completion of a high-quality professional development project designed by the division superintendent.

The performance expected for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement involves creating a systemic framework for school processes that become integrated into the school's culture and are sustainable beyond a principal's tenure. Inherent in the Principal of Distinction (Level II) performance indicators is the skill to responsively meet student needs, create collaborative work environments for teachers, engage constituencies in school improvement efforts, and foster a commitment to learning-centered schools.

Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision PreK-12 Endorsement: Principals have the option of seeking the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision preK-12 endorsement. Candidates for this "Principal of Distinction" status must hold a Level I endorsement (unrestricted), have five years of successful service as a building-level administrator, meet two of the five criteria specified by the Board of Education, completed a formal induction program or an alternative activity described in the guidelines, and be recommended by their employing Virginia school division superintendent. Principals who seek the

Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement must submit a written notice of their intent to seek the endorsement to their division superintendent.

A completed portfolio would be submitted to the superintendent for review and determination of whether the principal met all requirements. The superintendent may request the recommendation of a review panel serving in an advisory capacity to determine if sufficient evidence has been presented to support the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement. Panels could be constituted within the division or across regional areas of the state. At least one outside reviewer is advisable to lend creditability to the process. The review panel would make their recommendation for granting or denying the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement and the rationale for the decision to the superintendent. The division superintendent's recommendation will be required for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) administration and supervision endorsement.

The Board accepted for first review the *Advancing Virginia's Leadership Agenda Guidance Document: Standards and Indicators for School Leaders and Documentation for the Principal of Distinction (Level II) Administration and Supervision Endorsement*.

First Review of Proposed Board of Education Meeting Dates for the 2013 Calendar Year

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

- In recent years, the Board of Education has met monthly except for the months of August and December. Meetings are typically held on the fourth Thursday of the month, although this is not a requirement. Exceptions are the January meeting, which is held early in the month to coincide with the opening of the General Assembly session, and the November meeting, which is scheduled to avoid meeting during Thanksgiving week. The April meeting is typically a two-day planning session.
- In addition to the monthly business meetings, the President may call special meetings of the full Board of Education and its committees, as deemed necessary. Unless otherwise announced by the President, all Board of Education meetings will be held in the Jefferson Conference Room on the 22nd floor of the James Monroe Building, 101 North 14th Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.
- The proposed meeting dates for 2013 are as follows:

Thursday, January 10, 2013
Thursday, February 28, 2013
Thursday, March 28, 2013
Wednesday-Thursday, April 24-25, 2013
Thursday, May 23, 2013
Thursday, June 27, 2013
Thursday, July 25, 2013
Thursday, September 26, 2013
Thursday, October 24, 2013
Thursday, November 21, 2013

The Board received for first review the proposed schedule of meeting dates for the 2013 calendar year.

Report on Changes to the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) for the 2012-2013 School Year

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, presented this item. Dr. Wright introduced Mr. John Eisenberg, the new assistant superintendent for the division of special education and students services. Mr. Eisenberg assisted Mrs. Loving-Ryder in the presentation. The presentation included the following:

Planned Changes to the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)

Changes in 2014-2015

- In 2014-2015 Virginia will implement a new online alternate assessment program for students with significant cognitive disabilities to replace the current “Collections of Evidence” in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Online Alternate Assessment

- The online alternate assessment is being developed by the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment System Consortium.
- DLM Consortium includes 13 states.
- The DLM Assessment is based on research on how students with significant cognitive disabilities learn.

DLM Alternate Assessment

- The DLM system is designed to map a student’s learning throughout the year. The system will use items and tasks that are embedded in day-to-day instruction. In this way, testing happens as part of instruction, which both informs teaching and benefits students.

DLM Essential Elements

- The essential elements are specific statements of the content and skills that are expected of students with significant cognitive disabilities in reading, mathematics, and writing.
- They are linked to the grade level Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and to the Standards of Learning (SOL).

DLM Benefits

- Online format for reading, writing, and mathematics will address the intensive time and labor associated with current VAAP for these content areas.
- Computer adaptive feature will ensure that students are administered tasks/items appropriate to their ability levels.
- Support and contribution of multi-state consortium will address NCLB technical requirements critical to peer review.

DLM Implementation Time

- By 2014-15, the DLM will be fully implemented in the areas of reading, mathematics, and writing.
- History and science will continue to be offered as an evidence-based assessment.

2012-2013 VAAP Changes

- New tests in reading, writing, and science, based on SOL adopted in 2012.
- New Aligned Standards of Learning (ASOL) will also be needed for VAAP because of the changes in content.
- To support the transition to DLM, ASOL in reading, writing, and mathematics will be based on the DLM content.
- Science ASOL will change to reflect the new 2010 Science Standards of Learning.

Changes in the Selection of ASOL

- As another component of the transition to DLM, teachers must select an ASOL listed at the student's grade of enrollment for reading, writing, mathematics, and science.
- Teachers will not be allowed to select ASOL at a higher or lower grade level for these content areas.

Levels of Performance

- Beginning in 2012-2013, teachers will be allowed to determine the level of performance for ASOL in reading, writing, mathematics, and science.
- Levels of performance will provide flexibility for instruction and assessment.
- Level I: Student demonstrates the ASOL with significant support and modification.
- Level II: Student partially demonstrates the ASOL.
- Level III: Student fully demonstrates the ASOL.

What about VAAP History?

- History/Social Science ASOL will not change in 2012-2013.
- Teachers will be allowed to select ASOL at a higher or lower grade level than the student's grade level of enrollment.
- Levels of performance will not apply.

During the discussion it was noted that the following states were included in the DLM Consortium: Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Washington and Virginia joined the DLM Consortium after the award was funded.

The Board received the report.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Mr. Foster noted the acceptance of Virginia's application for U. S. Department of Education flexibility from certain requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA).

Dr. Wright indicated that based on the approval of Virginia's request for ESEA flexibility, the VDOE has established revised annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for federal accountability using the methodology described in Principle 2, Section 2.B, of the approved application.

Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility plan, schools and divisions will be required to reduce failure rates in reading and mathematics over the next six years for all students, each proficiency gap group, and each individual subgroup in order to meet federal accountability requirements. Additionally, high schools will need to meet the federal graduation indicator.

For English/reading, the AMO targets for this year were established for each group using test results from 2010-2011. The English/reading targets will be recalculated for accountability ratings in 2013-2014 (2012-2013 assessment year) and for subsequent school years based on the results of the new English/reading assessments administered in 2012-

2013. For mathematics, the AMO targets for each group were established using results from the administration of the new mathematics assessments in 2011-2012.

The Board met for dinner on Wednesday, July 25, 2012, at the Crowne Plaza Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Foster, Ms. Mack, and Mrs. Sears. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 9:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* Section 2.2-3711.A.41, for discussion and consideration by the Board of Education of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into executive session at Noon.

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Foster and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 12:45 p.m.

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under 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 Mr. Foster and carried unanimously.

Board roll call:

Ms. Mack – Yes
Mr. Braunlich – Yes
Mr. Foster – Yes
Dr. McLaughlin – Yes
Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mrs. Sears – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes

The following motions were made:

- Mrs. Sears made a motion to revoke license of Marc Andreas Allmond. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to revoke license of Reginald L. Brown. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Mr. Braunlich made a motion to revoke license of Kathleen K. Cawthorne. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sears and carried unanimously.
- Mr. Braunlich made a motion to revoke license of Cedric Dion Cradle, Sr. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mack and carried unanimously.

- Dr. McLaughlin made a motion to issue a license in Case #1. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Sears made a motion to approve renewal of the license in Case #3 contingent upon the completion and verification of renewal requirements. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to deny a license for Carron Penn. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke license for Robert Lamar Rogers. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.
- Ms. Mack made a motion to issue a statement of eligibility for a license in Case #6. The motion was seconded by Mr. Braunlich. The motion was passed with six “yes” votes. Dr. McLaughlin recused herself from voting on Case #6.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Foster adjourned the meeting at 12:50 p.m.



President