

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

October 22, 2009

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:

Dr. Mark E. Emblidge, President
Dr. Ella P. Ward, Vice President
Dr. Thomas M. Brewster
Mrs. Isis M. Castro
Mr. David L. Johnson

Mr. K. Rob Krupicka
Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin
Mr. Kelvin L. Moore
Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Dr. Emblidge, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Emblidge asked Mr. Moore to lead in a moment of silence and Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 17, 2009, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

RECOGNITION

The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and its Education and Statewide Partnership Trustee Committee received a Resolution of Recognition from the Board for its international reputation for creative excellence and innovative arts programming. The Museum's Office of Statewide Partnerships delivers programs and exhibitions throughout the Commonwealth by way of a voluntary network of more than 350 nonprofit institutions, including museums, galleries, art organizations, schools, community colleges, and colleges and universities. The following persons were present to accept the resolution:

- Alex Nyerges, director
- Pam Reynolds, board president
- Suzanne Mastracco, chair, Education and Statewide Partnership Trustee Committee
- Sandy Rusak, deputy director, Division of Education and Statewide Partnerships

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Terry Sisson
- Jim Brown
- David Hagan
- James Batterson
- Sarah Geddes

CONSENT AGENDA

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

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

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

The Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the literary fund as of June 30, 2009.

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans

The Board's approval of two applications totaling \$7,979,954 was approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Virginia Beach City	College Park Elementary	\$4,879,954.00
Washington County	William N. Neff Center	3,100,000.00
	TOTAL	\$7,979,954.00

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literary Fund Applications

The following elements were approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

1. Eight new projects, totaling \$10,110,035, are eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Washington County	John Battle High	\$ 489,126.00
Washington County	Abingdon High	489,126.00
Washington County	Patrick Henry High	1,177,236.00
Washington County	Holston High	602,186.00

Washington County	Meadowview Elementary	1,491, 288.00
Washington County	Wallace Middle	1,165,073.00
Washington County	Glade Spring Middle	1,596,000.00
Washington County	William N. Neff Center	3,100,000.00
	TOTAL	\$10,110,035.00

2. One new project, totaling \$4,879,954, which has a Literary Fund application, is approved as to form, but the plans have not yet been finalized. When the Department receives the plans, this project will be eligible for placement on a waiting list. Until such time, this project should remain on the Approved Application List.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Virginia Beach City	College Park Elementary	\$4,879,954.00

Final Review of the Standards of Quality

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the Standards of Quality report to the General Assembly will include proposed policy directions, options for revisions to the Standards of Quality, and issues for further study, which are as follows:

Policy Directions

- Enhance the Standards of Quality so that the Commonwealth’s basic foundation program for K-12 public education reflects a comprehensive educational program of the highest quality.
- Provide clarity and greater transparency in SOQ funding with the goal of maintaining the Commonwealth’s commitment to public education funding at the state and local levels and encouraging a continued emphasis on school-based instructional services.
- Provide greater flexibility to school divisions in using noninstructional personnel funding for instructional support services.
- Support the appropriateness of establishing ratio standards for individual categories of “support service” positions as is the current practice used for instructional personnel.
- Advocate against permanent structural changes to the Standards of Quality that result in decreased funding for K-12 public education.
- Begin building a more comprehensive basic foundation program by including in the SOQ gifted, special education, and career and technical staffing ratios and certain incentive programs that have become core components of K-12 educational programs statewide and currently funded in the appropriations act.
- Set priorities for the Board’s unfunded SOQ recommendations from previous years so that these instructional staffing standards can be fully implemented in future years.
- Begin to address the Board’s school leadership priorities of requiring a principal in every school and increasing the number of assistant principals in schools with the greatest need.
- Mitigate the perverse incentive of reducing a school division’s special education funding when it mainstreams students with disabilities into general education classrooms or uses

Response to Intervention (RtI) and/or other instructional supports to reduce the number of students identified as needing special education services.

- Provide additional policy guidance and direction to school divisions offering alternative or nontraditional educational programs, such as the Individual Student Alternative Education Plan (ISAEP).

SOQ Language Revisions to Address Policy Directions

- Codify the Board of Education's recommendations that were included in the 2009 Appropriation Act providing flexibility in the use of existing funds for hiring reading specialists, mathematics specialists, data coordinators, and instruction of English language learners.
- Codify the provisions of the Early Intervention Reading Initiative and the Algebra Readiness program by including them in the Standards of Quality and requiring all school divisions to provide these interventions with funding currently appropriated for these incentive programs.
- Codify the appropriation act provision that the Standards of Quality includes a minimum of 58 licensed, full-time instructional positions per 1,000 students, including instructional positions for special education, gifted education, and career and technical education.
- Codify the staffing standards for special education (currently in regulations), gifted education (currently in the appropriation act), and career and technical education (currently in regulations).
- Provide school divisions the flexibility to deploy assistant principals to the schools with the greatest needs, so long as they employ a sufficient number of assistant principal's divisionwide to meet the total number required in the current SOQ staffing requirement.
- Define the categories of personnel who make up "support services," specify how those positions are funded, and require transparency in the use of funds by mandating divisions publicly report the state and local amounts budgeted and expended for each category.
- Permit school divisions to use funds for support services to provide additional instructional services and include instructional services as a separate category to be reported publicly.

Issues for Further Study

As resources become available, conduct a comprehensive study of the following complex funding issues and report the findings to the Governor and General Assembly for consideration as part of the 2010 review of the SOQ.

- The feasibility of converting the prevailing costs for each major category of the "support services" positions into ratios (for example, based on positions per 1,000 students), and including ratios for some or all of the categories in the appropriation act.
- The feasibility of establishing alternative staffing approaches to provide school divisions with additional instructional resources to address identified needs. This could include ratios based on positions per 1,000 students for assistant principals, school counselors, and library-media specialists that would reduce funding "cliffs." It could also include assigning weights for students who may be at-risk and require additional support,

including special education services, services to English language learners, and services to disadvantaged students.

- The feasibility of creating a special education incentive fund or other funding methodologies to mitigate the perverse incentive of reducing a school division's special education funding when it mainstreams students with disabilities into general education classrooms or uses Response to Intervention (RtI) and/or other instructional supports to reduce the number of students identified as needing special education services.
- The feasibility of updating technology staffing ratios, taking into consideration the increased role of technology in instruction, assessment, and operations since staffing standards were first established in the SOQ.
- The feasibility of updating career and technical education staffing ratios, taking into consideration the (i.) implementation of new curricular pathways that require high-tech equipment and specialized instruction and (ii.) anticipated increased enrollments in CTE courses given the newly created standard technical and advanced technical diplomas.

Mrs. Wescott said that in addition to the revisions previously reviewed by the Board, one change is proposed to Standard 2 of the Standards of Quality (§ 22.1-253.13:2 of the *Code of Virginia*): Clarifying language would be added to the provisions related to special education to define Levels I and Level II services. The definitions are taken from the definitions in the Board's *Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia* (8 VAC 20-81-10), effective July 7, 2009. The additional change is as follows (in italics):

Each local school board shall employ licensed, full-time equivalent positions necessary to comply with the following requirements for special education services for students *requiring either Level I or Level II services. Level I services, means the provision of special education to children with disabilities for less than 50 percent of their instructional school day (excluding intermission for meals). Level II services, means the provision of special education and related services to children with disabilities for 50 percent or more of the instructional school day (excluding intermission for meals). The time that a child receives special education services is calculated on the basis of special education services described in the individualized education program, rather than the location of services.*

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to approve the report on the Standards of Quality, the proposed policy directions, and the recommended amendments to the Standards of Quality. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously. The report will be transmitted to the Governor and the General Assembly, as required by Item 140.C.5.k.3) of Chapter 781, 2009 Acts of Assembly.

First Review of a Revised Memorandum of Understanding for Petersburg City Public Schools to include Compliance with the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (8 VAC 20-131-315)

Dr. Kathleen Smith, director, office of school improvement, division of student assessment and school improvement, presented this item. Dr. James Victory, superintendent, and Mr. Kenneth Pritchett, chairman of the school board, attended to represent Petersburg City Public Schools.

Dr. Smith said that the November 2006 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specified target goals for three years ending after the 2008-2009 school year. Since Petersburg City Public Schools have schools in *Accreditation Denied* status for the 2009-2010 academic year based on 2008-2009 results, the MOU for division-level academic review will also serve as the MOU to satisfy Section 8 VAC 20-131-310. For the purposes of the proposed MOU, the Petersburg City School Board and central office staff will adopt two key priorities: *leadership capacity* and *teacher quality*. The priorities will improve student achievement across the school division and must be aligned with resources.

The Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will continue to assign a Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to work with the superintendent and administrative staff to develop, coordinate and monitor the implementation of processes, procedures, and strategies associated with the corrective action plan resulting from the proposed MOU. The CAO will coordinate with VDOE offices to provide technical assistance in support of the MOU and corrective action plan. The CAO will have administrative authority over processes, procedures, and strategies that are implemented in support of the MOU and funded by targeted federal and state funds with subsequent review and approval by the Petersburg City School Board.

Petersburg City Public Schools will provide the CAO with an office in the central administration office; telephone, computer, and printer access, and clerical support, as needed. Key administrative responsibilities are included in the proposed MOU:

Student Achievement

1. The central office leadership team under the direction of the CAO or designee will develop a consolidated federal application each year of the proposed MOU that complies with the findings of the efficiency review, focuses on improved student achievement, and connects strategies to the division's corrective action plan. The Petersburg City School Board will review and approve the consolidated federal application.
2. The central office leadership team under the direction of the CAO and Petersburg City School Board will develop and implement a corrective action plan that complies with the findings of the efficiency review, focuses on improved student achievement, and connects strategies to the full implementation of the algebra readiness and early reading initiatives.
3. The central office staff will provide monthly written reports on the implementation of the algebra readiness and early reading initiatives to include activities planned, activities completed, timelines, participation targets and requests for reimbursement to the CAO and the Petersburg City School Board.
4. The central office will work with school staff to implement effective corrective action plans for all schools that are in *Accreditation Denied* status and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) restructuring. The corrective action plans must meet the requirements of NCLB and the Standards of Accreditation (SOA) and be aligned with the division's key strategies for improved student achievement. Corrective action plans must be approved by the Petersburg City School Board, VBOE and VDOE. Additionally, progress reports on implementing the plans will be shared quarterly with these entities.
5. The central office will work with VDOE staff and the CAO to identify one or more external turnaround partners for the implementation of a specific restructuring plan that meets the requirements of NCLB for all schools in restructuring under NCLB and is approved by the VDOE.

Leadership Capacity

Petersburg City Public Schools will implement an accountability system that links leadership of both the school and the division to student achievement data and provides professional development to improve student achievement.

Petersburg City Public Schools will demonstrate commitment to hiring school and division staff with a proven record of increasing student achievement.

Teacher Quality

The central office leadership team under the direction of the CAO or designee will develop and monitor individual action plans to reduce the incidence of teachers with provisional licenses. Petersburg City Public Schools will commit to hiring personnel who are the most qualified for the position vacancy and have a proven track record of increasing student achievement.

Petersburg City Public Schools will provide written reports as requested by the CAO (as needed and appropriate) on current instructional vacancies, number of teachers with provisional licenses, and progress on individual action plans to reach full licensure to the VBOE and VDOE.

As a part of the proposed MOU, the Petersburg City School Board will continue to provide summative reports on progress made in meeting or exceeding MOU agreements and expectations to the VBOE and VDOE, as requested.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept for first review the revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Petersburg City Public Schools. The proposed MOU will be submitted to the Board of Education for final review on November 17, 2009. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

First Review of Report on Career and Technical Education Programs in Petersburg City Public Schools

Dr. Smith presented this item. Dr. Smith said that in 2004, recognizing the need for technical assistance, the Petersburg School Board requested a division-level review and assistance from the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE). Petersburg City Public Schools and the VBOE signed an initial memorandum of understanding (MOU) detailing the review process on April 21, 2004. The VDOE has provided ongoing technical assistance and monitored the implementation of the division's corrective action plan.

At the April 23, 2008, meeting of the Virginia Board of Education, School and Division Accountability Committee, members of the committee requested information on the following:

1. the number of students enrolled in alternative education programs and their status in these programs;
2. the number of students enrolled in the Individual Student Alternative Education Plan (ISAEP); and,
3. the number of unlicensed teachers (substitute teachers) by core content area in which they are teaching.

At the May 21, 2008, Virginia Board of Education meeting, a report containing the requested information was presented by department staff. At this time, the VBOE requested that a follow-up review be completed in the fall of 2008 to determine if the alternative education programs in Petersburg City Public Schools including the ISAEP program were in compliance with the Standards of Quality and the Standards of Accreditation.

The department conducted an academic review of the alternative programs in Petersburg City Public Schools on December 11-12, 2008. The review team consisted of VDOE staff and peer reviewers from other school divisions. The following essential actions were presented to Petersburg City Schools as part of the December 11-12, 2008 review:

- Align Horizons Program curriculum with skills necessary for transition to programs leading to a standard or advanced studies diploma or to a GED (ISAEP) program.
- Adhere to procedures for student placement that allow for parent input and are conducted in a timely manner.
- Secure the needed resources and materials for students and teachers (i.e., textbooks).
- Provide access to the Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs to the students enrolled in the Career Preparedness Program (CPP).
- Provide early intervention in elementary and middle school programs to reduce the need for alternative programs.

One of the concerns of the review team was that the CTE courses provided to students enrolled in the CPP program would not lead to a program completion upon graduation. For example, students are enrolled in Landscaping (course code 8036). There are other courses needed for a program concentration in Landscaping that lead to program completion upon graduation. These courses are not offered at Blandford Academy.

The CPP program provides high school students, age 16 or older and at least two grade-levels behind, with an opportunity to work toward successfully meeting the criteria for a certificate of completion, not a traditional or nontraditional diploma (GED).

At the January 15, 2009, Virginia Board of Education meeting, the Board accepted the findings of the review of alternative education programs in Petersburg City Public Schools and requested the department to complete a follow-up visit in the spring of 2009 to ensure that essential actions were being implemented.

The VDOE conducted a third review of the alternative programs in Petersburg City Public Schools on March 30, 2009. Interviews with students and teachers revealed that ISAEP, Horizons, and CPP students participate in the CTE programs at the high school twice a week after school. These practices were implemented during the start of the second semester of the 2008-2009 school year. These programs do not offer a program concentration that leads to program completion upon graduation. Two orientation programs for parents of Blandford Academy students were conducted to introduce the seven course offerings for the CTE program at Petersburg High School.

At the time of the review on March 30, 2009, current enrollment of ISAEP, Horizons, and CPP students who were participating in the CTE program after school at Petersburg High School were as follows:

- three students were enrolled in the carpentry program (one additional student was scheduled to begin on March 30, 2009);
- three students are enrolled in the child-care program (three additional students were scheduled to begin on March 30, 2009);

- two students were scheduled to begin the personal care aide program beginning on March 30, 2009;
- one student was scheduled to begin in the automotive program on March 30, 2009; and,
- one student was enrolled in the culinary arts program.

At the May 28, 2009, Virginia Board of Education meeting, the Board accepted the findings of the review of alternative education programs in Petersburg City Public Schools and requested the department to complete a follow-up visit in the fall of 2009 to ensure that CPP students are receiving certified CTE courses as described in the essential actions based on the follow-up review.

In a report submitted by Petersburg City Public Schools regarding the Blandford Academy students enrolled in CTE courses offered at Petersburg High School for the fall of 2009, the following data were indicated:

Course Code	Description	Number of Students Enrolled
8600	Basic Carpentry	1
8709	Auto Maintenance	1
8250	Introduction to Culinary Arts	6
8234	Introduction to Early Childhood Education	1
8511	Basic Masonry	3*
8403	Technology Foundations	7
8161	Hotel/Motel Services	5
8542	Computer Networking	3
TOTAL		26

*One student is completing an internship as a barber and is counted in Basic Masonry as well.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and accept the report from Petersburg City Public Schools on the enrollment of Blandford Academy students in CTE programs at Petersburg High School. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation Regarding the Certification of Braille Instructors in Response to the Virginia General Assembly House Bill 2224

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item. Mrs. Pitts said that in consultation with the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) began discussions regarding Braille instruction, certification, and licensure. During the April 20, 2009, meeting, the Advisory Board approved a committee to research the policy issues and make recommendations to the full Advisory Board.

ABTEL's committee on Braille convened July 8 and August 5, 2009. At the meeting on August 5, 2009, Dr. Edward C. Bell, director of the Professional Development and Research

Institute on Blindness, Louisiana Technology University, and Mr. Michael Kasey, National Federation of the Blind, met with the committee to present information on The National Literary Braille Competency Test.

On September 20-21, 2009, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure unanimously approved the following recommendation to the Board of Education:

The Advisory Board unanimously recommends to the Board of Education that a reliable, valid, and legally defensible assessment available statewide (to be determined) demonstrating Braille proficiency prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education be required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. [The Department of Education shall follow policies and procedures relative to the procurement of such an assessment.] Additionally, contingent upon available funding, opportunities for licensed teachers with the endorsement in Visual Impairments be afforded additional professional development in the teaching of Braille through the Virginia Department of Education and the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired. The Advisory Board supports the Virginia Board of Education's efforts to include teachers of visual impairments in the *Standards of Quality* funding formula.

Dr. Ward made a motion to receive for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation on Braille certification in response to the 2009 Virginia General Assembly House Bill 2224. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

Final Review of the Proposed Revised Curriculum Framework for 2009 Mathematics Standards of Learning

Mr. Michael Bolling, mathematics coordinator, presented this item. Mr. Bolling said that the new academic content *Mathematics Standards of Learning* were developed in 1995 and revised in 2001. On February 19, 2009, the Board approved the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning*. The Department of Education then took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:

- Selected a review committee that consisted of individuals solicited from school divisions as well as other stakeholder groups to participate in the process;
- Met with the review committee during May 2009;
- Developed a draft of the proposed revised Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning*.

On July 23, 2009, the Virginia Board of Education accepted for first review the proposed revised Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning*. A public comment period was held from July 24, 2009, to September 18, 2009.

The proposed revised Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning* contains minimal changes made as a result of public comment. These changes are indicated by double underlines and strikethroughs. Revisions include:

- corrections of typographical and formatting errors;

- revisions of language for clarification and/or specification of content and vocabulary;
- additions of essential knowledge and skills or background information for instruction, assessment, and/or vertical articulation;
- consolidation of content or background information;
- organization of topics to align with the sequence of the standard; and
- changes in word choice and limiters for instructional and assessment purposes.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to accept for final review the proposed revised Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning* and permit the Department of Education to make technical edits as needed. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously. The Curriculum Framework for the 2009 *Mathematics Standards of Learning* will be posted on the Department's Curriculum Framework Web site.

First Review of the Proposed Revised English Standards of Learning

Ms. Tracy Robertson, English coordinator, presented this item. Ms. Robertson said that the Standards of Learning for English were developed in 1995 and revised in 2002. The *English Standards of Learning* are scheduled for review in 2010. On January 15, 2009, the Board approved a plan to review these standards. In accordance with the plan, the Department of Education took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:

- Received online comments from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators;
- Met with a teacher review committee that consisted of recommended individuals solicited from school divisions on July 14 and 15, 2009, to review the public comment and consider recommendations and reports from Achieve, The College Board, ACT, as well as the National Association of Teachers of English (NCTE), The International Reading Association (IRA) Standards, The American Association of School Librarians (AASL) Standards for the 21st Century Learner, and NCTE 21st Century Skills Map;
- Solicited a postsecondary review committee comprised of English and English education faculty and met with the review committee on August 5, 2009;
- Solicited business leaders' comments; and
- Developed a draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*.

The proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* consists of the following elements:

Introduction

The *English Standards of Learning* identify academic content for essential components of the English curriculum at different grade levels for Virginia's public schools. Standards are identified for kindergarten through grade twelve. Throughout a student's academic career from kindergarten through grade twelve, specific content strands are included. The Standards of Learning for each strand progress in complexity at each grade level.

Organization

The goals of the *English Standards of Learning* are to teach students to read and to prepare students to participate in society as literate citizens, equipped with the ability to communicate effectively in their communities, in the workplace, and in postsecondary education. As students progress through the school years, they become active and involved listeners and develop a full command of the English language, evidenced by their use of standard English and their rich speaking and writing vocabularies. Standards for kindergarten through third grade are organized in three related strands: Oral Language, Reading, and Writing. Standards for fourth through twelfth grades are organized in four related strands: Communication: Listening, Speaking, and Media Literacy; Reading; Writing; and Research. Each grade level is preceded by an overview that describes the major concepts and skills that each student will be expected to understand and demonstrate. The standards reflect a comprehensive instructional program and document a progression of expected achievement in each of the strands. This organization of standards also reflects the gradual progression in the development of skills.

Standards

The English Standards of Learning for Virginia public schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The standards are not intended to encompass the entire curriculum for a given grade level or course or to prescribe how the content should be taught. Teachers are encouraged to go beyond the standards and select instructional strategies and assessment methods appropriate for their students.

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

- Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, rigor, alignment of skills and content, and a reflection of the current academic research and practice;
- Emphasis on vertical alignment in grades 4-12;
- Addition of the media literacy content in the communication strand;
- Addition of the research strand beginning in grade four;
- Addition of the specific vocabulary standards in high school; and
- Addition of 21st Century Skills.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept for first review the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

First Review of the Proposed Revised Science Standards of Learning

Ms. Paula Klonowski, science coordinator, presented this item. Ms. Klonowski said that the Standards of Learning for science were developed in 1995 and revised in 2003. The *Science Standards of Learning* are scheduled for review in 2010. On January 15, 2009, the Board approved a plan to review these standards beginning in 2009. The Department of Education took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:

- Received online comments from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators;

- Met with a teacher review committee that consisted of recommended individuals solicited from school divisions on July 16 and 17, 2009, to review the public comment and consider recommendations and documents from the: 1) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Frameworks; 2) the National Science Education Standards, Benchmarks for Science Literacy; and 3) a report on the 21st century content standards in physics, chemistry and engineering in Virginia's K-12 curriculum prepared by retired staff from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center and presented to Virginia's P-16 Education Council in June 2008 and to the Board of Education as part of public comment in April, May, June, and July 2009.
- Solicited a review committee comprised of faculty from science and science education departments at postsecondary institutions and representatives from state agencies and met with them on August 6, 2009, to review and discuss their comments;
- Solicited a business and industry review committee and met with them on August 17, 2009, to review and discuss their comments; and
- Developed a draft of the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning*.

The draft of the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning* consists of the following elements:

Introduction

The *Science Standards of Learning* for Virginia's Public Schools identify academic content for essential components of the science curriculum at different grade levels. Standards are identified for kindergarten through grade five, for middle school, and for a core set of high school courses — Earth Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Throughout a student's science schooling from kindergarten through grade six, content strands, or topics are included. The Standards of Learning in each strand progress in complexity as they are studied at various grade levels in grades K-6, and the strands are represented indirectly throughout the high school courses.

Goals

The purposes of scientific investigation and discovery are to satisfy humankind's quest for knowledge and understanding, to preserve and enhance the quality of the human experience, and to develop an understanding of the interrelationship of science with technology, engineering, and mathematics.

K-12 Safety

In implementing the *Science Standards of Learning*, teachers must be certain that students know how to follow safety guidelines, demonstrate appropriate laboratory safety techniques, and use equipment safely while working individually and in groups. Safety must be given the highest priority in implementing the K-12 instructional program for science.

Instructional Technology

The use of current and emerging technologies is essential to the K-12 science instructional program.

Investigate and Understand

Many of the standards in the *Science Standards of Learning* begin with the phrase “Students will investigate and understand.” This phrase was chosen to communicate the range of rigorous science skills and knowledge levels embedded in each standard. Limiting a standard to one observable behavior, such as “describe” or “explain,” would have narrowed the interpretation of what was intended to be a rich, rigorous, and inclusive content standard.

Application

Science provides the key to understanding the world in which we live. Making connections among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics allows us to design and create new devices or materials that increase our efficacy in the world and our enjoyment of it. Various strategies can be used to facilitate applications of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Standards

The *Science Standards of Learning* for Virginia public schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The *Science Standards of Learning* are not intended to encompass the entire science curriculum for a given grade level or course or to prescribe how the content should be taught. Teachers are encouraged to go beyond the standards and to select instructional strategies and assessment methods appropriate for their students.

The major elements of the revised *Science Standards of Learning* include:

- Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, rigor, alignment of skills and content, and a reflection of the current academic research and practice;
- The application of science concepts through technology, engineering, and mathematics;
- Addition of standards in Kindergarten, Grade Four and Chemistry; and
- Deletion of standards in Life Science, Chemistry and Physics.

Dr. Brewster made a motion to accept for first review the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning*. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

First Review of the 2008-2009 Annual Report on Regional Alternative Education Programs

Mrs. Diane Jay, associate director, office of program administration and accountability, presented this item. Ms. Jay's report included the following:

Executive Summary

The review was conducted on Virginia's 30 operational regional alternative education programs. These programs were established by the General Assembly in 1993-1994 with the intent of involving two or more school divisions working in collaboration to establish options for students who have a pending violation of school board policy, have been expelled or suspended on a long-term basis, or are returning from juvenile correctional centers. Section 22.1-209.1:2 of the *Code of Virginia* requires that a report be provided annually by the Board of Education to the Governor and the General Assembly on the effectiveness of the regional alternative education programs.

These regional alternative education programs are designed to meet the specific individual needs of students assigned to the programs. While there is some variation in programs, the legislation outlines the following components:

- an intensive, accelerated instructional program with rigorous standards for academic achievement and student behavior;
- a low pupil-teacher ratio to promote a high level of interaction between the student and teacher;
- a plan for transitioning the enrolled students into the relevant school division's regular program;
- a current program of staff development and training;
- a procedure for obtaining the participation and support from parents as well as community outreach to build school, business, and community partnerships; and
- measurable goals and objectives and an evaluation component to determine the program's effectiveness.

The number of students enrolled has increased from 217 students in four regional programs in 1993-1994 to 4,085 students in 30 operational programs during 2008-2009. Conclusions related to the program, services, and policies for the 2008-2009 school year are as follows:

- 97 percent of the program administrators indicate that school boards, localities, and area agencies generally offer good or excellent support;
- 97 percent of program administrators reported a good or excellent rating for technology and staff development programs;
- 90 percent of program administrators reported a good or excellent rating for discipline policies, student services, and academic programs;
- 89 percent of program administrators reported a decrease or no change in violence, firearms, and weapons possession incidences for students while in the program as well as a decrease in substance abuse and property offenses;
- 73 percent of program administrators reported academic improvement in their responses regarding perceived changes in student academic performance; and
- 67 percent of program administrators reported good or excellent support from community involvement.

Regional Alternative Education Programs

- 63 percent of program administrators reported a good or excellent rating for parental involvement;
- 47 percent of program administrators reported good or excellent support from the business community;
- of the 272 teachers employed, 249 (or 92 percent) are licensed;
- the average student-to-teacher ratio was 11:1;

- Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments in English and mathematics were taken by 2,543 alternative education students during the 2008-2009 school year. These students achieved a 61 percent pass rate on the English SOL and a 47 percent pass rate on the mathematics SOL;
- the dropout rate for these students is 5.83 percent. The expulsion or dismissal rate is 7.27 percent;
- of the students who were not eligible to graduate in the 2008-2009 school year and who did not dropout or were not expelled or dismissed, 72.6 percent remained in school at the end of the 2008-2009 school year; and
- of the students that were eligible to graduate from high school, 84.9 percent graduated at the end of the 2008-2009 school year.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to waive first review and approve the 2008-2009 Annual Report on Regional Alternative Education Programs pursuant to §22.1-209.1:2, *Code of Virginia*. The motion was seconded by Dr. Brewster and carried unanimously.

First Review of Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2009-2015

Mr. Lan Neugent, assistant superintendent for technology and career education, presented this item. Mr. Neugent's report included the following:

Vision

The vision of the Virginia Board of Education and Virginia Department of Education, in cooperation with their partners, is to create an excellent statewide system of public education that derives strength from its diversity and that ensures equality of opportunity for each student in a safe and healthy learning environment. The goal of this system is to prepare all students to be capable, responsible, and self-reliant citizens in the global society. To that end, the Department of Education will integrate innovative and authentic technologies effectively throughout all facets of the educational system to improve student academic achievement and 21st century skills and knowledge.

Mission

The Virginia Department of Education's Division of Technology and Career Education supports school division educational improvement efforts through the use of technology. The division provides training, technical assistance, and information to agency personnel and school divisions. The 2009-15 plan outlines strategic direction for agency and local educational technology planning while providing the flexibility to accommodate ongoing changes, innovations, and emerging technologies.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Provide a safe, flexible, and effective learning environment for all students.

Objective 1.1: Deliver appropriate and challenging curricula through face-to-face, blended, and virtual learning environments.

Objective 1.2: Provide the technical and human infrastructure necessary to support real, blended, and virtual learning environments.

Objective 1.3: Provide high-quality professional development to help educators create, maintain, and work in a variety of learner-centered environments.

Goal 2: Engage students in meaningful curricular content through the purposeful and effective use of technology.

Objective 2.1: Support innovative professional development practices that promote strategic growth for all educators and collaboration with other educators, content experts, and students.

Objective 2.2: Actualize the ability of technology to individualize learning and provide equitable opportunities for all learners.

Objective 2.3: Facilitate the implementation of high-quality Internet safety programs in schools.

Goal 3: Afford students with opportunities to apply technology effectively to gain knowledge, develop skills, and create and distribute artifacts that reflect their understandings.

Objective 3.1: Provide and support professional development that increases the capacity of teachers to design and facilitate meaningful learning experiences, thereby encouraging students to create, problem-solve, communicate, collaborate, and use real-world skills by applying technology purposefully.

Objective 3.2: Ensure that students, teachers, and administrators are ICT literate.

Objective 3.3: Implement technology-based formative assessments that produce further growth in content knowledge and skills development.

Goal 4: Provide students with access to authentic and appropriate tools to gain knowledge, develop skills, extend capabilities, and create and disseminate artifacts that demonstrate their understandings.

Objective 4.1: Provide resources and support to ensure that every student has access to a personal computing device.

Objective 4.2: Provide technical and pedagogical support to ensure that students, teachers, and administrators can effectively access and use technology tools.

Objective 4.3: Identify and disseminate information and resources that assist educators in selecting authentic and appropriate tools for all grade levels and curricular areas.

Goal 5: Use technology to support a culture of data-driven decision-making that relies upon data to evaluate and improve teaching and learning.

Objective 5.1: Use data to inform and adjust technical, pedagogical, and financial support.

Objective 5.2: Provide support to help teachers disaggregate, interpret, and use data to plan, improve, and differentiate instruction.

Objective 5.3: Promote the use of technology to inform the design and implementation of next generation standardized assessments.

Dr. Brewster made a motion to accept for first review the proposed *Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2009-15*. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

The proposed revisions to the plan will be posted on the Department's Web site for 20 days to provide school divisions and other interested parties with the opportunity to review them and offer comments. The comments will be compiled and presented to the Board at its meeting on November 17, 2009, and will be considered in the final version of the plan presented to the Board

First Review of the Board of Education's 2009 Annual Report of the Conditions and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia

Dr. Margaret Roberts, executive assistant for the Board of Education, presented this item. Dr. Roberts said that the Board of Education is requested to review the draft and make any necessary changes, additions, or deletions, all of which will be incorporated prior to the final review and adoption of the report.

The contents of the report include the following major headings:

- Summary of the Academic Progress of Virginia's Students
- Critical Areas of Need for the Public Schools in Virginia
- The Board of Education's Plan of Action
- The Board's Performance Measures: Addressing the Needs of Public Schools
- Compliance with the Requirements of the Standards of Quality
- Compliance with the Standards of Accreditation
- Review of the Standards of Quality

The report also contains appendices directly addressing the information specified in § 22.1-18 of the *Code of Virginia*, as follows:

- Virginia Assessment Program Results: 2005-2009
- Demographics of Virginia's Public Schools
- List of School Divisions Reporting Full Compliance with the SOQ: 2008-2009
- School Divisions Reporting Noncompliance with SOQ: 2008-2009
- Divisions with All Schools Fully Accredited, Schools Granted Conditional Accreditation, Schools Rated Accredited with Warning, and Schools Rated Accreditation Denied: 2008- 2009
- Standards of Quality: Board of Education Recommendations to the 2010 Session of the Virginia General Assembly

Dr. Roberts said that some data elements are not yet incorporated into the draft text. All data will undergo final verifications and will be added or adjusted prior to the final review of the text at the Board of Education meeting on November 17, 2009. Also, a description and explanation of the Board's final actions regarding the Standards of Quality will be added.

The *2009 Annual Report on the Conditions and Needs of Public Schools in Virginia* will be delivered to the Governor and members of the General Assembly slightly later than November 15 (the due date specified in § 22.1-18 of the *Code of Virginia*).

Dr. Ward made a motion to receive the draft report for first review and give staff suggestions for additions and changes to be incorporated into the report prior to the final review on November 17, 2009. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Annual Report from the Virginia Council for Private Education

Mr. George McVey, president, Virginia Council for Private Education, presented this item. Mr. McVey said that at its meeting in November 1993, the Board of Education adopted a resolution that recognized the accrediting process for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools as administered through the Commission on Accreditation of the Virginia Council for Private Education (VCPE). The resolution was primarily for the purpose of public school acceptance of credits earned by students who attended such schools when they transfer to public schools and for any other such purpose(s) which may, from time to time, be specified by the *Code of Virginia* or as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and VCPE. The resolution specifies, among other things, that the Board of Education will receive an annual report from VCPE.

**Virginia Board of Education Resolution
Recognizing VCPE: Accrediting Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Schools**

Resolution Number 1993-6

November 15, 1993

WHEREAS, the *Code of Virginia* requires that all children who are five years old by September 30 and not older than 18 attend a public or private or parochial school to satisfy compulsory attendance laws; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Council for Private Education (VCPE) was organized in 1974 as the Virginia affiliate of the National Council for American Private Education (CAPE) for purposes including "the encouragement of a broad public commitment to excellence in education"; and

WHEREAS, the VCPE established a Commission on Accreditation in July, 1985, "...for the purpose of approving appropriate accreditation processes for nonpublic schools in order to secure recognition for those schools by the State Department of Education"; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education ceased accrediting nonpublic schools, and at its meeting on April 25, 1985, approved recommendations affecting the relationship of nonpublic schools and the Department of Education; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Education has maintained and fostered an ongoing and viable relationship with the VCPE since that time; and

WHEREAS, the 1993 General Assembly of Virginia amended sections of the *Code of Virginia* relating to the licensure of child day care centers which included an exemption for "a certified preschool or nursery school program operated by a private school which is accredited by a statewide accreditation organization recognized by the State Board of Education..."; and

WHEREAS, the Board is desirous of reaffirming and strengthening its relationship with the VCPE;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board recognizes the accrediting process for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools as administered through the Commission on Accreditation of the Virginia Council for Private Education (VCPE) primarily for the purpose of public school acceptance of credits earned by students who attended such schools when they transfer to public schools and for any other such purpose(s) which may, from time to time, be specified by the *Code of Virginia* or as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and VCPE; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board will periodically review this recognition to ensure its continued relevancy and currency and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his designee, shall maintain contact with the VCPE and shall meet with its membership at least annually. Further, the Superintendent shall advise the Board on educational issues of concern to the VCPE.

*Adopted in the Minutes of the Virginia Board of Education
November 15, 1993*

The Board of Education received the report from Mr. McVey and thanked him for his outstanding work on behalf of the private schools in Virginia.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Dinner Session

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel with the following members present: Dr. Emblidge, Dr. Brewster, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Krupicka, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Saslaw and Dr. Ward. A brief discussion took place about general Board business. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. Ward made a motion to go into executive session pursuant to §2.2-3711.A.7 of the *Code of Virginia*, for consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants pertaining to actual or probable litigation in connection with a pending administrative proceeding concerning an employment matter. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously. The Board went into executive session at 11:15 a.m.

Dr. Ward made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 1 p.m.

The Virginia Freedom of Information Acts requires a roll call or recorded vote of each member of the Board, who are asked to certify that to the best of each member's knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting.

Board Roll call:

Dr. McLaughlin – Yes	Mrs. Castro – Yes
Mr. Moore – Yes	Mrs. Saslaw – Yes
Dr. Brewster – Yes	Mr. Johnson – Yes
Dr. Ward – Yes	Mr. Krupicka – Yes
Dr. Emblidge – Yes	

The following motions were made:

In Case CB-2009, the Board of Education revoked the license of Chadwick Blackwell.
In Case 1, the Board of Education revoked the license of Rodney Bower.
In Case 2, the Board of Education did not take action against the license.
In Case 3, the Board of Education denied the license (statement of eligibility) to Steven Patrick Ferrell.
In Case 4, the Board of Education revoked the license of Kelly L. Graham.
In Case 5, the Board of Education approved renewal of the teaching license.
In Case 6, the Board of Education issued an initial license.
In Case 7, the Board of Education did not suspend the license but sent a letter of reprimand.
In Case 8, the Board of Education issued an initial license.
In Case 9, the Board of Education did not take action against the license.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Emblidge adjourned the meeting at 1:04 p.m.

President