

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

June 22, 2017

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

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., President
Ms. Kim Adkins
Mr. James Dillard
Mrs. Elizabeth Lodal
Mr. Sal Romero, Jr.

Mr. Daniel Gecker, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Ms. Anne Holton
Dr. Jamelle Wilson

Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Dr. Cannaday asked for a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was followed by a moment of silence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Lodal made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2017, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson. Ms. Adkins asked the board to modify the minutes on page 69, to change the word “not” to “may” in the sentence, “Look at how VDOE measures success in College and Career Readiness for work-based learning experiences. The Board does not want to only measure participation.” All Board Members were in favor of approving the minutes with the modification and the motion carried. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during the public comment period:

- Dr. Jennifer Parish, Superintendent of Poquoson City Public Schools, spoke on the Standards of Accreditation.
- Jim Batterson, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate.
- Mrs. Charlotte Hayer, Teacher at Richmond Community High School and member of the Richmond Education Association, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, Virginia's ESSA State Plan, and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Mrs. Afreen Gootee, Teacher and member of the Hanover Education Association, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, Virginia's ESSA State Plan, and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Ms. Cynthia "Riley" O'Casey, Teacher and member of the Prince William Education Association, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, Virginia's ESSA State Plan, and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Mr. Dave Palanzi, Teacher and member of the Loudon Education Association, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, Virginia's ESSA State Plan, and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Mr. Jim Livingston, President of the Virginia Education Association, spoke on the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, Virginia's ESSA State Plan, and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Ms. Daisy Howard-Douglas, volunteer teacher, spoke on SOL Testing within the school divisions.
- Ms. Jewel Worthy, spoke on elementary math SOL Testing in the school divisions.
- Ms. Carolyn Elliott, Virginia Association of Science Teachers, spoke on changes to the number of required instructional hours for science education.
- Mr. Jack Clark, parent from Hanover County Public Schools, spoke on SOL Testing.
- Ms. Heidi Casper, spoke on Virginia's ESSA State Plan.
- Dr. Laurie McCullough, Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, spoke on accountability and the Standards of Accreditation.
- Ms. Sonia Smith, parent from Chesterfield Public Schools, spoke on SOL Testing.
- Mr. Marty Jewel, advocate, spoke on concerns for students with disabilities within several local school divisions.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Dillard made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson. All members were in favor. The motion carried.

A. Final Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Qualifying Score on the New SAT® as a Substitute Test for Praxis Core Assessment for Entry Into a Teacher Preparation Program

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Qualifying Score on the New SAT® as a Substitute Test for Praxis Core Assessment for Entry Into a Teacher Preparation Program.

B. Final Review of Nominations to Fill Vacancies on Board of Education Advisory Committees

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the Nominations to Fill Vacancies on Board of Education Advisory Committees.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

C. Final Review of Proposed Amendments to the Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, Parts I-VIII (8VAC 20-131)(Proposed Stage)

Dr. Cynthia Cave, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications, presented this item to the Board for final review.

Mrs. Atkinson spoke on the hard work put forth by staff and Board members into developing and drafting the proposed *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*. The comprehensive revision process began in 2014 and includes revisions to graduation requirements. Parts I – VII of the Standards of Accreditation (SOA) were approved by the Board in January 2017. Part VIII of the SOA includes the overhaul of the accountability system. During the Committee on School and Division Accountability meeting, revisions and responses to Board member questions were discussed in response to the May retreat. Board members were provided a revised draft of the SOA prior to the June Board meeting and were asked to submit questions to staff in advance. Staff prepared a document responding to Board member questions and comments, and the revision document was forwarded to Board members ahead of the meeting for their review. The document was reviewed at Wednesday's Committee on School and Division Accountability meeting.

Mrs. Atkinson thanked Dr. Staples and staff for exhibiting great work, and quickly providing responses to Board member questions. She also thanked Board members for being diligent through this review process.

Dr. Cave summarized the changes proposed to the SOA since May 2017, based on Board discussion and staff review. A summary of those changes are available in Attachment A of the Board item.

Dr. Cave reviewed the changes and edits that the Board discussed during Wednesday's Committee on School and Division Accountability meeting. The Board continued their discussion on the proposed changes and edits.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that the Board of Education approve the proposed revisions to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, Parts I-VIII, for final review and for further action as governed by the requirements of the Administrative Process Act.

Dr. Cannaday asked for a motion to approve the revisions to the *Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, Parts I-VIII. Dr. Wilson moved to approve the motion. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson. All members were in favor and the motion carried. The following amendments to the June 6, 2017 Standards of Accreditation draft were approved by the Board:

1. 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 1 and throughout] Board of Education definition/capitalization

"Board of Education" or "bBoard" means the board responsible for the general supervision of Virginia's public schools of the public school system in Virginia as prescribed in the Constitution of Virginia at Article VIII, § 4 and § 22.1-8 of the Code of Virginia.

The term "board" will be replaced with "Board" to designate the Board of Education throughout the document. [NOTE: The RIS style manual will not permit uppercase "Board"]

2. 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 1 and throughout] Department of Education capitalization

The term "department" should be replaced with "Department" throughout the entire document.

[NOTE: The RIS style manual will not permit uppercase "Department." In the alternate, a technical edit should be made to add a definition for "Department of Education" as follows:

"Department" means the Virginia Department of Education.

3. Amendment to 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 2] English Learner definition--clarified

4. 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 3] Reporting group definition

"Reporting group" means a subgroup of students who are identified as having common characteristics such as: students identified as belonging to major racial and ethnic

groups, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

5. 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 4] Verified Credits - The definition is revised for clarity and to add the verified credit for writing—and the ability of a student to obtain the verified credit in writing through a performance assessment.

"Verified unit of credit" or "verified credit" means credit awarded for a course in which a student earns a standard unit of credit and: **(1) achieves a passing score on a corresponding end-of-course SOL test; or (2) achieves a passing score on an additional test as defined in this section approved by the Board of Education board as part of the Virginia assessment program; or (3) meets the criteria for the receipt of a locally awarded verified credit awarded conferred in accordance with Board of Education board criteria and guidelines as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.3 when the student has not passed a corresponding SOL test in English, mathematics, laboratory science or history and social science; or (4) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for history and social science by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessments, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.4; or (5) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for English (writing) by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessment, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.5.**

6. 8VAC20-131-5 [p. 4 and throughout] Virginia Assessment Program capitalization

“Virginia **a**Assessment **p**Program” means a system used to evaluate student achievement that includes ~~Standards of Learning~~ **SOL** tests and additional tests that may be approved from time to time by the ~~Board of Education~~ **Board**.

Also the term “**Virginia assessment program**” replaced with “**Virginia Assessment Program**” throughout the entire document.

7. 8VAC20-131-10 [p. 5] Purpose – High quality

The foremost purpose of public education in Virginia is to provide children with a **high** quality education giving them opportunities to meet their fullest potential in life. The standards for the accreditation of public schools in Virginia are designed to ensure that an effective educational program is established and maintained in Virginia's public schools. The mission of the public education system is to educate students in the essential ~~academic~~ knowledge and skills in order that they may be equipped for citizenship, work, and **a an informed and successful** private life ~~that is informed and free~~. The accreditation standards:

The Standards of Accreditation provide the foundation for the provision of ~~an excellent~~ a high **high quality public education within a system of accountability and continual improvement...**

8. 8VAC20-131-51.B.2 [p. 18] definition of verified credit, Standard Diploma

"Verified unit of credit" or "verified credit" means credit awarded for a course in which a student earns a standard unit of credit and: (1) achieves a passing score on a corresponding end-of-course SOL test; or (2) achieves a passing score on an additional test as defined in 8VAC20-131-5 approved by the Board of Education board as part of the Virginia Assessment Program; or (3) meets the criteria for the receipt of a locally awarded verified credit awarded conferred in accordance with Board of Education board criteria and guidelines as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.3 when the student has not passed a corresponding SOL test in English, mathematics, laboratory science or history and social science; or (4) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for history and social science by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessments, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.4; or (5) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for English (writing) by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessment, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.5.

9. 8VAC20-131-51.C.2 [p. 22] Definition of verified credit, Advanced Diploma

"Verified unit of credit" or "verified credit" means credit awarded for a course in which a student earns a standard unit of credit and: (1) achieves a passing score on a corresponding end-of-course SOL test; or (2) achieves a passing score on an additional test as defined in 8VAC20-131-5 approved by the Board of Education board as part of the Virginia assessment program; or (3) meets the criteria for the receipt of a locally awarded verified credit awarded conferred in accordance with Board of Education board criteria and guidelines as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.3 when the student has not passed a corresponding SOL test in English, mathematics, laboratory science or history and social science; or (4) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for history and social science by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessments, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.4; or (5) meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit for English (writing) by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessment, as provided in 8VAC20-131-110.B.5.

10. 8VAC20-131-90 [p. 36] Career investigation course content

A. The middle school shall provide each student a program of instruction ... Each middle school shall provide a course in career investigation for seventh grade students in accordance with the provisions of 8VAC20-131-140. School divisions may seek alternate means of delivering the career investigation course content provided it is equivalent in content and rigor and provides the foundation for a student to develop their Academic and Career Plans as described in 8VAC20-131-140.B.2. Possible alternative means to deliver the career investigation course content could include,

but not be limited to: online methods, middle school exploratory course options, and delivering the course content through other courses.

11. 8VAC20-131-110.B.2 [p. 40] Additional tests (companion amendment to #5)

2. Achieves a passing score on an additional test as defined in 8VAC20-131-5, approved by the board as a part of the Virginia Assessment Program.

12. 8VAC20-131-110.B.4 [p. 40] Performance assessments in history and social science and in writing

4. ~~Students may receive locally awarded~~ Meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit in history and social science by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on locally developed an authentic performance assessments, that ~~comply~~ complies with guidelines adopted by the board. Such students shall not also be required to take the corresponding SOL tests test in history and social science.

5. Meets the criteria for the receipt of a verified credit in English (writing) by demonstrating mastery of the content of the associated course on an authentic performance assessment that complies with guidelines adopted by the board. Such students shall not also be required to take the corresponding SOL test in English (writing).

13. 8VAC20-131-140.B.2 [p. 43] Career investigation course content

...In middle school, students are to complete a locally selected career interest inventory and select a career pathway. ~~Students~~ To support development of the ACP, students shall complete a Career Investigations course selected from the Career and Technical Education state approved list to support development of the ACP, or a school division-provided alternative means of delivering the Career Investigations course content, provided that the alternative is equivalent in content and academic rigor...

14. 8VAC20-131-140.B.2 [p. 44] Academic and career plans

All schools shall continue development of a personal Academic and Career Plan (ACP) ACP with each seventh-grade student with completion by the end of the student's seventh-grade year....

...In high school, a career related learning experience will be chosen by the student and documented in the Academic and Career Plan Portfolio ~~ACPP ACP~~.

15. 8VAC20-131-180 [pp. 45-46] Off Site Instruction

A. Homebound instruction shall be made available to students who are confined at home...

...Credit for the work shall be awarded when it is done under the supervision of a licensed teacher, a person eligible to hold a Virginia teaching license, or other

appropriately licensed professional employed by the local school board, and there is evidence that the instructional time requirements or alternative means of awarding credit adopted by the local school board in accordance with the provisions of 8VAC20-131-110 have been met. ~~Verified units of credit may be earned when the student has passed the SOL test associated with the course completed.~~

A B. Schools are encouraged to pursue alternative means to deliver instruction to accommodate student needs through virtual courses, emerging technologies, and other similar means...

... A verified unit of credit may be earned when the student has successfully completed the requirements specified in 8VAC20-131-110. ~~A verified unit of credit may be earned when the student has passed the end-of-course SOL test associated with the completed course.~~

16. 8VAC20-131-370.A. [p.70] Purpose of Accountability and Accreditation System

A. The system of school accountability and accreditation provides a means of determining the quality and effectiveness of schools for the purposes of:

~~1. Providing a comprehensive picture of school quality information to the public;~~

~~2. For all schools, driving Driving continuous improvement in school achievement for all schools;~~

~~3. Building on strengths in schools and addressing specific areas needing improvement; and~~

~~4. Informing areas for technical assistance and the use of school improvement resources~~

1. Building on strengths in schools and addressing specific areas needing improvement;

2. Driving continuous improvement in school achievement for all schools;

3. Informing areas for technical assistance and the use of school improvement resources; and

4. Providing a comprehensive picture of school quality information to the public.

17. 8VAC20-131-380.A.4 [p. 71] Board Criteria for Selecting Indicators

4. Performance in the indicator ~~is modifiable~~ can be positively impacted through division and school-level policies and procedures;

18. 8VAC20-131-380.A [p. 72] Include measure of chronic absenteeism in high schools

Specific indicators designated by the board for accreditation purposes and defined in subsection E include, but are not limited to, the following: 5. Student participation and engagement as measured by chronic absenteeism in elementary and middle schools; and

19. 8VAC20-131-380.A.1 [p. 72] Description of Academic Achievement Indicators, add more information to description of academic achievement for all students to include student growth Specific indicators designated by the board for accreditation purposes and defined in subsection E include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Academic achievement for all students in English (reading and writing), mathematics, and science as measured by passing rates on state through board-approved assessments, including measures of student growth in English (reading), mathematics, and English learner progress from the Virginia Assessment Program and assessments used to determine English learner proficiency for English (reading and writing), mathematics, and science, student growth, and English Learner progress;

20. 8VAC20-131-380.D.1 [p. 74] Minor Edit – Description of Level one

1. Level One: At or Above Standard, represented by the color Green. A school's achievement on the specific indicator demonstrates acceptable performance or performance above the benchmark, or adequate improvement in/on the indicator.

21. 8VAC20-131-380.E.1 Prior year references to clarify that growth is from the previous year

<u>School Quality Indicator</u>	<u>Performance Levels</u>
<u>a. Academic Achievement Indicator for all students for English (reading and writing): the academic indicator will be calculated based on the rate of students who passed board-approved assessments, any additional students who showed growth on board-approved assessments, and any additional students who are English learners who showed growth toward English proficiency on board-approved assessments.</u>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 75 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 66 percent, or schools with a prior year rate of at least 50 percent that decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
<u>b. Academic Achievement</u>	<u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year</u>

<p><u>Indicator for all students for Mathematics: the academic indicator will be calculated based on the rate of students who passed board-approved assessments, and any additional students who showed growth on board-approved assessments.</u></p>	<p><u>average rate of at least 70 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 66 percent, or schools with a prior year rate of at least 50 percent that decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
<p><u>c. Academic Achievement Indicator for all students for Science: the academic indicator will be calculated based on the rate of students who passed board-approved assessments.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 70 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 66 percent, or schools with a prior year rate of at least 50 percent and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
<p><u>d. Academic Achievement Gaps for English (reading and writing). A single performance level is assigned for Academic Achievement Gaps for English (reading and writing), based upon the composite of performance levels calculated individually for each reporting group using the same methodology and benchmarks as provided for in the Academic</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with no more than one reporting group demonstrating Level Two performance.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools with two or more reporting groups demonstrating Level Two performance and no more than one reporting group demonstrating Level Three performance.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools with two or more reporting groups demonstrating Level Three performance.</u></p>

<p><u><i>Achievement Indicators for All Students.</i></u></p>	
<p><u><i>e. Academic Achievement Gaps for Mathematics. A single performance level is assigned for Academic Achievement Gaps for Mathematics, based upon the composite of performance levels calculated individually for each reporting group using the same methodology and benchmarks as provided for in the Academic Achievement Indicators for All Students.</i></u></p>	<p><u><i>Level One: Schools with no more than one reporting group demonstrating Level Two performance.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Level Two: Schools with two or more reporting groups demonstrating Level Two performance and no more than one reporting group demonstrating Level Three performance.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Level Three: Schools with two or more reporting groups demonstrating Level Three performance.</i></u></p>
<p><u><i>f. Graduation and Completion Index (GCI) for schools with a graduating class. The GCI is the percentage of students graduating from or completing high school based upon a graduation and completion index prescribed by the board. The board's GCI shall include weighted points for diploma graduates, recipients of high school equivalency credentials approved by the board, students not graduating but still in school, and students earning certificates of program completion.</i></u></p>	<p><u><i>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average index of at least 88, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and increase the index by ten percent or more from the prior year.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average index of at least 81, or schools that were at Level Three the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more from the prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</i></u></p>
<p><u><i>g. Dropout Rate for schools with a graduating class.</i></u></p>	<p><u><i>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of no more than six percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the rate by ten percent or more from the prior year.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of no more than nine percent, or schools that were at Level Three the prior year and decrease the rate by ten percent or more from the</i></u></p>

	<p><u>prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
<p><u>h. Chronic Absenteeism for elementary and middle schools. Chronically absent students are defined as those who are enrolled in a given school who miss ten percent or more of the school year, regardless of reason. Students receiving homebound instruction, as defined in 8VAC20-131-5, shall be excluded from the chronic absenteeism rate.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of no more than 15 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the rate by ten percent or more from the prior year.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of no more than 25 percent, or schools that were at Level Three the prior year and decrease the rate by ten percent or more from the prior year. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
<p><u>i. College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index ...</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: ...</u></p>

22. 8VAC20-131-380.E.1.a-c [pp. 77-78] Replace assessments for growth with measures to allow flexibility, and permit board to adopt additional measures of growth.

<u>School Quality Indicator</u>	<u>Performance Levels</u>
<p><u>a. Academic Achievement Indicator for all students for English (reading and writing): the academic indicator will be calculated based on of the rate of students who passed board-approved assessments, any additional students who showed growth on using board-approved assessments measures, and any additional students who are English learners who showed growth toward English proficiency on using board-approved assessments measures.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 75 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 66 percent, or schools with a prior year rate of at least 50 percent that decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>

<p><u>b. Academic Achievement Indicator for all students for Mathematics: the academic indicator will be calculated based on the rate of students who passed board-approved assessments, and any additional students who showed growth on using board-approved assessments measures.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 70 percent, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average rate of at least 66 percent, or schools with a prior year rate of at least 50 percent that decrease the failure rate by ten percent or more. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
---	---

Insert a new paragraph 5 in the list following the table:

5. The board may adopt valid and reliable measures of student growth to be used in calculating the Academic Achievement Indicators for English and mathematics and in determining the progress of English learners toward English proficiency.

56. The board shall provide a process for a...

23. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-370.E.1.f [p. 76] Amend percentage of growth in GCI to move from Levels based on improvement

<p><u>f. Graduation and Completion Index (GCI) for schools with a graduating class. The GCI is the percentage of students graduating from or completing high school based upon a graduation and completion index prescribed by the board. The board's GCI shall include weighted points for diploma graduates, recipients of high school equivalency credentials approved by the board, students not graduating but still in school, and students earning certificates of program completion.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: Schools with a current year or three-year average index of at least 88, or schools that were at Level Two the prior year and increase the index by ten 2.5 percent or more.</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: Schools not meeting Level One performance with a current year or three-year average index of at least 81, or schools that were at Level Three the prior year and decrease the failure rate increase the index by ten 2.5 percent or more. A school shall not receive a Level Two performance designation for more than four consecutive years.</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: Schools not meeting Level One or Level Two performance.</u></p>
--	---

24. 8VAC20-131-380.E.1.h [p. 77] Include measure of chronic absenteeism in high schools

<p><u>h. Chronic Absenteeism for elementary and middle schools.</u> <u>Chronically absent students are defined as those who are enrolled in a given school who miss ten percent or more of the school year, regardless of reason. Students receiving homebound instruction, as defined in 8VAC20-131-5, shall be excluded from the chronic absenteeism rate.</u></p>	<p><u>Level One: ...</u></p> <p><u>Level Two: ...</u></p> <p><u>Level Three: ...</u></p>
--	---

25. 8VAC20-131-390.A [p.80] Pre-accreditation certification to ensure instructional programs in history/social science and English writing

Insert new list item 4 after item 3 to state:

4. The school and school division's offering of history and social science and English, to include writing, as prescribed in 8VAC20-131-70.C.

26. 8VAC20-131-390.B [pp. 81-82] Make references to performance levels consistent

1. Accredited: When a school has each of its school quality indicators in the at Level One: At or Above Standard range, or the Level Two: Near Standard or Improvement from Level Three: range, it shall be "Accredited."...

2. Accredited with Conditions: When a school has any school quality indicator in the at Level Three: Below Standard range, it shall be "Accredited with Conditions."...

3. Accreditation Denied: When a school or school division fails to implement school division or school corrective action plans with fidelity to address school quality indicators at Level Three: Below Standard according to 8VAC20-131-400, or has taken no action on identified strategies and interventions, the school is reviewed for potential designation by the board as "Accreditation Denied." The board shall deny accreditation for designate any school that continues to demonstrate Level Three: Below Standard, performance levels in any school quality indicator due to a failure to implement actions prescribed in a corrective action plan as "Accreditation Denied."...

27. 8VAC20-131-390.B.3 [pp. 81-82] Denied Accreditation wording revisions and placement of some wording in "actions" section 8VAC20-131-400.C.3

3. Accreditation Denied: ~~When~~ If a school is designated “Accredited with Conditions,” and the a school or school division fails to adopt and implement school division or school corrective action plans with fidelity as specified by 8VAC20-131-400.C., it may be designated by the board as “Accreditation Denied” as provided in 8VAC20-131-400.C.4. to address school quality indicators at Level Three: Below Standard according to 8VAC20-131-400, or has taken no action on identified strategies and interventions, the school is reviewed for potential designation by the board as “Accreditation Denied.” The board shall deny accreditation for designate any school that continues to demonstrate Level Three: Below Standard, performance levels in any school quality indicator due to a failure to implement actions prescribed in a corrective action plan as “Accreditation Denied.” The local school board shall be given an opportunity to correct such failure, and if successful in a timely manner, the school’s “Accreditation Denied” designation may be rescinded at the board’s discretion.

28. 8VAC20-131-400.A, B, and C [pp. 83-86] Make references to performance levels consistent

1A. Level One: At or Above Standard, Green performance level. If a school quality indicator falls within the is at Level One range for of performance, the school and its school division superintendent and the school principal shall continue to monitor the indicator and the multi-year school improvement plan for continuous improvement ...

... 2B. Level Two: Near Standard or Improvement from Level Three, Yellow performance level. If a school quality indicator falls within the is at Level Two range of performance, the school and its school division shall have primary responsibility to develop and implement a multi-year school improvement plan...

... 5e. evaluate the progress of the school quality indicator(s) in the at Level Two range at the end of each year, and assess the results of the school improvement plan actions at the end of two years. If no progress is made within the two-year period on such school quality indicators, the plan shall be revised.

If the any of the Academic Achievement Indicators for all students, as provided in 8VAC20-131-380.E.1.a, 1.b or 1.c school quality indicator “Academic achievement for all students” is within the at Level Two range, the school must undergo an academic review conducted by the department, or under its guidance, to further identify required actions to improve student achievement...

... School divisions with indicators in the at Level Two performance range may request technical assistance from the department.

3C. Level Three: Below Standard, Red performance level; Corrective Action Plan.:-

1. Corrective Action Plans. If any school quality indicator falls within the is at Level Three: Below Standard range for of performance, a the school and school division shall

work cooperatively with the department, under its direction, to develop a corrective action plan, which shall be incorporated as a component of the school's comprehensive, unified, long-range plan...

...All schools with indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~ must undergo ~~a~~ an academic or other review, as appropriate, conducted by the department, or under its guidance, to further identify required actions to improve student achievement and the school quality indicators which are ~~Below Standard~~ ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~...

...~~b~~(2). ~~The~~ the number of school quality indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~ for the school;

~~e~~(3). ~~A~~ a school's trajectory on the indicator(s) ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~;

~~d~~(4). ~~The~~ the length of time the school indicator has been ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~ ~~Below Standard~~ and remains ~~Below Standard~~; and

~~e~~(5). ~~The~~ the number of schools in the division with multiple school quality indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~...

...~~c~~. Under the direction of with department staff, school division and school staff shall:

~~a~~(1). identify factors related to the school's performance on the indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~ as part of the school's comprehensive needs assessment...

...~~42~~. ~~Level Three: Below Standard~~; Memorandum of Understanding. School divisions that do not demonstrate evidence of progress in implementing ~~the~~ corrective action plans ~~plan~~(s) for schools ~~a~~ school(s) with indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance level~~ shall be required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between the local school board and the ~~Virginia Board of Education~~ board...

...~~3~~. Denial of Accreditation. When a school or school division fails to implement corrective action plans with fidelity to address school quality indicators ~~in the at~~ Level Three ~~performance range~~, or has taken no action on identified strategies and interventions, the school is reviewed for potential designation by the board as "Accreditation Denied" as provided by 8VAC20-131-390.B.3. The board shall deny accreditation for any school that continues to demonstrate Level Three: ~~Below Standard~~, performance levels in any school quality indicator due to a failure to implement actions prescribed in a corrective action plan...

29. 8VAC20-131-400.A [p. 83] Level One actions amended to remove submittal of multiyear plan to department

~~*1A. Level One: At or Above Standard, Green performance level. If a school quality indicator is at Level One, the school and its school division superintendent and the school principal shall continue to monitor the indicator and the multi-year school improvement plan for continuous improvement. The school's multi-year school improvement plan shall be submitted to the Department of Education (department) and reviewed through a department Department of Education (department) established process, which may include peer review by staff from other school divisions or schools selected by the department for review.*~~

30. 8VAC20-131-400.B [p.83 and p. 84] Level Two actions amended to require local school board approval and to permit VDOE audit. State academic review remains for Level Two Academic Indicators. In addition, department establishes review process for school improvement plans addressing Level Two Academic Indicators for all students. The department may implement an audit process.

~~*2B. Level Two: Near Standard or Improvement from Level Three, Yellow performance level. If a school quality indicator is at Level Two range of performance, the school and its school division shall have primary responsibility to develop and implement a multi-year school improvement plan.*~~

~~*School division and school staff shall:*~~

~~*1.a. identify factors...*~~

~~*2b. use the results of the comprehensive needs assessment to develop a multi-year school improvement plan which addresses the factors identified in the needs assessment that are related to the performance on the indicator. The school's multi-year improvement plan shall be submitted to the department and reviewed through a department-established process, which may include peer review by staff from other school divisions or schools selected by the department for review. approved by the local school board. The department may implement an audit process to ensure compliance with this provision.*~~

~~*3.e...*~~

~~*... If the any of the Academic Achievement Indicators for all students, as provided in 8VAC20-131-380.E.1.a, 1.b or 1.c school quality indicator "Academic achievement for all students" is within the Level Two range, the school must undergo an academic review conducted by the department, or under its guidance, to further identify required actions to improve student achievement. Review of other indicators by the department, or under its guidance, may occur based on the school's multi-year school improvement plan. School improvement plans developed for Academic Achievement Indicators for*~~

all students that are at Level Two shall be reviewed through a department-established process, which may include peer review by staff from other school divisions.

31. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-400.C.1 [p. 84] Level Three: wording edit VDOE Consultation instead of VDOE direction

3C. Level Three: Below Standard, Red performance level; Corrective Action Plan.:

1. Corrective Action Plans. If any school quality indicator falls within the Level Three: Below Standard range for of performance, a the school and school division shall work cooperatively and in consultation with the department, under its direction, to develop a corrective action plan, which shall be incorporated as a component of the school's comprehensive, unified, long-range plan.

In developing such plan, the school and school division, under department direction in consultation with the department, shall determine the issues and conditions which are likely contributing to the school's performance on the indicator, and to plan and implement the essential actions and research-based strategies to achieve improvement to the Level One standard.

32. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-400.C.1.b and 2 [pp. 84-85] Superintendent to Superintendent Agreements promoted to item in list of actions available to Level Three schools

3C. Level Three: Below Standard, Red performance level; Corrective Action Plan.:

1. Corrective Action Plans. If any school quality indicator falls within the Level Three: Below Standard range for of performance, a the school and school division shall work cooperatively with the department, under its direction, to develop a corrective action plan, which shall be incorporated as a component of the school's comprehensive, unified, long-range plan...

a. Considerations for the level of direction and intervention from the department include, but are not limited to...

b. The level of direction and intervention from the department may include requiring the local school division superintendent and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to enter into an agreement which shall delineate responsibilities for the school division staff, school staff, and department staff and shall also include required essential actions to improve student achievement and to improve performance on school quality indicators.

eb. Under the direction of department staff, school division and school staff shall...

2. Superintendent Agreement. The level of direction and intervention from the department may include requiring the local school division superintendent and the

Superintendent of Public Instruction to enter into an agreement which shall delineate the responsibilities for the school division staff, school staff, and department staff and shall also include required essential actions to improve student achievement and to improve performance on school quality indicators.

423. ...

33. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-400.C.1.c [p. 85] Level Three Actions –Additional language: Corrective Action Plan review and approval process

c. Under the direction of In consultation with department staff, school division and school staff shall:

a(1). identify factors related to the school's performance on the indicators in the Level Three performance range as part of the school's comprehensive needs assessment;

b(2). use the results of the comprehensive needs assessment to develop a multi-year corrective action plan which addresses the factors identified in the needs assessment that are related to the performance on the indicator through essential actions and research-based strategies;

e(3). submit the completed corrective action plan to the department, through the division superintendent for department approval;

(4) amend the plan, if the department disapproves any portion thereof, as needed to secure the department's approval;

d(45). implement the essential actions and research-based strategies approved corrective action plan with fidelity; and

e(56). meet regularly with department staff to monitor evidence of the school's progress in implementing the plan, to track improvement on the indicator, and to identify next steps.

34. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-400.C.2 [p. 85-86] MOUs possible if CAP not adopted or implemented, also could be for multiple schools

42. Level Three: Below Standard; Memorandum of Understanding. School divisions that do not demonstrate evidence of progress in adopting or implementing the corrective action plans plan(s) for a school or schools a school(s) with indicators in the Level Three performance level shall be required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding between the local school board and the Virginia Board of Education-board. The Memorandum of Understanding shall delineate responsibilities for the local school board, the Virginia Board of Education-board, school division staff, school staff, and department staff and shall also include required essential actions to improve student achievement and to improve performance on school quality indicators...

35. 8VAC20-131-400.C.3 [p. 86] Denial of Accreditation wording revisions

3. Denial of Accreditation. ~~When~~ If a school is designated “Accredited with Conditions,” and the a school or school division fails to adopt and implement corrective action plans with fidelity as specified by this section to address school quality indicators in the Level Three performance range, or has taken no action on identified strategies and interventions, the school is reviewed for potential designation by the board as “Acreditation Denied” as provided by 8VAC20-131-390.B.3, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall review the school for potential designation by the board as “Accreditation Denied” and shall present the results of such review to the board with recommendations. If the board determines that any such school is at Level Three on any school quality indicator due to its failure to adopt and implement corrective action plans with fidelity as required by this section, the board shall designate such school as “Accreditation Denied.” The board shall deny accreditation for any school that continues to demonstrate Level Three: Below Standard, performance levels in any school quality indicator due to a failure to implement actions prescribed in a corrective action plan. The local school board shall be given an opportunity to correct such failure, and if successful in a timely manner, the school’s “Accreditation Denied” designation may be rescinded at the board’s discretion.

36. Amendment: 8VAC20-131-400 [p. 86] At-Risk Add on – Mirror Appropriation Act language verbatim

B4. At-Risk Add-On Funds. As provided in the Appropriation Act, If if the board has required a local school board to submit a corrective action plan pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:3(A) of the Code of Virginia, either for the school division pursuant to a division level review, or for any schools within its division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the board , the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall determine and report to the board whether each such local school board has met its obligation to develop and submit such corrective action plan(s) and is making adequate and timely progress in implementing the plan(s). Additionally, if an If a state academic review process undertaken pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:3(A) of the Code of Virginia has identified actions for a local school board to implement, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall determine and report to the board whether the local school board has implemented required actions. If the Superintendent certifies that a local school board has failed or refused to meet any of those obligations, the board shall withhold payment of some or all At-Risk Add-On funds otherwise allocated to the affected division pursuant to this allocation for the pending fiscal year. In determining the amount of At-Risk Add-On funds to be withheld, the board shall take into consideration the extent to which such funds have already been expended or contractually obligated. The local school board shall be given an opportunity to correct its failure and, if successful in a timely manner, may have some or all of its At-Risk Add-On funds restored at the board’s discretion.

A fully revised version of the proposed *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, Parts I-VIII is available online at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/accreditation/draft-soa-062317.pdf>.

D. First Review of the Consolidated State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA)

Dr. Lynn Sodat, Director, Office of Program Administration and Accountability, presented this item to the Board for first review. The presentation included the following information:

The Federal Programs included in the ESSA state plan are:

- Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students
- Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC)
- Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-income School Program
- Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

A peer review process will be conducted for Title I, Title III, and Title VII, with the remaining sections of the Consolidated State Plan to be reviewed by USED staff.

Stakeholder involvement activities have been conducted to receive feedback and provide information on the elements of the consolidated application. Those activities include the State Board of Education Listening Tour, the ESSA Survey, two webinars, 45 meetings and convenings, and topical roundtable discussions with a wide variety of organizations and practitioners. Written feedback has been continuously accepted through the VDOE website.

Virginia's federal accountability application will closely align with the state accountability system such that schools identified for federal improvement are also designated in the "yellow" or "red" levels on the state accountability matrix. ESSA requires long-term goals and interim measures of progress for each indicator to include student achievement, growth for elementary and middle schools, graduation rates, progress in English Learners gaining proficiency in English and school quality or student success. ESSA also integrates achievement, growth, and progress for EL students towards gaining proficiency in reading.

A student will be counted in the numerator of the reading or mathematics combined rate if:

The student passes the assessment*; or the student does not pass the assessment but demonstrates growth using the progress tables; or for the reading assessment only, the student does not pass the assessment or demonstrate growth, but is an EL and demonstrates progress as measured by the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment.

The gap closing mythology used to provide the targets to meet the long term goal used for reading and math. To align with our state expectations, reading is 75 and math is 70. Both reading and math will be revised according to new test.

Federal graduation indicators are for students receiving a standard or advance diploma as required by USDE.

The chronic absenteeism indicator will have much less weight than other indicators, if the school had not met the internal targets in chronic absenteeism, working on it will become a part of that school's improvement process.

During the 2015-2016 assessment year, new English language proficiency online assessments – ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 – were released to replace the ACCESS for ELLs assessments. These were administered in Virginia in early 2016.

Virginia has determined that two years of data are needed from the new ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment before long-term goals and interim measures of progress can be established. Once the data is available, these steps will be taken: Analyze score scales to establish exit criteria under the new assessment; establish rigorous and reasonable progress measures, a timeline for students to achieve English language proficiency, which may be differentiated by grade span or other learner characteristics if indicated by the data.

Comprehensive support and improvement schools will be identified 2017-18 school year. The proposal will be to identify all Title I schools that did not meet the interim target in reading and mathematics using the combined rate for all students. Of those schools, average the combined rates for reading and mathematics, identify the bottom five percent of Title I schools based on the averaged rates. If a “tie” occurs, use the rate of chronic absenteeism as the “tie breaker”. Identify any high schools with a federal four-year cohort graduation rate below 67%.

To exit the comprehensive support status, schools will be required to implement interventions over a two year period. At the end of year two, schools no longer in the bottom five percent may exit comprehensive support and improvement status. Schools that exit this status at the end of year two will be required to implement sustainability plans for at least one additional year. Implementation of interventions for exited schools will be monitored during the required sustainability year. If a school has not exited comprehensive support and improvement status after three years of interventions, more rigorous interventions will be required in the fourth year of comprehensive support and improvement status. The Federal graduation rate below 67 percent will be required to implement interventions designed to address the issues causing the school to

miss the threshold for graduating students. Once a high school has a federal graduation rate above the threshold for identification, the school will exit from comprehensive support and improvement status.

For all indicators except the federal graduation rate must meet the interim measure of progress or reduce the failure rate by ten percent for two consecutive years in the reporting group(s) for which the school was identified. High schools identified for not meeting the federal graduation rate must meet the interim measure of progress or increase the federal graduation rate by ten percent over a two year period in the reporting group(s) for which the school was identified. Divisions with schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement will receive support from the Department to develop, implement, and monitor interventions. The support provided will be individualized based on the unique needs of the divisions and schools, and will be consistent with the support that the schools identified as “Accredited with Conditions” will receive. Title I schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement that do not meet the exit criteria after three years will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

The Board held a discussion on the federal targets, as some Board members felt that the targets were ambitious, especially for students with disabilities and English language learners.

A Board member asked if there is flexibility with the federal targets and what are the consequences if schools fail to meet the targets. Dr. Sodot responded that a school must meet the target or reduce the failure rate by ten percent from the previous year. The target can be met in the current year or in the three-year average.

A Board member reminded members that the combined rate does include growth.

A Board member asked for clarification on the MOU process for Comprehensive Schools that do not meet the exit criterion after three years. Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder responded that the Board has several school-level MOU's currently. The process outlined in the ESSA state plan closely aligns with the state accountability system. A Board member asked for clarifying language to be added about the MOU and Corrective Action Plan process.

A Board member asked if the state accountability benchmarks and the federal targets are required to be the same. Dr. Sodot responded that there isn't a requirement that the state accountability benchmarks and federal targets match but there has been a strong emphasis on the need and desire for them to be closely aligned.

A Board member stated that they would have concerns if different state accountability benchmarks and federal targets were set. They felt that it should be aligned.

Dr. Staples reminded Board members that one of the key components of ESSA is that it is intended to be a gap-closely approach. Much of our accountability systems, state and federal, has

not focused on catching children up who historically have been behind so there is an emphasis on targeting these areas. At the July meeting VDOE staff will more clearly differentiate and help the Board in understanding the differences between No Child Left Behind (NCLB) responses and responses for ESSA.

A Board member requested that VDOE staff bring real school data to the July meeting to review with Board members. They reminded Board members that the inclusion of growth in ESSA is a big step forward. They also reminded Board members that state accreditation and ESSA are just two pieces in a larger picture of accreditation. It is important to remember that the Board should always do what is best for children.

A Board member asked VDOE staff to come back in July with alternatives to the value tables used for growth measures in the ESSA state plan and language for flexibility once alternatives are available and reliable. Another Board member raised concerns about this request without receiving more information from staff about what VDOE is proposing as valid measure(s) of growth in the ESSA state plan. Dr. Staples reminded the Board that cost may be a factor for the department and local school divisions. A Board member asked that staff include cost as part of their presentation at the July meeting.

The Board of Education received for first review the Consolidated State Plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

E. First Review of Division-Level Memorandum of Understanding for Richmond City Public Schools

Beverly Rabil, Director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement presented this item to the Board for first review. The presentation included the following information:

During the school years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, Richmond City Public Schools division, school leaders and the Director of the Office of Improvement met quarterly to review evidence of progress in selected Richmond City schools and planned next steps. During these meetings, Richmond City Public Schools staff noted the need to include some division-wide essential action plans. In August 2015, Richmond City Public Schools superintendent and Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) staff discussed Richmond data and the benefits of a division-level review. In July 2016, Richmond City Public Schools superintendent indicated that division data indicated the need for a division-level review. With further discussion, it was agreed to proceed with plans for a Richmond City Public School division-level review. In November 2016, the Virginia Board of Education approved the request for a division-level review in Richmond City Public Schools. In preparation for the review, VDOE staff provided training on the division-level review tool to Richmond City Public Schools staff on January 19, 2017. A team of VDOE staff conducted the onsite review from March 6, 2017 through March 10, 2017. The division-level review focused on the following five categories: Academics and Student Success, Leadership and

Governance, Operations and Governance, Human Resource Leadership, and Community Relations and Communications. These categories are noted as the key priority areas in the MOU and are the five areas for developing essential actions in the Corrective Action Plan. The schedule and process for the onsite review is included in the documentation. Following the division-level review, the Memorandum of Understanding for Richmond City Public Schools was developed. Essential actions for the division Corrective Action Plan are developed based upon the review of artifacts for each of the five focus areas in the division-level review tool. This draft will become the basis of the division level Corrective Action Plan. The Corrective Action Plan will come before the Virginia Board of Education once work between OSI and Richmond City school leaders and the Richmond City Public Schools stakeholder process has been completed.

Mr. Thomas Kranz, who will begin his role as Interim Superintendent for Richmond City Public Schools on July 1, 2017, was introduced to the Board. He thanked the Board on behalf of Richmond City Public Schools for giving him the opportunity to review the memorandum and working collaborative with staff. He stated that the Richmond City School Board is very dedicated to this process and ensured the Board that improvements will be made. Board members welcomed Mr. Kranz aboard and thanked him for taking on the review process.

The Board of Education received for first review the Division-Level Memorandum of Understanding for Richmond City Public Schools.

F. First Review of Proposal to Establish the Governor's STEM Academy at Osbourn High School (Manassas City)

Ms. Lolita B. Hall, Director, Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education along with Ms. Susan McNamara, Career and Technical Education Supervisor for Manassas City Public Schools, presented this item to the Board for first review. Ms. Hall had the pleasure of introducing the staff of Manassas City Public Schools and support team from the community partners.

The Governor's STEM Academy is designed to expand opportunities for the general student population to acquire STEM literacy and other critical skills, knowledge, and credentials that will prepare them for high-demand, high-wage and high-skill careers. Partnerships establishing academies must include at least one public school division, business and industry, and postsecondary education.

The STEM Academy is scheduled to open fall of 2017 and will provide three career clusters and three career pathways which will include: Engineering and Technology, Networks Systems, Facility and Mobile Equipment Maintenance.

Ms. McNamara provided an overview of the academy to include local needs and regional data. The advisory committee selected these pathways to provide instruction and opportunities for students to graduate with high-demand credentials. Ms. McNamara's objective is for students to be employed in high-skill, high-wage occupations, enter college with prerequisite skills for rigorous course work, and provide the workforce with qualified employees to fill high-need vacancies.

Osborn High School currently offers four of these supporting courses. The remaining supporting courses will be implemented according to the plans of study as students' progress through the Academy. The Governor's STEM Academy students will have the opportunity to earn 24 college credits through a combination of academic and technical courses. The Governor's STEM Academy has three primary goals: Student Achievement; Learning Environment and Program Effectiveness.

All of Osborn High School's staff meets the Virginia Department of Education licensure requirements. Professional development is provided annually to all staff to ensure high-quality, effective instruction for both existing and new courses.

Students will begin exploring the opportunity to participate in the Governor's STEM Academy in middle school through an outreach effort initiated by the Academy faculty. Presentations in class, curriculum and career fairs, extracurricular activities, and meetings with counselors will help students learn about and explore opportunities at the Governor's STEM Academy. Students may apply for admission during their eighth-grade year.

Specific expectations for successful student admission include a minimum grade-point average of 2.5 quality points, a demonstration of interest in STEM courses and/or STEM careers, and demonstrated achievement in rigorous mathematics and science courses at the middle school level, including Algebra I.

Entering ninth grade, a career cluster is declared and the student works with counselors to map a pathway that best addresses the student's interests. Students participate in a variety of authentic experiences, including hands-on and project-based learning opportunities.

The Governor's STEM Academy students will extend their knowledge through work-based learning experiences with area business and industry partners.

Students will actively participate in pathway-related co-curricular student organizations including Future Business Leaders of America, SkillsUSA, and the Technology Student Association, as well as extracurricular activities, such as FIRST Robotics.

The Planning Committee will ensure that students are involved in local, regional, and national leadership development programs including the National Technical Honor Society.

Summer enrichment opportunities currently exist at all levels within the school division. A wide range of community, business, and education partners are involved in planning the Governor's STEM Academy. These partners which represents leading industry professionals, non-profit organizations, local businesses, international corporations and postsecondary institutions, will provide regular input and guidance as members of the Governor's STEM Academy Advisory Committee.

Mrs. Atkinson commended the staff for putting forth the effort to establish a Governor's STEM Academy.

Mrs. Lodal also congratulated the staff and asked if other students will have the opportunity to take the courses. Ms. McNamara stated that students will have the opportunity to work side by side with students enrolled as dual classes. All classes will be taken at Osbourne High School thus transportation will not be an issue.

Ms. Adkins asked to define the role of the community partners. Ms. McNamara stated that the community partners serve in many capacities such as participating in mock interviews, assisting with project based learning, serving as advisors, and teaching work ethics.

Mr. Romero asked how the academy will be advertised to families to let them know of this great opportunity in high school. Ms. McNamara stated that in the fall, the team plans to visit each elementary school to have discussions with parents so they may understand the value of K-12 CTE and the opportunities of the STEM academy. Additionally, a parent trip to the high school is planned. The Board of Education accepted for first review the proposal to establish the Governor's STEM Academy at Osbourn High School, Manassas City Public Schools.

The Board of Education received for first review the Proposal to Establish the Governor's STEM Academy at Osbourn High School (Manassas City).

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES – by Board of Education Members and Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Dillard referenced a letter received from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation with many great proposals regarding the Standards of Accreditation (SOA). He inquired about what steps the organization can take now that the Board has approved the proposed stage of the SOA. Dr. Staples discussed that the Foundation's suggestions are currently in the curriculum or standards areas which staff could integrate or link to. The Foundation's suggestions have been referred to VDOE instructional staff and they are reviewing the recommendations to see if they already align with our standards or could be incorporated in existing standards. Mrs. Lodal stated that the Chesapeake Bay Foundation recommendations can be easily incorporated into what we are doing.

Mr. Dillard requested that the Board adopt revised language on the Profile of Virginia Graduate communications documents, specifically regarding civic and community engagement.

Mrs. Atkinson congratulated the department, Board members, and the SOL Innovation Committee on receiving Richmond Technology Council's award for 2017 Public Sector Innovation and Utilization. The award recognizes the creative use of existing technology benefits. Additionally, the National School Public Relations Association awarded VDOE with the 2017 Golden Achievement Award and the 2017 Award of Merit Publication for Electronic Media in a subcategory of internet and intranet websites. This communication award recognizes outstanding

print publications and exemplary activities, programs and project for the school quality profile. The Board congratulated Mr. Charles Pyle, Director of Communications.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Gecker made a motion to go into executive session under Virginia Code §2.2-3711(A) (41), for the purpose of discussion and consideration of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses, and that Susan Williams and Mona Siddiqui, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education; as well as staff members Dr. Steven Staples, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, whose presence will aid in this matter, participate in the closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 1:26 p.m.

Mr. Gecker made a motion that the Board reconvened in open session at 1:31 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Mr. Gecker made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements under this chapter and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered.

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

Board roll call:

Dr. Wilson - Aye
Mrs. Lodal –Aye
Mr. Dillard – Aye
Mr. Gecker - Aye
Dr. Cannaday – Aye
Mrs. Atkinson – Aye
Mr. Romero - Aye
Ms. Holton – Aye
Ms. Adkins - Aye

The Board made the following motions:

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Heidi Bradshaw Sheets. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and carried unanimously.

DINNER MEETING

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at 6:00 p.m., at the Berkley Hotel with the following members present: Ms. Adkins, Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Ms. Holton, Mr. Gecker, Mrs. Lodal, Mr. Romero and Dr. Wilson. The following department staff also attended: Dr. Steven Staples, Superintendent of Public Instructions, and Ms. Emily Webb, Director of Board Relations.

Members informally discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 7:20p.m.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION

There being no further business of the Board of Education, Dr. Cannaday adjourned the meeting at 1:33 p.m.



President