

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

PLANNING SESSION

April 23, 2014

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

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Dr. Oktay Baysal
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.

Mr. James H. Dillard
Mrs. Darla Edwards
Mr. Andrew Ko
Mrs. Joan Wodiska

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Mr. Braunlich called the meeting to order at 11 a.m.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mr. Braunlich opened the meeting by welcoming members and guests to the Board's planning session.

OVERVIEW OF PRESENTATION TOPICS

Dr. Wright gave an overview of the session topics:

- Update on Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Preparation in Virginia
- Standards of Learning (SOL) Assessment Program

UPDATE ON TEACHER RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND PREPARATION IN VIRGINIA

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

TEACH VIRGINIA

- Established in 2002, the job bank assists in the recruitment and retention efforts for Virginia school divisions and prospective teachers.
- The TeachVirginia Statewide Job Bank, powered by Teachers-Teachers.com, is an online tool that allows job seekers and school division recruiters to communicate with one another.

- The job bank provides access for teachers to view job openings and apply to Virginia school divisions.
- School divisions are provided a database of Virginia teaching candidates' résumés and access to a system to:
 - ✓ advertise recruitment events
 - ✓ post an unlimited number of instructional personnel positions
 - ✓ conduct searches for candidates in all areas
 - ✓ communicate with prospective candidates
 - ✓ hire teachers, administrators, and related service providers
- The site provides links to information for individuals who:
 - ✓ may be exploring a career in education
 - ✓ are making the decision to become educators, and are inquiring about school personnel licensure in Virginia
 - ✓ are licensed educators seeking employment in Virginia schools

VIRGINIA CAREER SWITCHER PROGRAM

- Established in the 1999 Appropriation Act, the pilot program was implemented in the summer of 2000 to encourage individuals from various occupational and life experiences to become classroom teachers, thereby increasing the quantity and diversity of applicants to the profession.

Prerequisites for the Program

- A bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution
- Five years of professional full-time work experience or the equivalent
- The completion of teaching area requirements for an endorsement in a content area as set forth in the current state licensure regulations or the equivalent through verifiable experience or academic study
- Virginia qualifying scores on the professional teacher's examinations as prescribed by the Board of Education
- All components of the career switcher alternative route for career professions must be completed by the candidates

Level I

- A minimum of 180 clock hours of instruction, including field experience, and professional studies requirements (instruction curriculum and instruction, differentiation of instruction, classroom behavior management, human growth and development, etc.)

Level II: Provisional Career Switcher License

- Five seminars (20 total instructional hours)
- One year of successful, full-time teaching experience under a mentor
 - ✓ Upon successful completion of Levels I and II and a recommendation of the superintendent or designee from the Virginia employing educational agency, the candidate will be eligible to apply for a five-year, renewable license.

Program Completers

- Between September 1, 2012, and August 31, 2013, 306 individuals completed the career Switcher Program and received a five-year renewable license.

Mentor Funding for the Career Switcher Program

- Funding (FY 2014) - \$279,983 is appropriated to support mentor funding for the Career Switcher Program
 - ✓ \$1,000 for mentor support for each Provisional Career Switcher license holder during Level II (the first year of employment as a teacher).

MONARCHTEACH

- The Mathematics and Science Teacher Education initiative was established and funded by the 2012 General Assembly with \$700,000 for two years.
- A unique collaboration between the College of Education and the College of Sciences at Old Dominion University, modeled after the nationally acclaimed UTeach program at the University of Texas at Austin.

- An innovative teacher preparation pathway that allows mathematics and science majors to receive teacher licensure while earning their degree in four years.

Purpose

- Increase significantly the number of students who will become the next generation of mathematics and science teachers in Virginia.
- Develop outstanding teachers who will improve mathematics and science education in their schools.
- Offer advice, mentoring, and financial assistance throughout the program and continued support after graduation.
- Promote mathematics and science in the community and improve the quality of STEM education in local schools.

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked the number of participants in the MonarchTeach Program. Mr. Jim Firebaugh, coordinator of the MonarchTeach Program, responded that there were 53 participants in the first cohort.

MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER CORPS (MSTC)

- The MSTC was established in 2005.
- The Virginia MSTC program provides the structure and incentives for school divisions to recruit experienced mathematics teachers for middle schools that have been designated as “at risk in mathematics” as a result of being *Accredited with Warning*” in mathematics or not meeting federal benchmarks.
- Schools eligible to participate in the MSTC will have the opportunity to take part in the initiative for at least three years and provide qualified recruits with incentive payments of \$5,000 per year, pending available funding from the Virginia General assembly.
- All funds are used for the Middle School Teacher Corps salary adjustment incentives (\$415,000 per year).
- MSTC teachers receive a salary adjustment (through the employing school division) for:
 - ✓ Retention in their current school; or
 - ✓ Recruitment to a high school. MSTC teachers receive the stipend for up to three years.
- Schools eligible for the MSTC are middle schools that:
 - ✓ Are “Warned in Mathematics” under the state’s school accreditation process
 - ✓ Did not meet mathematics “Annual Measurable Objectives” (AMOs) under the federal *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB); and/or
 - ✓ Are identified as Priority Schools, where mathematics is an area identified for improvement

MSTC teachers must:

- Hold an active, five-year Virginia teaching license
- Hold an appropriate teaching endorsement to teach middle school mathematics
- Have at least three years’ experience in full-time teaching of middle or high school mathematics
- Have a major or minor in mathematics (a minimum of 18 semester hours of mathematics coursework)
- Have a demonstrated success in improving students’ academic achievement in mathematics

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Dillard asked about the Middle School Teacher Corps incentives for mathematics teachers. Mrs. Pitts said in the past teachers reassigned from an accredited school to a school designated as "at risk in mathematics" as a result of being Accredited with Warning in mathematics or not meeting federal benchmarks could receive \$10,000 up to three years, and a teacher qualified for the program already assigned to an eligible at-risk school could received \$5,000 up to three years. Mrs. Pitts said that next year the emphasis will be on teacher recruitment. Schools eligible to participate in the

- Middle School Teacher Corps will have the opportunity to take part in the initiative for at least three years and provide qualified recruits with incentive payments of \$5,000 per year, pending available funding from the Virginia General Assembly.
- Mr. Braunlich asked how accomplishments of teachers are measured after three years. Mrs. Pitts said school divisions recommend teachers for the incentive at the end of the school year.
 - Mr. Braunlich asked if there is a screening process for teachers to enter the program. Mr. Firebaugh said the school has to be eligible for the MSTC and teachers must hold an active, five-year Virginia teaching license, hold an appropriate teaching endorsement to teach middle school mathematics, have at least three years' experience in full-time teaching of middle or high school mathematics, have a major or minor in mathematics with a minimum of 18 semester hours of mathematics coursework, and have demonstrated success in improving students' academic achievement in mathematics.
 - Mrs. Sears asked how success is defined for teachers in the program. Mr. Firebaugh said this is left up to the school division and teachers must meet or exceed Standard 7 of the teacher evaluation.
 - Mrs. Sears asked how many teachers are retained in the program. Mr. Firebaugh said most teachers stay three years in the program.
 - Dr. Wright said the basic tenants of this initiative are what they were when created and funded by the General Assembly but the program has been modified to keep up with policies of the Board. Dr. Wright said an example was a couple years ago when the Board approved the teacher evaluation system. Dr. Wright said they thought the right thing to do was to require MSTC teachers to have a successful evaluation to continue in the program.
 - Mrs. Wodiska asked if school divisions have raised any concerns with the requirement that teachers in the program must have a minimum of three years of experience. Mr. Firebaugh said that this has not been an issue. Mr. Firebaugh said this criterion was set at the beginning of the program.
 - Mrs. Atkinson asked if there will be a need to make changes to the program once changes are made in the licensure regulations pertaining to requirements for middle school mathematics. Mrs. Pitts said the minimum semester hours of mathematics coursework could be changed.

STRATEGIC COMPENSATION GRANTS

- The 2011 General Assembly funded a pilot program, the Virginia Performance-Pay Incentive (VPPI) initiative. The 2013 General Assembly appropriated funding for the Strategic Compensation Grants initiative for Fiscal Year 2014.
- To award competitive state grants to school divisions to design and implement compensation systems for teachers that provide incentives based on each participating school division's strategic goals and objectives.

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if funding for strategic compensation grants was included in this year's budget and at what amount. Mrs. Pitts said that for 2013-2014, thirteen grants have been awarded for \$13 million dollars.
- Dr. Wright said there is very little interest of school divisions with the strategic

compensation grants. Dr. Wright said school divisions expressed to her that the base pay needs to be improved.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, OR MATHEMATICS (STEM) INITIATIVE

- The STEM initiative was funded by the 2012 General Assembly. The appropriation for FY 2014 is \$808,000.
- The STEM initiative offers incentives to two groups of teachers:
 - ✓ Teachers reassigned from a Fully Accredited School to a Hard-to-Staff School or School Not Fully Accredited
 - ✓ Teachers new to the profession of teachers with up to three years' teaching experience (applicants must have less than three years' teaching experience.)

Criteria for Teacher Participants

- Teachers reassigned from a Fully Accredited School to a Hard-to-Staff School or School Not Fully Accredited
 - ✓ Be a teacher employed full-time in a Virginia school division
 - ✓ Successful teachers, regardless of teaching experience, selected to participate in the pilot program under criteria will be eligible to receive a \$5,000 initial incentive award after the completion of the year of teaching experience in the hard-to-staff school or a school that is not fully accredited, a satisfactory performance evaluation, and a signed contract in the same school division for the following year.
 - ✓ Hold an active five-year Virginia teaching license with one of the following endorsements:
 - Middle Education 6-8
 - Mathematics
 - Mathematics: Algebra I
 - Mathematics
 - Middle Education 6-8 Science
 - Biology
 - Chemistry
 - Earth and Space Science
 - Physics; or
 - Technology Education
 - ✓ Regardless of teaching experiences, be a teacher who is reassigned from a fully accredited school in a Virginia school division to a hard-to-staff school or a school that is not fully accredited in the 2013-2014 school year.
- Teachers new to the profession or teachers with up to three years' teaching experience (applicant must have less than three years' teaching experience)
 - ✓ Be a teacher new to the profession (no teaching experience) or a teacher with up to three years of teaching experience (less than three years' teaching experience)
 - ✓ Be employed as a teacher full-time in a Virginia school division
 - ✓ Hold an active five-year Virginia Teaching license with one of the following endorsements:
 - Middle Education 6-8
 - Mathematics
 - Mathematics: Algebra I
 - Mathematics
 - Middle Education 6-8 Science
 - Biology
 - Chemistry
 - Earth and Space Science
 - Physics; or
 - Technology Education
 - ✓ Be assigned to a teaching position in a corresponding subject area
 - ✓ Successful teachers selected to participate in the pilot program under this criteria will be eligible to receive a \$5,000 initial incentive award after the completion of the first, second, or third year of teaching with a satisfactory performance evaluation and a signed contract in the same school division for the following school year.

STEM Awards

Continuing Awards:

- An additional \$1,000 incentive award may be granted for each year the eligible teacher receives a satisfactory evaluation and teaches a qualifying STEM subject in which the teacher has an endorsement for up to three years in a Virginia school division following the year in which the teacher receives the initial incentive award.
- Maximum incentive (initial and continuation), contingent upon available funding: \$8,000

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if schools are limited to the amount of grants awarded. Mrs. Pitts said there are only the grant limitations. Mrs. Pitts said this particular grant is first come first serve and many applicants did not meet the criteria.
- Mr. Braunlich asked about the measurement for success used for the pilot program. Mrs. Pitts said the measurement of success will include the retention of teachers in low performing schools and success in teaching for the full year.
- Dr. Cannaday said it may be helpful for the Board to have priorities because there are so many initiatives and programs that it is difficult to determine which ones should rise to the top and be sustained. Dr. Cannaday said he does not think the Board will have a lot of new resources and the Board needs to think about what things the Board wants to measure intentionally that seem to matter the most. Mrs. Pitts said in some cases funds are available for the incentive but there is no funding for evaluation.
- Dr. Wright said she was glad the Board was discussing initiatives because the work of the office of teacher education and licensure goes beyond what the Board sees every month. Dr. Wright said all of the initiatives are developed and implemented out of the office of teacher education and are governor's initiatives funded by the General Assembly. Dr. Wright said a pilot means there is no intent to provide funds to every school division. Dr. Wright said the state does not get extra money to do an evaluation of the programs. Dr. Wright said the agency has a sundry of initiatives that were created at the request of legislators or governors. Dr. Wright said the Board is not being asked to develop new initiatives but to set the policy. Dr. Wright said the role of the Department is to design initiatives for others as requested that comply with Board policies.

VIRGINIA TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP LOAN PROGRAM

- The Virginia Teaching Scholarship Loan Program was reinstated in 1999 to provide financial support as an incentive to students who are pursuing a teaching career in one of Virginia's critical shortage teaching endorsement areas.
- Between 1999-2006, each year the General Assembly appropriated \$558,000 from the general fund for the Virginia Teaching Scholarship Loan Program. The 2007 General Assembly approved \$150,000 increase for the 2007-2008 program year.
- Since fiscal year 2008, the appropriation each year has totaled \$708,000.
- Scholarship amounts are based on \$10,000 per year for full-time students and are prorated for part-time students based on number of credit hours for which the students have enrolled.
- These scholarships shall be for undergraduate students at or beyond the sophomore year in college with a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.7, who were in the top 10 percent of their high school class, who are nominated by their college and students at the graduate level, and who meet the criteria and qualifications, pursuant to §22.1-290.01, *Code of Virginia*.
- Students eligible to apply must be enrolled full-time or part-time in approved undergraduate or graduate teacher education programs in a critical teacher shortage area or who seek degrees in career and technical education.
- Minority students may be enrolled in any content area for teacher preparation and male students may be enrolled in any approved elementary or middle school teacher preparation program.

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if teachers at charter schools are eligible for grants. Mrs. Pitts said charter schools are considered to be public schools so they are eligible to apply for grants.

- Mrs. Atkinson asked about critical shortage teaching endorsement areas. Mrs. Pitts said there are ten broad areas, and offered to get her a copy.

NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION

- Through the National Board certification process, teachers document their subject matter knowledge; provide evidence that they know how to teach their subjects to students most effectively; and demonstrate their ability to manage and measure student learning.
- All National Board assessments consist of two major parts, the portfolio entries and the assessment center exercises.
- The 1999 General Assembly codified the National Teacher certification Incentive Reward Program.
- In 2013, continuing bonuses of \$2,500 were granted to 1,727 National Board Certified teachers and 192 received an initial bonus of \$5,000.
- In November 2013, another 261 Virginia teachers became National Board Certified and may be eligible for the initial incentive bonus in 2014.

MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM

- The mentor teacher program was established by the 1998 General Assembly to provide funds to assist school divisions in providing mentor programs for teachers with no teaching experience as a means to develop and retain high-quality teachers.
- Funds for FY 2014 were allocated by the General Assembly to provide grants to school divisions providing mentors for new teachers with zero years of teaching experience.
- \$1,000,000 in funding is available statewide to support this program.
- 125 school divisions requested funding for mentoring 4,402 new teachers. The allocation was \$227.17 per teacher, totaling \$1,000,000.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Dillard asked for clarification of the funding for the mentor teacher program. Mrs. Pitts said the money goes to the school division in the form of a grant to help support their mentoring program. Mrs. Pitts said the mentoring teachers do not receive the money; it is used to support the mentoring program. Mrs. Pitts said some school divisions pay mentors a small stipend but most mentors do it as a way of giving back to their profession.

CLINICAL FACULTY GRANTS

- The Clinical Faculty Grants were established by the 1998 General Assembly.
- Clinical faculty are historically referred to as the cooperating teacher – the teacher in the school division who is assigned to work with and support the student teacher. The student teacher is supported by the clinical faculty and the supervising university faculty.
- The Virginia General Assembly appropriated \$318,750 to support proposals from Virginia regionally accredited institutions of higher education with Board of Education approved educator preparation programs to support Clinical Faculty Programs that assist preservice teachers and beginning teachers to make a successful transition into full-time teaching.

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if clinical faculty grants could be used as additional funding for lab schools or would they be eliminated. Mrs. Pitts said having a lab school will not negate the needs for these funds. Mrs. Pitts said these funds help colleges and universities to work collaboratively with teachers in public schools who are working with student teachers.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL TRAINEESHIP

- Funding is awarded to Virginia regionally accredited institutions of higher education that have a Board of Education approved program in Special Education: General Curriculum K-12 to deliver undergraduate and/or graduate-level special education courses to individuals who hold a provisional (special education) license with a Special Education: General Curriculum K-12 endorsement and who are employed in Virginia public schools as special educators of children with disabilities (accessing the general curriculum).

The Board's discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked for clarification of the \$600,000 funding for the traineeship program. Mrs. Pitts said that this funding will be focused on individuals endorsed in special education general curriculum and are teaching students accessing the general curriculum. Mrs. Pitts said this is an area with a shortage of teachers.
- Mr. Braunlich said a member of the General Assembly had looked at the STEM programs and asked how the Board will know if they work. Mr. Braunlich said it feeds into the issue raised by Dr. Wright which is that a lot of this came in because of an individual's request. Mr. Braunlich said it keeps getting funded over and over again.
- Mr. Braunlich said he was struck by Dr. Cannaday's comment regarding sustainability. Mr. Braunlich said some school divisions will be able to sustain it and some will not and the ones who will not are the ones it was designed to help.
- Mr. Braunlich said at some point the Board and Department should look at what is being accomplished and determine the programs' usefulness. Mr. Braunlich said the General Assembly will be informed of that and be appreciative of it. Mr. Braunlich said this is the kind of presentation that would be useful to the General Assembly. Mr. Dillard agreed that this type of presentation would be useful to the General Assembly.
- Dr. Wright noted that Department of Education staff routinely brief the Senate Finance Committee and House Appropriations Committee at the General Assembly.

LICENSURE REGULATIONS FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Highlights of major proposed revisions

- Increases coursework in mathematics and science for elementary endorsements
- Increases coursework in mathematics for middle education 6-8
- Establishes an endorsement in Engineering
- Allows individuals who hold the Early Childhood Special Education endorsement to add the Early Childhood for Three- and Four-year-olds add-on endorsement
- Creates new add-on Special Education-General Curriculum endorsements (K-6, 6-8, and 6-12)
- Establishes separate Mathematics Specialist endorsements for elementary and middle education
- Adds coursework in "Assessment of and for Learning" to Professional Studies requirements
- Increases hours of specified coursework to become eligible for a Provisional (Special Education) License
- Requires license holders to take licensure assessments to receive a third year on a Provisional License
- Adds the Teach for America License prescribed by law
- Revises the alternate route to Administration and Supervision endorsement to add an option of a combination of graduate-level coursework and a research-based program

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA

- Requires professional education program accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CAEP)
- Eliminates the professional studies coursework cap
- Establishes an expectation for approved teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate level

- Stipulates 10 weeks of a summative clinical student teaching experience under the supervision of a cooperating teacher with demonstrated effectiveness in the classroom
- Includes an indicator that employer job satisfaction documentation must address teachers' performance, including student academic progress
- Requires an Annual Report Card
- Requires specified semester hours in English, social sciences, mathematics, and science for elementary education and includes a testing option
- Adds "Assessment of and for Learning" to Professional Studies requirements

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked if the executive branch review process includes the governor's office and office of the attorney general. Mrs. Pitts said that it does.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if individuals already licensed through the Board's licensing process have reciprocity to be automatically licensed through the Board of Audiology. Mrs. Pitts said the law states that anyone holding a Board of Education license in Speech Language Pathology as of June 30, 2014, will be eligible to receive a license from the Board of Audiology. Mrs. Pitts said the only exception would be a misconduct issue. Mrs. Pitts said they are encouraging teachers to begin applying July 1, 2014, because federal money will be used until December 1, 2014 to pay the initial fee. Mrs. Pitts said teachers will have until June 30, 2015 to apply.
- Mrs. Sears said a 2013 report from the Council of Chief State School Officers indicated disparities in the initial licensure requirements of different states related to content knowledge. Mrs. Sears asked about the impact on Virginia. Mr. Braunlich said this question relates to the National Council on Teacher Quality and asked Mrs. Sears to hold her question for a later discussion.

2013 STATE TEACHER POLICY YEARBOOK: VIRGINIA
Source: National Council on Teacher Quality, January 2014

Overall Yearbook Grades

2013 – C+
2011 – D+
2009 – D+

Area Grades

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2011</u>
Area 1 – Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers	C+	C-
Area 2 – Expanding the Teaching Pool	C-	C
Area 3 – Identifying Effective Teachers	C-	F
Area 4 – Retaining Effective Teachers	B	C
Area 5 – Exiting Ineffective Teachers	C	D+

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked about the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) findings.
- Dr. Wright said NCTQ is one of many national organizations in education policy that the Department follows closely. Dr. Wright said the NCTQ report was used for guidance as Virginia developed revisions to the teacher licensure regulations and program approval regulations. Dr. Wright said there are some areas that the Board does not have the authority to make changes in because the authority rests with the General Assembly. Dr. Wright said the Department takes their recommendations seriously but

- there are some areas where the Board has no control.
- Mrs. Atkinson indicated that some of the updates to the regulations will not be reflected in the current grades because those regulations are not effective yet. Mrs. Pitts said she was correct and that Virginia did not get credit for those regulations because they have not been implemented. Dr. Wright said Virginia's grades should go up significantly once those regulations are approved.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Policy Strengths:

- Elementary teacher candidates are required to pass a content test with individually scored subtests in each of the core content areas.
- Elementary teacher candidates must pass a reading test to ensure knowledge of effective reading instruction.
- Middle school teachers may not teach on a K-8 generalist license and must pass a single-subject content test.

Policy Weaknesses:

- Although teacher candidates are required to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs, the test is not normed to the general college-going population.
- Although secondary teachers must pass a content test to teach a core subject area, secondary social studies teachers are not required to pass content tests for each discipline they are licensed to teach.
- State offers K-12 special education endorsements.
- A pedagogy test is not required as a condition of licensure.
- Requirements for teacher preparation do not ensure a high-quality student teaching experience.
- The teacher preparation program approval process does not hold programs accountable for the quality of teachers they produce.

Area 2: Expanding the Pool of Teachers

Policy Strength:

- There are no restrictions on alternate route usage or providers.

Policy Weaknesses:

- Admission requirements for alternate route to licensure are not sufficiently selective.
- More could be done to ensure that alternate route programs meet the immediate needs of new teachers.
- The state does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part-time.
- Out-of-state teachers are not required to meet the state's testing requirements, and there are additional obstacles that do not support licensure reciprocity.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Dillard asked about alternate routes to licensure. Mrs. Pitts explained that some states require that any teacher preparation programs must be housed in a college or university. Mrs. Pitts said Virginia received points for the Career Switcher Program because it is offered at school divisions and community colleges in Virginia and not restricted to only four-year colleges and universities.
- Dr. Baysal asked why Virginia requires five years of full-time work experience to participate in the Career Switcher Program. Mrs. Pitts said when the program was implemented there was a lot of discussion on what experience should be required because they did not want individuals who just graduated from college to enter into the program.
- Dr. Cannaday asked if NCTQ defines how they captured 'better'. Mrs. Pitts said an analysis for each explaining their rationale was given but 'better' was not defined.

- Mr. Ko asked if volunteer teacher assistants are required to have a license. Mrs. Pitts said they do not need a license.
- Mr. Braunlich asked what is necessary for school divisions to hire people with occupational experience but without a license to teach. Mrs. Pitts said individuals with occupational experience in a trade area can seek a provisional license which will lead to a technical professional license. Mrs. Pitts said individuals are not required to take assessments for the technical professional license but they are required to take professional studies coursework, and they must take human growth and development and curriculum behavior management.
- Mr. Braunlich asked how licensure requirements can be balanced so the state is not losing new teachers and helping school divisions in rural areas that have difficulty hiring teachers. Dr. Wright said there is always a balance between rigor for the good of students and recognizing the need for a work force.
- Dr. Cannaday said the candidate pool for teachers needs to be strengthened over time.
- Mr. Braunlich asked how the reciprocity issue in Virginia compares with other states. Mrs. Pitts said it varies from state to state. Mrs. Pitts said the reciprocal agreement Virginia has with other states does not include assessments, but endorsements and completion of approved programs are recognized.
- Mrs. Sears asked for clarification of reciprocity with other states. Mrs. Pitts said to be exempted from a license assessment in Virginia the individual must have three years of appropriate teaching experience and have a full credential from another state. Mrs. Pitts said every state has its own licensure requirements and they are varied. Mrs. Pitts said even the endorsements states offer are different. Mrs. Pitts said the only things required are those that are statutory such as first aid, CPR, technology standards, and child abuse recognition and intervention.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Policy Strength:

- Although objective evidence of student learning is not the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluation, it is a significant component, and the state has articulated other important evaluation requirements.

Policy Weaknesses:

- Although the state has established a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness, it has not taken other meaningful steps to maximize the system's efficiency and potential.
- Annual evaluations for all teachers are not required.
- Tenure decisions are connected to evidence of teacher effectiveness, but this evidence is not the preponderant criterion.
- Licensure advancement and renewal are not based on teacher effectiveness.
- Little school-level data are reported that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

The Board discussion included:

- Dr. Baysal asked for clarification of how teacher effectiveness is measured. Dr. Wright said that Standard 7 of the teacher evaluation guidelines addresses student academic progress and is referred to for teacher effectiveness. Dr. Wright said for federal reporting purposes school divisions' student growth percentiles on reading and mathematics teachers for K-8 are provided.
- Mrs. Wodiska said she values staff recommendations on areas of focus for the Board

and asked Mrs. Pitts and staff to give their personal observations and opinions during presentations to the Board.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Policy Strengths:

- All new teachers receive mentoring.
- Teachers receive feedback from their evaluations, and professional development is aligned with findings from teachers' evaluations.
- Teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluations are placed on structured improvement plans.
- Districts are given full authority for how teachers are paid, although they are not discouraged from basing salary schedules solely on years of experience and advanced degrees.
- Teachers can receive additional compensation for working in high-need schools or shortage subject areas, and teachers in some districts can receive performance pay.

Policy Weakness:

- The state does not support additional compensation for relevant prior work experience for new teachers.

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Policy Strength:

- Performance is the top criterion for districts to consider when determining which teachers to lay off during reductions in force, and a last hired, first fired layoff policy is prohibited.

Policy Weaknesses:

- Teachers can teach for up to three years before having to pass required subject-matter tests.
- Although ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal, the state allows multiple appeals for teachers who are dismissed.

The Board Discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked if other states have a three-year provisional license. Mrs. Pitts said it varies from state to state.
- Mrs. Sears asked what happens to a teacher with a provisional license who wants to teach in Virginia. Mrs. Pitts said the time for the license will begin when the individual receives a provisional license in Virginia. Mrs. Pitts said the statute prohibits Virginia from issuing a provisional to exceed a period of three years but it depends on the individual's circumstances. The person may have a provisional in another state and is now applying through an alternate route to licensure. Mrs. Pitts said provisional licenses from other states are not accepted in Virginia to grant endorsements.
- Dr. Baysal said three states received a score of "A" for this area (Colorado, Illinois and Oklahoma) and suggested staff look at how they deal with ineffective teachers compared to Virginia. Mrs. Pitts clarified that those states received a score of "A" for this area but not for an overall score.
- Mrs. Sears asked if the issue here relates to the ability to appeal to the state. Mrs. Pitts said that probably the other states that received a higher grade have less of an appeal process than Virginia. Mrs. Pitts said that in Virginia we have due process.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if teachers remain in the classroom during the appeal process. Mrs. Pitts said they would be appealing dismissal so they would have already been dismissed.
- Mr. Ko thanked Mrs. Pitts for her detailed presentation. Mr. Ko asked Mrs. Pitts what

would be one recommendation to the Board that other states are doing that stood out and could be done effectively and quickly in Virginia. Mrs. Pitts said there are several things worth considering. Mrs. Pitts said she proceeds with caution because some things that sound good on paper in reality would affect teachers and the work force in a negative way and school divisions are already struggling to employ teachers. Mrs. Pitts said some things have already been done and as soon as the licensure and program regulations are approved they can be implemented in Virginia. Mrs. Pitts said the Board should be proud of the work they have done to address many of these issues already.

UPDATE ON THE VIRGINIA ASSESSMENT PROGRAM: CONTINUING TO MAXIMIZE THE OPPORTUNITIES OF ONLINE TESTING

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, presented this item. Her presentation included the following:

HISTORY OF THE SOL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

- 1983 – Initial development of SOL classroom assessments
- 1998 – Initial implementation of statewide SOL testing
- 2001 – Introduction of online testing
- 2006 – Introduction of reading and mathematics tests at grades 4, 6, and 7 to meet federal mandates
- 2012 – Introduction of technology-enhanced items
- 2013 – Introduction of operational online writing test
- 2014 – Computer Adaptive Testing (CAT) Pilot

Implementation of New Tests

- History in 2010-2011
- Mathematics in 2011-2012
- Reading, Writing and Science in 2012-2013

Opportunities Available with Online Testing

- Technology-Enhanced Items:
 - increase ability to test higher order thinking skills;
 - allow assessment to more closely mirror classroom instruction; and
 - permit addition of research-based supports to improve access for students with disabilities.
- Approximately 15 percent of the items on SOL tests in mathematics, reading, writing and science are Technology-Enhanced.

The Board discussion included:

- Dr. Wright noted that fifteen percent of the items on the tests are technology enhanced. Dr. Wright said if the Board wants to increase rigor and has the funding, the percentage of technology enhance items can be increased. Dr. Wright said technology enhanced items are more expensive to develop than multiple choice. Dr. Wright said the Board already has a structure in place that will allow them to increase the rigor of the assessments.
- Dr. Cannaday asked how the changes to the SAT, particularly in the grammar section, align with technology enhanced items in the writing assessment. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the current end-of-course writing tests have two components—the student has to

write a short paper and respond to multiple choice and technology enhanced items. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said students have to drag and drop to indicate the punctuation. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said within this framework changes can be made that do not go too far outside the current blueprint.

FOCUS ON READINESS FOR COLLEGE

Adoption of “Advanced/College Path” Achievement Levels

- Algebra II
- End-of-Course Reading
- End-of-Course Writing

Development of “Advanced/College Path” Achievement Levels

- Replaced the existing “pass/advanced” achievement level for these three EOC tests.
- The “proficient” achievement level continues to allow students to meet graduation requirements.

Identification of Content for Tests: Survey of College Faculty

- Conducted survey with higher education faculty to determine to what extent the content standards are associated with success in introductory credit-bearing college classes
 - Algebra II content standards - introductory college mathematics classes
 - Reading and Writing content standards - introductory college classes with substantial reading and writing loads
- Asked to rate content standards in Algebra II, reading and writing as to whether the content was “essential,” “important,” “relevant,” or “not required” as prerequisites for success in introductory credit-bearing college course
- Success defined as a “C” or better in the college course

Standard Setting for New SOL Tests

- Committees of educators convened to review the new Algebra II, EOC Reading and EOC Writing tests and recommend “cut scores” for “proficient” and “advanced/college path.”
- Committees included high school educators and representatives from two-year and four-year institutions of higher education.

Definition of “Advanced/College Path” for EOC Reading

- A student obtaining an “advanced/college path” score should have the necessary knowledge and skills for enrollment, without remediation, in an introductory credit-bearing college course with a substantial reading load, assuming that the student continues to demonstrate a comparable level of achievement in subsequent high school English courses prior to high school graduation.

Next Steps for “Advanced/College Path” Achievement Level

- In the future, evaluate success of college students who took the new Algebra II, EOC reading and EOC writing tests to validate “advanced/college path” achievement level.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich asked if there has been discussion on requirements of students leading up to end-of-course test. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said our Standards of Learning are articulated and spiral across the grade levels so a student that does well on an end-of-course writing test would be assumed to have been taught that content in earlier grades and done well. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the downside to not having the 5th-grade writing test is there will not be a standardized measure of writing achievement at the elementary level.
- Dr. Cannaday asked if staff will be able to inform the committee around the old model of what tests seem to be a good predictor of student performance. Dr. Cannaday asked if staff will be able to provide the committee with some data that key

anchor points are more likely to give a picture of who was able to maintain writing improvement or where it seems to be flat lining or decreasing. Dr. Loving-Ryder said that is something that could be looked at—how students did on their 5th-grade test, 8th- grade test, and then end-of-course.

REVISED LIST OF SUBSTITUTE TESTS FOR VERIFIED CREDIT

- Existing list still in effect for 2013-2014.
- Newly approved list will go into effect at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year.
- A few tests were removed from the list.
- Some tests have new cut scores.
- New tests were added to the list.
- Beginning in 2014-2015, the WorkKeys Writing test may only be used with students who need to pass the EOC writing test based on the 2002 SOL.
- All AP and IB mathematics and English tests will verify two credits.

ASSESSMENT RESOURCES PROVIDED TO SCHOOL DIVISIONS

SOL Practice Items

- Developed and implemented prior to field testing to provide practice with technology-enhanced items and test items reflecting increased rigor.
- Additional items developed and inserted as needed.
- Developed Practice Item Guides for use with students to help teachers highlight the new information.
- Developed audio versions of the Practice Items for students who receive that accommodation.

Practice Writing Tool

- Provides students with an opportunity to practice composing their short papers online in an application similar to what is used for SOL testing
- Implemented prior to online writing field test in spring 2012

SOL Writing Prompts

- All writing prompts that may be used for the SOL writing assessment are posted on the Department's Web site.
- Updated as new prompts are added.

Understanding Scoring

- Online application that provides teachers with training and practice in scoring the short paper component of the SOL writing tests.

Student Performance Analysis

- DOE staff reviews statewide SOL tests results and identifies content that was challenging for students
- Narrated PowerPoint presentations that describe content and provide examples
- Designed as professional development tools for teachers

MOVING TO COMPUTER ADAPTIVE TESTING

Current Testing System

- All students taking a particular test (e.g., grade 7 mathematics) are administered one of several versions of that test.
- Test forms are constructed by testing contractor staff and reviewed by Department staff and by committees of educators.
- All students must demonstrate the same level of achievement to be considered proficient or advanced regardless of the version of the test they take.

Computer Adaptive Testing (CAT)

- As with the current system, all students must demonstrate the same level of achievement to be considered proficient or advanced.
- However, instead of each student responding to the same test items contained in a particular version of the test, the computer customizes the items administered to each individual student.

CAT

- In CAT, the computer scores the student's responses to a test item and selects the next item based on the student's response.
- CAT is iterative in that the process of choosing questions, scoring responses, and selecting new items is repeated throughout the test.

Advanced of CAT

- Improved security since students in the same test session are responding to different items
- May allow for more flexible test administration windows
- May improve student motivation because content is administered at a more engaging level of difficulty, especially for struggling students

Streamlined Test Development

- Detailed test construction requirements used for each test (e.g., grade 7 mathematics) are collected and programmed into the CAT algorithm prior to first CAT administration.
- With CAT, the computer automatically assembles tests that meet these requirements while also customizing the test for each individual student.
- Prior to the CAT administration, simulations of tests are run and test developers review them to refine the requirements in the computer to ensure the CAT forms being assembled by the computer meet the SOL content expectations.
- The need for manual test construction by test developers is eliminated.

CAT Pilots

- Grade 7 mathematics in January 2014
- Grade 8 reading in May-June 2014
- Results with the use of CAT for operational testing

Grade 7 Mathematics CAT Pilot

- Pilot conducted in January 2014
- Participants included 8th-grade students who took grade 7 Math in spring 2013 and sampled from schools who volunteered to participate

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked for clarification of the Mathematics CAT pilot. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said it was grade 8 students who had taken grade 7 the previous spring and had the content previously. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said pilots do not count.

Student Survey Responses: "The amount of time I had to take this test was..."

- Just right – 82%
- Not enough – 4%
- Too much – 14%

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears asked about the breakdown by region. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said staff has that information and will need to look into it.

- Dr. Cannaday said we have to be careful because this may not be representative of a region but certain people in a region. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that is correct because in one region there are only six students to consider.
- Mrs. Sears asked if it would be helpful to give that information to the school divisions so they will know what to spend more time on. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the students are talking about the time allowed to take the test and not the level of difficulty.
- Mr. Dillard asked if the tests are timed. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the tests are not timed and generally students have a day to complete the test.

Selection of Items for Students

- In general, CAT was able to match items to students very well.
- Additional “difficult” items should be developed for the SOL item banks for use with advanced students.

Student Survey Responses: “Overall I think the questions on this test were...”

- Somewhat difficult – 47%
- Very difficult – 3%
- Somewhat easy – 44%
- Very easy – 6%

How was this test different from other SOL tests you have taken?

- No ability to review a question or flag it for review
- No ability to go back to a question
- This test wasn’t much different than previous tests
- No ability to skip a question

The Board discussion included:

- Dr. Cannaday said what he appreciates so much about this is that you test something first to see what you have learned and allow that to determine what is to happen next. Dr. Cannaday said he hopes that during the Board’s work on its Comprehensive Plan that they are able to identify things for which the Board has a structured way to learn what could make things better and then talk about a strategy for implementing it over time.

Conclusions

- The CAT pilot test administration did not encounter any issues.
- The tests administered reflected the blueprints and other content requirements appropriately.
- The level of measurement precision for student scores was high.
- The exposure of items was maintained to appropriate levels for test security.
- It will be important to educate schools and students about how CAT works.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder showed a short video to Board members which is the first showing with the initial endeavor to explain CAT to the public.

The Board discussion included:

- Dr. Baysal noted he recently participated on a panel at a local Virginia Beach public television station. Dr. Baysal said the panel consisted of an individual from a local school division, a delegate from the General Assembly, and a gentleman from fairtest.com. Dr. Baysal said the discussion centered on standardized testing effectiveness, changes, etc. Dr. Baysal said staff’s development of the CAT video

- will help the public understand it better. Dr. Baysal said in order to prevent people from picking up on one issue and dismissing the whole system, he asked staff to classify questions into the following categories for posting on the Department's Web site: (1) content and adequacy of the content objectives; (2) delivery methods and suitability of the delivery methods; (3) scheduling and timing of when tests are administered; and (4) how results are used.
- Mr. Dillard asked about how CAT works. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said Department staff will develop a training test for students that will also be available for the public to experience.
 - Dr. Wright said it is important to remember that all students will be held to the same standards. Dr. Wright said the computer is set up to judge their responses against the standard expected. Dr. Wright said it is a technical process and it is being done all over the country and has been well researched. Dr. Wright said the benefit to the student is that they get to answer questions they can handle.
 - Mrs. Sears referred to the questions Dr. Baysal said were asked at his meeting and said she has heard those questions since her first day on the Board. The most famous one is "we take the SOLs and then there is nothing else for us to do for the rest of the month so we sit around looking." Mrs. Sears asked Dr. Wright to answer that question again. Dr. Wright said it is called leadership and expectations for classroom teachers. Dr. Wright said there has been a lot of talk of providing more instructional time. Dr. Wright said the time is there. Dr. Wright said if school divisions choose to give the SOLs earlier in the spring then the expectation will be for instruction to take place after the SOLs are given.
 - Mr. Ko asked if bandwidth was an issue. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said there were no issues.
 - Mr. Ko asked are there any issues with resources. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said more resources will be needed to develop another CAT instruction video and a practice CAT test for students.
 - Mr. Ko asked if testing pilots are done in a lab. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said they are done on laptop or desktop computers and wireless cards.
 - Mr. Ko asked if CAT was Virginia's idea or Pearson's. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said it is Pearson's computer but Virginia owns all of the items.
 - Mr. Ko asked if it was possible to sell CAT to other states. Dr. Wright said Virginia has been approached by several states for CAT.
 - Mrs. Atkinson said she is distressed with individuals that say there is little time to teach after SOL assessments.
 - Mrs. Edwards complimented Mrs. Loving-Ryder on her presentation and said this is the best investment that could be done for students.
 - Mr. Dillard asked Mrs. Loving-Ryder to clarify what happens once students complete the test. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said once the test is submitted it may be a couple of weeks before students receive their score because that is left up to school divisions.
 - Mrs. Sears said she thought teachers would be able to access the information. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said it is a local decision but teachers do have access to the information. Mrs. Loving-Ryder clarified that there are credit reports on the computer if school division chooses to print the scores.

- Mr. Braunlich said the investment in CAT testing eventually will become a tool that can be used in classroom instruction for classroom assessment and will provide teachers better measures of student strengths and weaknesses. Mr. Braunlich said the problem right now is putting the test into place and there is no budget to do that.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if opportunities are available for retesting with CAT. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said there will be more opportunities for retesting because CAT has a larger item bank.

Next Steps

- Based on pilot results, CAT delivery for mathematics can move forward as planned if sufficient funding is available.
- CAT will be further evaluated for reading—Grade 8 Reading Pilot begins on May 5th.
- Development of resources for school divisions.

Proposed Timeline for CAT Implementation

- Grades 6, 7, and 8 mathematics in fall 2014
- Grades 3, 4, and 5 mathematics in spring 2015 pending sufficient funds
- Plan is for full implementation in 3 years if funding is available

Costs Associated with Moving to CAT

- Initial cost increase to implement CAT system
- Item/test developments costs should decrease once CAT is fully implemented
- Test administration costs will depend on number of tests taken

New Score Reports

- The SOL score reports for all tests except for writing are being significantly revised.
- New score reports will be implemented with the fall 2014 test administration.
- Training on using new reports will be provided for school division staff in late summer or early fall 2014.

POTENTIAL USE OF AUTOMATED SCORING FOR THE SOL WRITING TESTS

Potential Use of “Automated Scoring”

- Currently, two human readers score each of the short papers that students write as part of the SOL writing tests.
- A benefit of moving the SOL writing test online was the potential use of computerized automated scoring to score the short-paper components.
- Studies to investigate feasibility conducted in summer 2013.
- Studies were successful; scoring engine is trained on all current SOL prompts.
- In fall 2014, the Department plans to use “automated scoring” as the second reader for grade 8 writing and EOC writing.
- Should reduce turnaround time for delivery of scores.

USE OF ADDITIONAL DEVICES FOR ONLINE SOL TESTING

Current Status

- Current test delivery system (TestNav 7) only supports SOL testing on Microsoft Windows-based and Mac OS-based hardware.
- Devices such as Google Chromebooks, Apple iPads, Android-based devices, or touch screen devices are not supported for testing with TestNav 7.
- TestNav 8 is a new test delivery system that will support additional devices but a transition to administering SOL tests with TestNav 8 will require significant time and effort.

Movement to TestNav 8

- Plans for transitioning to TestNav 8 are underway but the implementation will have to occur in phases; a firm timeline is not yet available.
- SOL test items need to undergo multiple conversion steps and verifications prior to being administered with TestNav 8.
- Research to evaluate differences in SOL item presentation on touch screen devices has been underway since 2012.

Tablet Research in Virginia: Findings

- Impact of touch screens on technology-enhanced items - the “dragger” or “hot spot” may be smaller than a student’s finger.
- When typing a longer response, students found that the imprecision of their fingers to indicate location interfered with their ability to select text when trying to replace words or to fix spelling, punctuation, or capitalization.
- Students with typing/keyboarding skills were slower and less accurate with the on-screen keyboard and became frustrated with writing tasks.
- Younger students without typing skills often preferred the on-screen keyboard.
- Text selection and editing on a tablet was difficult even with the external keyboards; not all students used the keyboard’s arrow keys to position the text cursor.
- Tools currently available to students in TestNav 7 may not be available on tablets (e.g., hover feature) or may be more difficult to use (e.g., highlighter, pencil tool).
- Tools such as the calculator or the tablet’s onboard keyboard “cover up” the test item when accessed.

Timeline for Inclusion of Tablets in SOL Test Administration

- Additional research is ongoing. Pilot with high school students in progress now.
- “Sample items” in TestNav8 will be provided in summer 2014 so that school division staff can experience the differences in how items are presented.
- Tablet implementation will occur in phases.

Development of Additional Measures of Growth

- Development of a vertical scale for the reading and mathematics tests to allow for additional measurement of growth.
- Technical work to establish a vertical scale planned for spring 2015.

IMPLEMENTATION OF HOUSE BILL 930/SENATE BILL 306

Eliminated the following SOL tests

- Grade 3 History
- Grade 3 Science
- Grade 5 Writing
- US History to 1865
- US History: 1865 to the Present

Requirements for Local School Divisions

- Each school board shall annually certify that it has provided instruction and administered an alternative assessment, consistent with Board guidelines, to students in grades three through eight in each Standards of Learning subject area in which a Standards of Learning assessment was not administered during the school year.
- Such guidelines shall (1) incorporate options for age-appropriate, authentic performance assessments and portfolios with rubrics and other methodologies designed to ensure that students are making adequate academic progress in the subject area and that the Standards of Learning content is being taught; (2) permit and encourage integrated assessments that include multiple subject areas; and (3) emphasize collaboration between teachers to administer and substantiate the assessments and the professional development of teachers to enable them to make the best use of alternative assessments.

Development of Guidelines for Local Assessments: Questions for Consideration

- How will school divisions certify that local assessments measure the SOL?
- Must the local assessments include all SOL for that subject?
- Must local assessments include “authentic performance assessments” or may they include primarily multiple-choice or technology-enhanced items?
- What is the definition of “authentic performance assessments”?
- Must the same assessment be used across a division or may decisions about assessments be made at the school level?
- Must local assessments provide a summative measure of student achievement or will interim assessments administered throughout the year be sufficient?
- Will the guidelines allow for group work? If so, will there be guidance as to how the contribution of individual students will be captured?
- If performance tasks are used
 - ✓ will students be permitted to attempt the same task again if they are unsuccessful on the first attempt?
 - ✓ will it be permissible to use the same tasks from year to year or will it be necessary to develop new tasks?
- If integrated assessments are used, will the requirements be different?
- What professional development must be provided to teachers?
- What support will be provided to small school divisions?
- How will “adequate academic progress” be defined?
- IDEA requires that alternate assessments be provided for students who are unable to participate in the regular district assessment.
- How will school divisions ensure that this requirement is addressed?

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears said it is her understanding that there are no additional funds to help school divisions develop their own assessment and asked for clarification. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that was correct.
- Mrs. Sears asked if school divisions can use their benchmark tests. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that will be a question for the Board to consider when the guidelines are developed. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the bill requires school divisions to administer alternative assessments that meet the guidelines.
- Mrs. Sears asked the reason for eliminating the Grade 3 Science SOL test. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said there was concern to restrict the test at Grade 3 to reading and math.
- Mr. Braunlich asked when the guidelines should be completed. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said the law goes into effect July 1, 2014.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if benchmark tests come in Braille or will there be accommodations as needed. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said they will not have accommodations.
- Mrs. Sears asked if these questions were presented when the General Assembly agreed to eliminate tests. Dr. Wright said these are questions the Board will need to consider when guidelines are developed.
- Mr. Dillard noted that school divisions did raise these questions before the bill was passed.
- Mrs. Wodiska noted a teacher’s concern that the new law should not go into effect this school year, as there is no time to adjust budgets or be trained on new items.
- Mr. Dillard said that normally a bill such as this would be carried over to allow time for discussion and better understanding.

BOARD OF EDUCATION'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This item was removed from the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT OF PLANNING SESSION

Mr. Braunlich adjourned the Board of Education Planning Session at 4:31 p.m.

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, April 23, 2014, at the Commonwealth Park Suites Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Edwards, Mr. Ko, Mrs. Sears, and Mrs. Wodiska. Dr. Patricia Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction, also attended the meeting. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:00 p.m.

The Board of Education convened for the Business Session at 9 a.m., Thursday, April 24, 2014.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

April 24, 2014

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

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President
Mrs. Winsome E. Sears, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Dr. Oktay Baysal
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.

Mr. James H. Dillard
Mrs. Darla Edwards
Mr. Andrew Ko
Mrs. Joan E. Wodiska

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Braunlich asked for a moment of silence, and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Edwards made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 27, 2014, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dillard and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

A Resolution of Appreciation was presented to Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction. Board members thanked Dr. Wright for her service to the Board and Department of Education.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Dr. Sue Flanagan, represented Virginia Association of Science Teachers, thanked Dr. Wright for her service
- Kristian Havard, represented Virginia Hospitality and Travel Association, spoke about Pre Labor Day waivers and thanked Dr. Wright for her service

- George McVey, represented Virginia Council for Private Education, thanked Dr. Wright for her service

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

With the Board's approval on the consent agenda, the Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the Literary Fund as of December 31, 2013.

Report on Effective Strategies for the School Improvement Process in Virginia

This item was presented by Dr. Kathleen Smith, director of school improvement. Dr. Smith's presentation included the following:

Years 1-3 of the Academic Review Process

Year 1 of Accredited with Warning or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate Status

- In the fall of the first year of warning, the Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) Office of School Improvement (OSI) hires contractors to complete academic reviews and support schools in developing school improvement plans. Contractors work with multiple schools during the year as a part of the academic review process.
- Technical assistance from the VDOE follows in the spring based on differentiated need. This could include assistance in aligning curriculum in mathematics, English or other content areas as well as assistance with reviewing and using data to evaluate programs and strategies.
- Data are reviewed by VDOE quarterly in meetings with the academic review contractors. Reports, including the academic review findings, are analyzed and progress reports are reviewed monthly.

Year 2 of Accredited with Warning or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate Status

- In the Second year of warning, a contractor is assigned to the school, and VDOE Office of School Improvement staff members assist and monitor the school. The contractor and OSI staff members review the school improvement plan and data provided by the school to determine what is working and what needs to be changed.
- The VDOE team meets with the school team, and the plan is revised to include new strategies and assistance from the VDOE Office of School Improvement and other VDOE offices are deployed. This includes school visits, Web conferences, professional development, monthly data tracking, monthly analysis of reports from the contractors, and quarterly reviews of the school's improvement plan with the local academic review team.
- Programs of intervention the school has purchased, such as reading programs, are monitored by VDOE through a VDOE electronic data system.

Year 3 of Accredited with warning or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate and Conditionally Accredited Status

- The technical assistance provided and the school's improvement plans are monitored monthly by the VDOE Office of School Improvement and the contractor for fidelity of implementation.

- Programs of intervention the school has purchased, such as reading programs, are monitored by VDOE through a VDOE electronic data system.

Denied Accreditation

- In the fall of Year 4, the Virginia Board of Education and local school board develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) based on the needs of the school.
- Emphasis is placed on the division support provided to the school. If the school is also a Priority school, emphasis is placed on the role of the external Lead Turnaround Partner.
- The schools and division are assigned a VDOE Office of School Improvement contractor to monitor the implementation of the MOU and to provide technical assistance to the division and the Lead Turnaround Partner, if a Priority school.
- The schools and division are assigned 2.5 full-time VDOE Office of School Improvement staff members who provide intensive technical assistance throughout the year.

Six Lessons Learned

1. Effective teachers and principal leaders matter most in the lowest-performing schools to raise student achievement. In low-performing schools, the goal is to increase the critical mass of effective teachers and leaders to a point where student achievement begins a steep trajectory upward.
2. In most schools being *Accredited with Warning* is enough to move the school to full accreditation in one to two years.
3. Schools that are unable to meet the bar in two to three years are uniquely different from each other, and technical assistance strategies must be differentiated to meet those needs. Assistance also must include building capacity to sustain improvement.
4. “On-the-ground” support almost daily from experienced turnaround leaders and a laser focus on implementing the turnaround plans with fidelity from the school board or principal are necessary conditions to raise student achievement in the lowest-performing schools.
5. Lead Turnaround Partners (LTPs) bring expertise to the table, but expertise without “on-the-ground” support almost daily from the LTPs in the first two years does not affect the change needed to raise student achievement. There must also be cooperation from the governing body or principal to support the recommendations of the LTP to move the school forward.
6. Without state authority to make decisions about the selection and evaluation of school leadership and instructional personnel, curricula and instructional programs, time, and resources, state assistance becomes advisory. Current state statute limits what the Commonwealth can require of local school boards, especially in areas dealing with personnel—the key factor to student achievement.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich thanked Dr. Smith for her report, and asked about next steps for principals completing the National Institute of School Leadership (NISL) program. Dr. Smith noted this as a lesson learned – school divisions need to create their own pool of leaders within the division to serve at low-performing schools. Dr. Smith said the NISL program cost \$15,000 per principal and the cost drops to \$5,000 per principal when school divisions build their own pool of leaders within their school division. Dr. Wright noted NISL will only come into a state if the state school chief officer embraces and co-endorses the program. Dr. Wright said this is a state-

sponsored program, but the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) does not administer the program. The Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership (VFEL) trained ten principals as certified trainers. Dr. Wright noted her hope that the program grows and becomes the premier executive development program for principals in the Commonwealth.

- Mrs. Atkinson thanked Dr. Smith for her report and noted that the lessons learned will be beneficial for the Board.
- Dr. Cannaday said Dr. Smith had done an excellent job sharing what is a comprehensive approach in helping schools build internal capacity so it can be sustained.

The Board received the report on effective strategies for the school improvement process in Virginia.

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Martinsville City Public Schools

This item was presented by Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications. Mrs. Pamela Heath, superintendent, represented Martinsville City Public Schools. Mrs. Westcott's presentation included the following:

- Section 22.1-79.1 of the *Code of Virginia* prohibits local school boards from adopting school calendars that require schools to open prior to Labor Day unless a waiver is granted by the Board for "good cause." The conditions under which the Board may grant such waivers are outlined in the *Code*. The provision that permits the Board to approve a waiver for an experimental or innovative program may be found in § 22.1-79.1 as follows:

§ 22.1-79.1. Opening of the school year; approvals for certain alternative schedules.

- A. Each local school board shall set the school calendar so that the first day students are required to attend school shall be after Labor Day. The Board of Education may waive this requirement based on a school board certifying that it meets one of the good cause requirements of subsection B.
- B. For purposes of this section, "good cause" means:
1. A school division has been closed an average of eight days per year during any five of the last 10 years because of severe weather conditions, energy shortages, power failures, or other emergency situations;
 2. A school division is providing, in the school year for which the waiver is sought, an instructional program or programs in one or more of its elementary or middle or high schools, excluding Virtual Virginia, which are dependent on and provided in one or more elementary or middle or high schools of another school division that qualifies for such waiver. However, any waiver granted by the Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision shall only apply to the opening date for those schools where such dependent programs are provided;
 3. A school division is providing its students, in the school year for which the waiver is sought, with an experimental or innovative program which requires an earlier opening date than that established in subsection A of this section and which has been approved by the Department of Education pursuant to the regulations of the Board of Education establishing standards for accrediting public schools. However, any waiver or extension of the school year granted by the Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision or its standards for accrediting public schools for such an experimental or innovative program shall only apply to the opening date for those schools where such experimental or innovative programs are offered generally to the student body of the school. For the purposes of this subdivision, experimental or innovative programs shall include

instructional programs that are offered on a year-round basis by the school division in one or more of its elementary or middle or high schools; or

4. A school division is entirely surrounded by a school division that has an opening date prior to Labor Day in the school year for which the waiver is sought. Such school division may open schools on the same opening date as the surrounding school division....

- For the 2013-2014 school year, 57 school divisions have a waiver for weather-related reasons, six have dependent programs, ten are entirely surrounded by a school division that has an opening date prior to Labor Day, three school divisions have one or more schools with waivers because they are year-round schools, and two school divisions have waivers for innovative or experimental programs that are not year-round schools. Martinsville Public Schools has had a waiver for several years because it is entirely surrounded by Henry County, which has a weather-related waiver.
- The 2012 General Assembly added language in the Appropriation Act to maintain current waivers, and the 2013 General Assembly extended the waiver through the 2013-2014 school year. The 2014-2016 Budget Bill – which has not yet been approved by the General Assembly – would extend the waiver for two additional years. The language says:

To provide additional flexibility, notwithstanding the provisions of § 22.1-79.1 of the Code of Virginia, any school division that was granted a waiver regarding the opening date of the school year for the 2011-12 school year under the good cause requirements shall continue to be granted a waiver for the 2014-15 school year and the 2015-16 school year.

- If the General Assembly approves the budget with this language, Martinsville Public Schools will be able to open school before Labor Day for the next two years. It is also eligible because it is entirely surrounded by Henry County, which currently has a weather-related waiver.
- The Martinsville City School Board is requesting approval of an innovative program for Clearview Early Childhood Center, Albert Harris Elementary School, Patrick Henry Elementary School, Martinsville Middle School, and Martinsville High School. Approval of this request would permit all of these schools to open prior to Labor Day. In order to provide the maximum educational benefit for students, it is important that all of these schools operate on the same calendar.
- Martinsville City Public Schools (MCPS) is a small, rural school division consisting of Martinsville High School (9-12), Martinsville Middle School (6-8), Patrick Henry Elementary School (K-5), Albert Harris Elementary School (K-5), and Clearview Early Childhood Center (PK). The most recent data shows Martinsville as having 27% of its residents living in poverty. The median household income for Martinsville is \$29,701. Of the 2,286 children enrolled in MCPS, 75% or 1,715 receive free or reduced meal prices. As to residents living in poverty, Martinsville ranks 130 (the fifth highest) out of 134 localities in Virginia.
- Since May 2007, Martinsville City has led the state in unemployment for all but two months. As of November 2013, Martinsville had an unemployment rate of 13.7% as compared to the state rate of 5%. The two largest industries are services (education, healthcare, etc.) at 44.7% and manufacturing at 22.4%. Due to loss of furniture and textile manufacturing, Martinsville suffered an economic crisis from which it is slowly recovering. The Martinsville-Henry County Economic Development Corporation (EDC) has worked to create new jobs and opportunities and support and develop local industries. However, that is just one piece of the focus for this organization. Because the area was previously supported by the many manufacturing jobs in the area, college attendance was not part of the culture for many families in the area.
- Starting in April 2012, MCPS leaders began working collaboratively with leaders from the Harvest Foundation, Patrick Henry Community College, New College Institute, Henry County Public Schools, and the EDC. Through the committee's work, it has been determined that there are growing demands in the areas of advanced manufacturing (engineering), information technology, and health care. To address these needs, these organizations have collaborated to develop the MHC-STEM Pipeline Initiative.

- The MHC-STEM Pipeline Initiative is an innovative program with research-based, positive student outcomes at each program level that will have short-term and long-term positive economics for the community. For Clearview Early Childhood Center, the anticipated outcome is an increase in the students' number sense upon entering kindergarten. With the free and reduced lunch rate at Clearview at 96 percent, Albert Harris Elementary at 96 percent, and Patrick Henry Elementary at 64 percent, the mathematics achievement gap as related to socioeconomic status is of particular concern. For Albert Harris Elementary and Patrick Henry Elementary Schools, the expected outcomes are the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills while strengthening mathematics and science skills through application in STEM inquiry-based/project-based learning, improved student performance on SOL math and science assessments, increased student knowledge and interest in STEM disciplines, and increased parent and student awareness of postsecondary education opportunities. For Martinsville Middle School, the expected outcomes are to continue developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills as well as communication and collaboration skills. In terms of student performance, the outcomes are to improve student performance on the SOL mathematics assessments as well as increase the number of students receiving verified credits in Algebra I and geometry in middle school. Expected outcomes for high school students include those related to increasing the number of students earning Associates' Degrees while in high school, developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills as well as communication and collaboration skills, improving student performance on SOL mathematics and science assessments, and increasing the number of students receiving credits in Algebra II.
- Currently 54% of MCPS graduates plan to attend four-year colleges and 18% plan to attend two-year programs. One of the program goals is to facilitate an increase in both categories.
- Opening prior to Labor Day in order to align with college schedules is essential in maintaining dual enrollment course offerings and STEM Pipeline activities at all levels of schooling. Through collaboration with Patrick Henry Community College, the New Community College, and Virginia State University, Martinsville Public Schools reports that it has a very successful dual enrollment program. In its application, it also indicated that it is important that the academic year closely align with the colleges and Henry County academic year schedules since the dual enrollment programs involve sharing of faculty and on-site courses from Patrick Henry Community College, the New Community College, and Virginia State University. A Pre-Labor Day opening allows fall SOL testing which eliminates the need for remediation and review after an extended break. In addition, with limited funding and resources, many of the families benefit economically from the dual enrollment option. At the middle and elementary school levels, the alignment of schedules is also crucial for continuation of the initiative. Starting after Labor Day would cause one quarter of the school division's middle school students to be denied equal access to the expanded K-8 Science, Engineering, and Math Aerospace Academy in partnership with Virginia State University due to the nine-week rotation schedule of the middle school exploratory wheel. It would also push the end of the school year into June and limit the access to college facilities and faculty, as well as limit summer programs.
- For the innovative PK-12 robotics program and the grades 4-12 FIRST Robotics Competition (FRC), a start date prior to Labor Day is essential. The start date for competition season preparation which is set by the international FIRST organization is in August with competitions in November. It is during this time that students learn the skills of critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and collaboration. Starting after Labor Day limits the amount of instructional time students will spend developing these skills. As the mathematics performance data is showing that this program has a positive impact on student performance in mathematics, all students should have access to this curriculum.

Mrs. Heath and Dr. Coray Davis, School of Engineering, Science and Technology, Virginia State University (VSU), presented an overview of the request for an innovative program opening prior to Labor Day from Martinsville City Public Schools

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich noted the specificity of the *Code* regarding Pre-Labor Day opening. Mr. Braunlich asked for more information about the middle school exploratory program and its dependence on opening prior to Labor Day. Mrs. Heath noted that if the program does not begin prior to Labor Day the students in the last nine-week cohort would not have access to the VCU faculty. She also noted the importance of opening prior to Labor Day for the robotics program. She indicated that by not opening prior to Labor Day, some students will be denied opportunities that all students should have access to.
- Mr. Braunlich further asked about the partnership with VSU. Dr. Davis noted the integral connection between Martinsville public schools and VSU in terms of exposure and academic opportunities. He noted there are four VSU personnel involved in the program currently, and the program is growing. Dr. Davis noted the importance of consistency in the program.
- Mr. Braunlich asked about the robotics program at the elementary level. Mrs. Heath noted that all grades and all students are involved. She noted the importance of sustaining the programs throughout k-12.
- Dr. Baysal noted the importance of science and mathematics instruction and programs in early grade levels. He indicated his support for the waiver request.
- Dr. Cannaday said he believes Martinsville has made the case that it is innovative for elementary and middle school because the college career pathway should start before students are exposed to careers.
- Mr. Ko thanked Mrs. Heath for her presentation. He noted that Mrs. Heath indicated students could not compete with other school divisions due to the lack of income and access to the Internet.
- Mrs. Edwards thanked Mrs. Heath for her leadership and innovation. Mrs. Edwards noted that Mrs. Heath made the case for an innovative program to include elementary and middle school students.
- Mrs. Wodiska said Mrs. Heath has done an exceptional job in presenting the case for opening before Labor Day as the program is innovative and requires a pre-Labor Day opening.
- Mrs. Sears thanked Mrs. Heath for her presentation. Mrs. Sears said Mrs. Heath's March presentation made the case of the high school, and her presentation in April made the case for the middle school. Mrs. Sears asked Dr. Wright to give her opinion on this issue. Dr. Wright noted the high school request meets the criteria, and Mrs. Heath's presentation got closer to making the case for the middle school. Dr. Wright said her recommendation stands.
- Mr. Braunlich said he thought the case of opening prior to Labor Day was made for the middle school but not the elementary school.

The Board made the following motions:

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve Martinsville Public Schools' request for its high school to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sears. The motion

passed with eight “yes” votes. Mrs. Atkinson abstained from voting.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve Martinsville Public Schools’ request for its middle school to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sears. The motion passed with eight “yes” votes. Mrs. Atkinson abstained from voting.

Dr. Cannaday made a motion to approve Martinsville Public Schools’ request for its elementary school to begin school prior to Labor Day. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska. The motion was passed with six “yes” votes and two “no” votes. Mrs. Atkinson abstained from voting.

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Pittsylvania County Public Schools STEM Academy and Academy for Engineering and Technology (AET)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda. The Board did not take action on this item.

Final Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Danville City Public Schools Academy for Engineering and Technology (AET)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda. The Board did not take action on this item.

First Review of Corrective Action Plan Required by the Division-Level Review for Franklin City Public Schools

This item was presented by Dr. Kathleen Smith, director of school improvement. Her presentation included the following:

- The Standards of Quality (SOQ) require local school boards to maintain Fully Accredited schools and to take corrective actions for schools that are not *Fully Accredited*. Further, when the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) has obtained evidence through the academic review that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the SOQ, the VBOE may require a division-level academic review.

§ [22.1-253.13:3](#). Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation.

...Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards of accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education. Each local school board shall review the accreditation status of all schools in the local school division annually in public session. Within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit corrective action plans for any schools within its school division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the Board....

...When the Board of Education has obtained evidence through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division level failure to implement the Standards of Quality, the Board may require a division level academic review. After the conduct of such review and within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit for approval by the Board a corrective action plan, consistent with criteria established by the Board and setting forth specific actions and a schedule designed to ensure that schools within its school division achieve full accreditation status. Such corrective action plans shall be part of the relevant school division’s comprehensive plan pursuant to § [22.1-253.13:6](#)....

- All three schools in Franklin City Public Schools have been *Accredited with Warning* for two consecutive years, and have federal sanctions due to not meeting the federal annual measurable objectives (AMOs). The school academic review process conducted in the 2012-2013 school year revealed evidence that the failure of the schools within the division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the SOQ, consistent with Section 22.1.-253.13:3 of the SOQ.
- On October 24, 2013, the VBOE placed Franklin City Public Schools in division-level academic review status and authorized the Department of Education to begin the review process. The division-level review process was conducted December 1-5, 2013.
- On March 27, 2014, the Virginia Board of Education approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Franklin City School Board and the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU, subject to annual review and revisions by the Board of Education, will be in place until all Franklin City Public Schools are Fully Accredited.
- As required by the Standards of Quality, the Franklin City School Board and the central office staff must include four key priorities in the corrective action plan and implement certain essential actions related to the findings of the division-level review process to improve student achievement:
 1. Curricula Alignment
 2. Human Resource Management and Quality of Leadership, Teachers and Support
 3. Purpose and Direction
 4. Leadership and Governance
- The comprehensive nature of the essential actions and findings from the division-level review will require the local board to focus its work on a few immediate priorities while making plans to implement actions that are more systemic over a longer period of time with input from the community.
- Immediate Priority Actions:

The corrective action plan will include timelines that place immediate priority on essential actions that will have a direct impact on student achievement:

 1. Curricula alignment
 2. Quality of leadership, teachers and support
- Systemic Planning Actions:

At the same time, the Franklin City School Board and the Division Superintendent must begin working on systemic governance and strategic planning issues cited in the review:

 1. Purpose and direction
 2. Governance and leadership
- The MOU requires essential actions categorized by immediate priority or systemic action over a longer period of time.
- The corrective action plan submitted by the Franklin City School Board makes reference to all essential actions noted in the MOU and indicates whether the essential action requires immediate priority or systemic action over a longer period of time. In addition, the department has provided proposed amendments to the corrective action plan as shown in the attachment.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich said the Board would like to hold a public hearing in Franklin to hear feedback from community members on the corrective action plan before it takes action.

- Mrs. Atkinson asked that the following issues in the corrective action plan be enhanced: leadership development, lead turnaround partner, and parent engagement.
- Dr. Cannaday said the superintendent should be the school board's chief development officer.
- Mrs. Sears asked if students had been given an opportunity to express their feelings about the turnaround leaders coming to Franklin City. Mrs. Sears said her other concern was related to evidence of academic progress.
- Dr. Smith suggested inviting the student council to speak at the public hearing. Mr. Braunlich agreed and said the notice would include parents, students, teachers, staff, citizens, and the business community.
- Mrs. Wodiska thanked Franklin City for attending the meeting and noted her concern for the community's schools. Mrs. Wodiska said the Board wants to see improvement in student performance, more support for teachers, and a change in how the school board conducts its business.
- Mr. Dillard discussed the historical impact of the homeschool law. He noted more parents are taking religious exemption which limits local school boards' impact on what students are taught.

The Board accepted for first review the Franklin City School Board's corrective action plan with amendments proposed by the Department of Education.

First Review of Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day (Year-Round School) from Loudoun County Public Schools Middleburg Community Charter School

Mrs. Anne Wescott presented this item. Representatives from Loudoun County Public schools included the following: Dr. Edgar Hatrick, superintendent; Jill Turgeon, vice chair of the school board; David Quanbeck, charter school applicant; and Miriam Delgard, principal of the charter school. Mrs. Westcott's presentation included the following:

- Section 22.1-79.1 of the *Code of Virginia* prohibits local school boards from adopting school calendars that require schools to open prior to Labor Day unless a waiver is granted by the Board for "good cause." The conditions under which the Board may grant such waivers are outlined in the *Code*. The provision that permits the Board to approve a waiver for an experimental or innovative program may be found in § 22.1-79.1 as follows:

§ 22.1-79.1. Opening of the school year; approvals for certain alternative schedules.

- A. Each local school board shall set the school calendar so that the first day students are required to attend school shall be after Labor Day. The Board of Education may waive this requirement based on a school board certifying that it meets one of the good cause requirements of subsection B.
- B. For purposes of this section, "good cause" means:
 5. A school division has been closed an average of eight days per year during any five of the last 10 years because of severe weather conditions, energy shortages, power failures, or other emergency situations;
 6. A school division is providing, in the school year for which the waiver is sought, an instructional program or programs in one or more of its elementary or middle or high schools, excluding Virtual Virginia, which are dependent on and provided in one or more elementary or middle or high schools of another school division

that qualifies for such waiver. However, any waiver granted by the Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision shall only apply to the opening date for those schools where such dependent programs are provided;

7. A school division is providing its students, in the school year for which the waiver is sought, with an experimental or innovative program which requires an earlier opening date than that established in subsection A of this section and which has been approved by the Department of Education pursuant to the regulations of the Board of Education establishing standards for accrediting public schools. However, any waiver or extension of the school year granted by the Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision or its standards for accrediting public schools for such an experimental or innovative program shall only apply to the opening date for those schools where such experimental or innovative programs are offered generally to the student body of the school. For the purposes of this subdivision, experimental or innovative programs shall include instructional programs that are offered on a year-round basis by the school division in one or more of its elementary or middle or high schools; or
8. A school division is entirely surrounded by a school division that has an opening date prior to Labor Day in the school year for which the waiver is sought. Such school division may open schools on the same opening date as the surrounding school division....

- Loudoun County Public Schools (LCPS) seeks a waiver request to implement an innovative year-round program at one elementary school, Middleburg Community Charter School. The school system conditionally approved the charter for this elementary school pending negotiation of a charter school contract and lease, on March 4, 2014. At the same meeting, the LCPS School Board approved submission of a waiver request to the Board of Education for a Pre-Labor Day opening so the new charter school could operate a year-round calendar.

Stated benefits of the year-round approach and need for a Pre-Labor Day opening

- Through the year-round approach, the Middleburg Community Charter will offer quarterly thematic units with a multi-age/grade interdisciplinary structure to connect learning across disciplines.
- Loudoun County Public Schools indicates that the year-round calendar with planned intersessions necessitates a pre-Labor Day opening. The timing and placement of the intersessions is designed to increase learning time for students, offering continuous learning throughout the year, prevent learning loss and increase professional learning for the instructional staff. The school will begin August 4, 2014, have two-week intersessions in October and March, and end on June 16, 2015. This compresses the school's summer break to six weeks, which is consistent with the charter school's goal to shorten summer learning loss and provide continuous learning throughout the year.
- The innovative year-round program will reflect a goal of full accreditation with Annual Measurable Outcomes that meet or exceed state and federal requirements. Teachers will receive professional learning time during early release days and use a block planning time for weekly professional learning communities focused on student achievement and professional growth.

The Board discussion included:

- Mr. Braunlich said Loudoun County was the first charter school to ask for a waiver from the Board and the first to be approved by the local school division without having to come before the Board for its review process.
- Mr. Ko thanked Loudoun County for the innovative program and noted the excitement it has caused in the community.
- Mr. Dillard asked how many additional school days are included in the program. Mrs. Wescott said there are twenty additional school days including the intersessions.

Mr. Dillard made a motion to waive first review and approve the request from Loudoun County Public Schools for an innovative program, pursuant to the provisions of §.22.1-79.1 of the *Code of Virginia*. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried with eight "yes" votes.

Mrs. Atkinson abstained from voting.

First Review of Revisions to Industry, Professional, or Trade Association Certification Examinations and Occupational Competency Assessments to Meet the Requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the Student-Selected Verified Credit

This item was presented by Mrs. Lolita Hall, director for career and technical education. Her presentation included the following:

- The *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, requirements for graduation 8 VAC 20-131-50.K.3, provide students who demonstrate academic excellence and/or outstanding achievement the opportunity to earn the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education Seal.

8 VAC 20-131-50.K.3 – “The Board of Education’s Career and Technical Education Seal will be awarded to students who earn a Standard Diploma or Advanced Studies Diploma and complete a prescribed sequence of courses in a career and technical education concentration or specialization that they choose and maintain a “B” or better average in those courses; or (i) pass an examination or occupational competency assessment in a career and technical education concentration or specialization that confers certification or an occupational competency credential from a recognized industry, trade or professional association or (ii) acquire a professional license in that career and technical education field from the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Board of Education shall approve all professional licenses and examinations used to satisfy these requirements.”

- The *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, requirements for graduation 8 VAC 20-131-50.K.4, provide students who demonstrate academic excellence and/or outstanding achievement the opportunity to earn the Board of Education’s Seal of Advanced Mathematics and Technology.

8 VAC 20-131-50.K.4 – “The Board of Education’s Seal of Advanced Mathematics and Technology will be awarded to students who earn either a Standard Diploma or Advanced Studies Diploma and (i) satisfy all of the mathematics requirements for the Advanced Studies Diploma (four units of credit including Algebra II; two verified units of credit) with a “B” average or better, and (ii) either (a) pass an examination in a career and technical education field that confers certification from a recognized industry, or trade or professional association, (b) acquire a professional license in a career and technical education field from the Commonwealth of Virginia, or (c) pass an examination approved by the board that confers college-level credit in a technology or computer science area. The Board of Education shall approve all professional licenses and examinations used to satisfy these requirements.”

The *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* make the following provisions relative to students earning verified units of credit:

8 VAC 20-131-110.C Standard and verified units of credit
“The Board may from time to time approve additional tests for the purpose of awarding verified credit. Such additional tests, which enable students to earn verified units of credit, must, at a minimum, meet the following criteria:

1. The test must be standardized and graded independently of the school or school division in which the test is given;
2. The test must be knowledge-based;
3. The test must be administered on a multi-state or international basis, or administered as part of another state’s accountability assessment program; and
4. To be counted in a specific academic area, the test must measure content that incorporates or exceeds the SOL content in the course for which verified credit is given.”

5 A student may utilize additional tests for earning verified credit in computer science, technology, career and technical education, economics, or other areas as prescribed by the board in 8VAC 20-131- 110.

6 Students who complete a career and technical education program sequence and pass an examination or occupational competency assessment in a career and technical education field that confers certification or an occupational competency credential from a recognized industry, or trade or professional association or acquires a professional license in a career and technical education field from the Commonwealth of Virginia may substitute the certification, competency credential, or license for (i) the student selected verified credit and (ii) either a science or history and social science verified credit when the certification, license, or credential confers more than one verified credit. The examination or occupational competency assessment must be approved by the Board of Education as an additional test to verify student achievement.”

- The list of 295 industry, professional, trade association certification examinations, or occupational competency assessments meets the Board's requirements as noted in 8 VAC 20-131-50.I.3, 8 VAC 20-131-50.I.4, 8 VAC 20-131-110, and 8 VAC 20-131-50.B.4 (Footnotes 5 and 6 and C., Footnote 5) for the Career and Technical Education Seal, the Seal of Advanced Mathematics and Technology, and student-selected verified credit.
- Included in the list are 18 additional industry certification examinations and occupational competency assessments (shown in bold print) that have been identified as meeting criteria to satisfy requirements for the Career and Technical Education Seal, the Seal of Advanced Mathematics and Technology, and student-selected verified credit.
- Industry, professional, and trade association certifications are continually being revised or discontinued to stay current with technology and new techniques. These changes may be such that individual certifications are no longer available, no longer meet the Board of Education's criteria for diploma seals or student-selected verified credit, or require additional criteria such as work experience beyond high school. Technical changes have been made to the credential name of three certifications that were previously approved by the Board. In addition, three certification examinations are recommended for deletion from the Board-approved list.

Mr. Braunlich noted that the Board's vote is only related to technical changes, additions to and deletions from the list. All other industry certifications currently in place are not being voted on as part of this agenda.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to waive first review and approve the following technical changes and additions to and deletions from the list of industry certification examinations, occupational competency assessments, and licenses to meet the requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the student-selected verified credit; and to authorize staff to make minor technical edits to the previously board-approved list. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

The technical changes are as follows:

Business and Information Technology

1. ~~IC3 Certification~~ – Internet and Computing Core (IC³) Global Standard (GS) 4 Certification Examination (Certiport)

Trade and Industrial Education

2. ~~Diesel Engine Mechanics Assessment~~ – Diesel Technology Assessment (NOCTI)
3. ~~Electrical Construction Assessment~~ – Electrical Construction Technology Assessment (NOCTI)

The additions are as follows:

Agricultural Education

1. Briggs & Stratton Master Service Technician Program Examination (Briggs & Stratton Corporation)
2. Equine Science Examination – New York State Department of Education (Cornell University)

Business and Information Technology

3. Security + Certification Examination (CompTIA)

Career and Technical Education Across-the-Board Credentials

4. College and Work Readiness Assessment (CWRA+) – (Council for Aid to Education)

Family and Consumer Sciences Education

5. Food Science Fundamentals Examination (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences – AAFCS)
6. Housing and Furnishings Examination (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences – AAFCS)
7. Retail Commercial Baking Assessment (National Occupational Competency Testing Institute- NOCTI)
8. Praxis, Part I Examination (Educational Testing Service)

Health and Medical Sciences Education

9. Certified Surgical Technologist Examination (CST) – (National Board of Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting – NBSTSA)

Technology Education

10. Energy Industry Fundamentals Certificate Assessment (Center for Energy Workforce Development)
11. Mechanical Drafting and Design Assessment (National Occupational Competency Testing Institute – NOCTI)

Trade and Industrial Education

12. Emergency and Fire Management Services Assessment (National Occupational Competency Testing Institute – NOCTI)
13. Fundamentals of Construction Assessment (National Occupational Competency Testing Institute – NOCTI)
14. Global Logistics Associate Certification Examination (American Society of Transportation & Logistics)

Examination

15. College Level Examination Program (CLEP): Financial Accounting – (The College Board)
16. College Level Examination Program (CLEP): Introductory Business Law – (The College Board)
17. College Level Examination Program (CLEP): Principles of Management – (The College Board)
18. College Level Examination Program (CLEP): Principles of Marketing – (The College Board)

The deletions are as follows:

Health and Medical Sciences Education

1. Certified Operating Room Surgical Technician (CORST) – (National Healthcareer Association)
2. Certified Medical Laboratory Assistant (CMLA) – (National Healthcareer Association)

Trade and Industrial Education

3. General Drafting and Design Assessment (National Occupational Competency Testing Institute – NOCTI)

First Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for Passing Scores for the Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003) of the Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Test

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

- Section 22.1-298.1. *Regulations governing licensure of the Code of Virginia* require that the Board of Education’s regulations “shall include requirements that a person seeking initial licensure: 1. Complete professional assessments as prescribed by the Board of Education;...”
- Currently, the Virginia Board of Education requires the following licensure assessments:
 - ✓ Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA)
 - ✓ Praxis II: Specialty Area Tests
 - ✓ Reading for Virginia Educators (RVE)
 - ✓ School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)
- The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) tests as a professional teacher’s assessment requirement for initial licensure in Virginia. The Praxis II assessment currently required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Early/Primary Education PreK-3 or Elementary

Education PreK-6 is the Praxis Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014/5014) test.

- The Educational Testing Service (ETS) developed a new Praxis Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (5031) test. This assessment, unlike the Praxis Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014/5014) assessment, requires a passing score for each of the four subtests. Standard-setting studies were conducted and presented to the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure.
- At the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, on June 27, 2013, the Virginia Board of Education adopted the following passing scores and implementation date for the Praxis Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (5031) test required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in early/primary education or elementary education. This action strengthened content requirements for the initial licensure of elementary teachers.

Praxis Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (5031) Test		
Subtest Name	Pass Score	Implementation Date
Reading and Language Arts (5032)	165 scaled score (46 raw-score points)	July 1, 2014
Mathematics (5033)	164 scaled score (28 raw-score points)	
Social Studies (5034)	155 scaled score (35 raw-score points)	
Science (5035)	159 scaled score (33 raw-score points)	

- In December 2013, ETS contacted the Virginia Department of Education to request participation in multistate standard-setting studies on February 3-4, 2014, for the Reading and Language Arts Subtest and the Mathematics Subtest of the Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (5031) test because these subtests had been revised. The Department was unaware that the subtests had been revised and new standard-setting studies would be required. Please note that the number of the Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects test will change from 5031 to 5001 to reflect that the two subtests have been revised.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction communicated by letter and in a meeting with ETS officials her dissatisfaction with the lack of communication regarding the revisions in the subtests. ETS apologized and promised to work with Virginia to phase in the new subtests.
- A multistate standard-setting study was conducted by ETS in February 2014 for the revised Praxis II Reading and Language Arts (5002) and Mathematics (5003) subtests. Participants from 20 states served on the multistate study panel. Virginia was represented by three Virginia educators who were nominated by Virginia educational agencies. A detailed summary of the study, *Multistate Standard-Setting Technical Report – Praxis II Elementary Education: Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003)* is attached (Appendix A) and includes participants, methodology, and recommendations. The purposes of the study were to (a) recommend the minimum passing score for the Praxis II Elementary Education: Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003) and (b) confirm the importance of the Praxis content specifications for entry-level elementary school teachers. To pass the Praxis II Elementary Education: Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003), a candidate must meet or exceed the passing scores established by the Virginia Board of Education.
- The Praxis *Test at a Glance* documents for the Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003) are attached (Appendix B) and describe the purpose and structure of the assessments. In brief, the purpose of the subtests is to assess whether the entry-level elementary school teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice. A National Advisory Committee of elementary teachers and college faculty defined the content of the assessments, and national surveys of teachers and college faculty confirmed the content.
- The Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) contains 80 selected-response items covering two content areas: Reading (approximately 38 items) and Writing, Speaking, and Listening (approximately 42 items). The reporting scale for the Reading and Language Arts (5002) subtest ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

- The Mathematics Subtest (5003) contains 50 selected-response and numeric entry items covering three content areas: Numbers and Operations (approximately 20 items), Algebraic Thinking (approximately 15 items), and Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability (approximately 15 items). The reporting scale for the Mathematics (5003) subtest ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

Multistate Standard-Setting Study

Reading and Language Arts: The multistate panel recommended a passing score of 42 out of a possible 65 raw-score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 42 is 157 on a 100 to 200 scale.

Mathematics: The multistate panel recommended a passing score of 26 out of a possible 40 raw-score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 26 is 157 on a 100 to 200 scale.

- The multistate standard-setting study provides the estimated conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM). The CSEM is a statistical phenomenon and is unrelated to the accuracy of scoring. All test results are subject to the standard error of measurement. If a test taker were to take the same test repeatedly, with no change in his level of knowledge and preparation, it is possible that some of the resulting scores would be slightly higher or slightly lower than the scores that precisely reflects the test taker’s actual level of knowledge or ability. The difference between a test taker’s actual score and his highest or lowest hypothetical score is known as the standard error of measurement.
- The CSEM for the recommended passing scores for multistate standard-setting study are shown below. Note that consistent with the recommended passing score, the passing scores at the different CSEMs have been rounded to the next highest number, and the rounded values are converted to scaled scores.

Conditional Standard Error of Measurement Summaries

Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002)

Passing Scores Within 1 and 2 CSEMs of the Recommended Passing Score – Multistate Panel

Recommended passing score (CSEM)		Scale score equivalent
	42 (3.89)	157
- 2 CSEMs	35	141
-1 CSEM	39	150
+1 CSEM	46	165
+ 2 CSEMs	50	174

Mathematics Subtest (5003)

Passing Scores within 1 and 2 CSEMs of the Recommended Passing Score – Multistate Panel

Recommended passing score (CSEM)		Scale score equivalent
	26 (3.06)	157
- 2 CSEMs	20	136
-1 CSEM	23	146
+1 CSEM	30	171
+ 2 CSEMs	33	182

- At the March 24, 2014, meeting the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure recommended that the Virginia Board of Education:

- (1) approve the following subtests and passing scaled scores for the Praxis II Elementary Education Multiple Subjects (5001) test effective July 1, 2015, for individuals seeking an initial license with an early/primary education or elementary endorsement:
 - ✓ Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) – 157 scaled score
 - ✓ Mathematics Subtest (5003) – 157 scaled score
- (2) accept the following scores for the Praxis II Elementary Education Multiple Subjects (5001) test for candidates who take and pass the subtests prior to July 1, 2015 (i.e., allow early implementation of newly-revised subtests):
 - ✓ Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) – 157 scaled score
 - ✓ Mathematics Subtest (5003) – 157 scaled score

The Board accepted for first review the Advisory Board of Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation that the Virginia Board of Education approve the following passing scores for the revised Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) and Mathematics Subtest (5003) for the Praxis Elementary Education Multiple Subjects (5001) test to become effective July 1, 2015, and accept candidates' passing scores for these subtests taken prior to July 1, 2015.

- Reading and Language Arts Subtest (5002) – 157 scaled score
- Mathematics Subtest (5003) – 157 scaled score

First Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) for a Passing Score for the Praxis II Middle School Science Test (5440)

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

- Section 22.1-298.1. *Regulations governing licensure of the Code of Virginia* require that the Board of Education's regulations "shall include requirements that a person seeking initial licensure: 1. Complete professional assessments as prescribed by the Board of Education;...."
- Currently, the Virginia Board of Education requires the following licensure assessments:
 - Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA)
 - ✓ Praxis II: Specialty Area Tests
 - ✓ Reading for Virginia Educators (RVE)
 - ✓ School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)
- The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) tests as a professional teacher's assessment requirement for initial licensure in Virginia. The Praxis II test currently required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Middle Education 6-8: Science is the Praxis II Middle School Science (0439) test.
- The Educational Testing Service (ETS) that administers the Praxis II has developed the revised Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test. The purpose of the test is to assess whether the entry-level middle school science teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice. Test preparation resources and materials, including study guides and practice tests, are available on the [ETS Test Preparation Web site](#).

- A multistate standard-setting study was conducted by ETS in February 2014 for the Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test. Participants from 20 states and Guam served on the multistate study panel. Virginia was represented by two Virginia educators who were nominated by Virginia school divisions. A detailed summary of the study, *Multistate Standard-Setting Technical Report – Praxis II Middle School Science (5440)* is attached (Appendix A) and includes participants, methodology, and recommendations. The purposes of the study were to (a) recommend the minimum passing score for the Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test and (b) confirm the importance of the Praxis content specifications for entry-level middle school science teachers. To pass the Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test, a candidate must meet or exceed the passing score established by the Virginia Board of Education.
- The *Praxis Test at a Glance* document (Appendix B) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the purpose of the test is to assess whether the entry-level middle school science teacher has the content knowledge and skills believed necessary for competent practice. A National Advisory Committee of middle school science teachers and college faculty defined the content of the assessment, and national surveys of teachers and college faculty confirmed the content.
- The Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test contains 125 selected-response items covering six content areas: Scientific Inquiry, Methodology, Techniques, and History (approximately 15 items); Basic Principles of Matter and Energy (approximately 15 items); Physical Sciences (approximately 28 items); Life Sciences (approximately 30 items); Earth and Space Sciences (approximately 22 items); and Science, Technology, and Society (approximately 15 items). The reporting scale for the Praxis II Middle School Science (544) test ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

Multistate Standard-Setting Study

The multistate panel recommended a passing score of 60 out of a possible 100 raw-score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 60 is 150 on a 100 to 200 scale.

The multistate standard-setting study provides the estimated conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM). The CSEM is a statistical phenomenon and is unrelated to the accuracy of scoring. All test results are subject to the standard error of measurement. If a test taker were to take the same test repeatedly, with no change in his level of knowledge and preparation, it is possible that some of the resulting scores would be slightly higher or slightly lower than the scores that precisely reflects the test taker’s actual level of knowledge or ability. The difference between a test taker’s actual score and his highest or lowest hypothetical score is known as the standard error of measurement.

The CSEM for the recommended passing scores for multistate standard-setting study are shown below. Note that consistent with the recommended passing score, the passing scores at the different CSEMs have been rounded to the next highest number, and the rounded values are converted to scaled scores.

Conditional Standard Error of Measurement Summaries Middle School Science (5440)

Passing Scores within 1 and 2 CSEMs of the Recommended Passing Score – Multistate Panel

Recommended passing score (CSEM)	Scale score equivalent
60 (4.92)	150
- 2 CSEMs	51
-1 CSEM	56
+1 CSEM	65
+ 2 CSEMs	70

- At the March 24, 2014, meeting the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure recommended that the Virginia Board of Education approve the passing scaled score recommended by the multistate standard-

setting panel of 150 (60 raw-score points) for the Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test with an implementation date of July 1, 2015.

The Board discussion included:

- Mrs. Sears noted that the majority of states generally accept the ETS recommended cut score, and ABTEL members researching the matter in great detail.

The Board accepted for first review the Advisory Board of Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation that the Virginia Board of Education approve a pass score of 150 (60 raw-score points) for Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test to become effective on July 1, 2015. In addition, allow the acceptance of Virginia approved passing scores for initial licensure for individuals who take the Praxis II Middle School Science (5440) test prior to Virginia's implementation date of July 1, 2015.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, April 23, 2014, at the Commonwealth Park Suites Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mr. Braunlich, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Edwards, Mr. Ko, Mrs. Sears, and Mrs. Wodiska. Dr. Patricia Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction, also attended the meeting. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mrs. Sears 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, under *Virginia Code* § 2.2-3711(A)(7), to consult with counsel and receive legal advice regarding the same, and that Noelle Shaw-Bell, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education, and Wendell Roberts, as well as staff members, Patricia Wright, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, and Richard Schley, participate in this closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 1:05 p.m.

Mrs. Sears made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 2:13 p.m.

Mrs. Sears made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were discussed and (2) only matters identified in the motion to have the closed session were discussed. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mr. Dillard – Yes

Dr. Baysal – Yes

Mrs. Edwards – Yes
Mrs. Sears – Yes
Mr. Braunlich – Yes
Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Mrs. Wodiska – Yes
Mr. Ko – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to revoke the license of Laurie L. Millard. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Demetrius Hakim Muhammed. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to issue a license in Case #3. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sears and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to issue a license in Case #4. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.
- Mrs. Atkinson made a motion not to revoke the license in Case #5. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ko and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Braunlich adjourned the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

President