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

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

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

Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dr. Cannaday called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Dr. Cannaday asked for a moment of silence.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

RESOLUTIONS OF RECOGNITIONS

A Resolution of Recognition for Virginia Education Association’s Award for Teaching Excellence was presented to Carol D. Bauer. Ms. Bauer, a 4th grade teacher at Grafton Bethel Elementary School in York County.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2017, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson. Eight members were in favor of approving the minutes, and one member abstained. The motion to approve the minutes carried. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.
PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during the public comment period:

- Jim Livingston, President of Virginia Education Association, spoke about Ms. Carol Bauer, the Virginia Education Association Award for Teaching Excellence winner.
- Laurie McCullough, spoke on the need for a balance accountability system with SOL tests, measures of growth in literacy and mathematics, and performance assessments.
- Thomas Smith, VASS, complimented the Board of their work, spoke on reducing the number of SOL testing to the federal minimum and looking at the cost to local school divisions when making changes to the Standards of Accreditation.
- Kandise Lucas, advocate, spoke on the challenges advocates face when working with families and local school divisions.
- Zahra Lakhani, parent, spoke on the challenges that children with disabilities face in local school divisions.
- Zaib Lakhani, student, spoke on the many challenges students with disabilities face in local school divisions.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to move Item D, Final Review of Revisions to the List of 2017-2018 Board of Education Approved Industry Certifications, Occupational Competency Assessments, and Professional Licenses from the consent agenda. Out of the abundance of caution, Mrs. Atkinson recused herself from voting on this item due to the possibility that her husband’s firm represented several of the entities listed in the board item. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and carried unanimously. Item D was removed from consent agenda and placed on Action Items.

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson. Eight members were in favor and one member abstained. The motion carried.

A. Final Review of Requests for Renewal of Alternative Accreditation Plans from Albemarle County Public Schools, Town of Colonial Beach Public Schools, Craig County Public Schools, Highland County Public Schools, Richmond City Public Schools, Scott County Public Schools and York County Public Schools for High Schools with a Graduation Cohort of Fifty (50) or Fewer Students

With the Board’s approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved Requests for Renewal of Alternative Accreditation Plans from Albemarle County Public Schools, Town of Colonial Beach Public Schools, Craig County Public Schools, Highland County Public Schools, Richmond City Public Schools, Scott County Public Schools and York County Public Schools for High Schools with a Graduation Cohort of Fifty (50) or Fewer Students.
B. Final Review of Requests for Renewal of Alternative Accreditation Plans from Albemarle County Public Schools, Chesterfield County Public Schools, and Fairfax County Public Schools

With the Board’s approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved Requests for Renewal of Alternative Accreditation Plans from Albemarle County Public Schools, Chesterfield County Public Schools, and Fairfax County Public Schools.

C. Final Review of Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Accredit the Teacher Education Program at Averett University through a Process Approved by the Board of Education

With the Board’s approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Accredit the Teacher Education Program at Averett University through a Process Approved by the Board of Education.

E. Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the School Bus Driver Physical Form (Form EB.001) in the Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation (Exempt Action)

With the Board’s approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved Proposed Revisions to the School Bus Driver Physical Form in the Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation (Exempt Action)

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. Final Review of Revisions to the List of 2017-2018 Board of Education Approved Industry Certifications, Occupational Competency Assessments, and Professional Licenses

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the Revisions to the List of 2017-2018 Board of Education Approved Industry Certifications, Occupational Competency Assessments, and Professional Licenses. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson. Eight members were in favor. Mrs. Atkinson recused herself from the vote. The motion carried.

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

Dr. Cynthia Cave, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications, presented this item to the Board for first review. She reviewed the organization of the Standards of Accreditation, the history of the current comprehensive review of the SOA, and the revisions that were made to Parts I-VII of the SOA. Additionally, Dr. Cave reviewed the revisions to the Part VIII of the SOA related to school accreditation. You can access her presentation online at:
Mrs. Atkinson summarized the discussion from the Tuesday meeting of the Committee on School and Division Accountability when the Board reviewed Parts I-VII.

- Career Exposure and Opportunity – There is a need to align with regional needs.
- Concerns were raised with the one verified credits in English as writing has been identified as extremely important skill by business, community and higher education institutions.
- Concerns were raised that a student could earn a verified credit in History and Social Science without taking a course. Clarification was provided that in order to receive a verified credit, a student must earn a standard unit of credit by taking the course.
- Add language to the introduction of world of work that says “and as responsible citizens.”
- Put emphasis on fine arts and encourage interdisciplinary courses which will reflect the overlap of knowledge in various areas.

Mrs. Atkinson had concerns of what will be put into the portfolio of Academic and Career plan portfolio.

Mrs. Lodal discussed concerns at the middle school level in reference to the career investigation requirement. Her concern is that it will require school divisions to create a separate course. She would like language to be added that clarifies that a separate course is not required.

Dr. Staples informed Board in reference to Mrs. Lodal’s concern that Dr. Constantino, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, and his team convened a group of local school divisions to discuss how to craft potential models and a communications plan for the career investigations requirement. Additional information will be sent to school divisions soon.

Dr. Staples also thanked the Board for their thoughtful discussion during the long review on Part VIII of the SOA at the Wednesday work session/retreat.

Dr. Staples provided a high-level overview from the Wednesday work session on the Standards of Accreditation. He provided a detailed list of action items that the Board would like to see added or clarified in the next draft. The list can be found below:

- Add civic readiness to the College and Career Readiness Index.
- Look at how VDOE measures success in College and Career Readiness for work-based learning experiences. The Board doesn’t want to just measure participation.
- Provide enhanced language that would offer greater flexibility around how VDOE measures growth.
- Adjust the exemplar status to reflect already high achieving, high-poverty schools (i.e. Colorado model).
- Review the WIDA-ACCESS test for ELL students to determine if listening and speaking could determine growth for accreditation.
• Chronic absenteeism – establish criteria for students with severe health issues to ensure that they don’t impact a school’s rating.
• Direct VDOE to look at the capacity of staff to implement tiered levels of support. Consider having the local divisions carry out some of these activities per Board guidelines.
• More clearly articulate the tiered interventions associated with Level 3 schools.
• Confirm alignment between the interventions of state accreditation and ESSA.
• Provide clarity on how schools that have been denied accreditation can receive a status of accredited or accredited with conditions.
• More clearly articulate the list of actions that the Board can take before a school reached the denied level (at the MOU level).

Dr. Wilson had concerns with flexibility with growth measures. She asked does VDOE know to what degree are schools and school divisions ready to move to the use of true growth measure tools (how many school divisions have these tools available to them now). In her second question, she asked how do VDOE and the Board prepare our schools for the changes related to the number of verified credits a student must earn including the potential changes to the writing assessment. Dr. Cannaday responded that the current system does accept reading or writing but that the Board and VDOE will make sure that schools are prepared to help students understand the new graduation requirements.

Board members discussed the role that foundations play in providing additional funding to local school divisions so that they can purchase and utilize various tools to capture certain data sets like growth and teacher effectiveness.

Board members requested to receive another draft of the revisions to the Standards of Accreditation two week before the June Board meeting.

The Board received for first review the Proposed Amendments to the Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, Parts I-VIII (8VAC 20-131)(Proposed Stage).

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

Mrs. Patty Pitts, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item to the Board for first review. The presentation included the following information:

In 2006, the General Assembly approved Section 22.1-298.2 of the Code of Virginia directing the Board of Education to prescribe an assessment of basic skills for individuals seeking entry into Virginia approved teacher education programs. The Praxis I Pre-Professional Skills Test was approved as the prescribed assessment of basic skills for individuals seeking program entry. The Board of Education approved the use
of the SAT and ACT as substitute tests for Praxis I. Subsequently, in March 2010, the Board of Education also approved the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA) as a substitute test for the Praxis I Reading and Writing tests combined with the Praxis I Mathematics assessment (or equivalent SAT or ACT test scores) to meet the entry assessment requirement.

On June 27, 2013, the Board of Education approved the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators Tests to replace the Praxis I Pre-Professional Skills Tests for reading, writing, and mathematics as the assessments for entry into a Virginia approved teacher education program. The following SAT and ACT substitute tests were approved to continue as substitute tests for the basic skills entry assessment until comparison studies using the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators Tests: Reading (5712); Writing (5722); and Mathematics (5732) were available.

A new SAT test was administered by The College Board in March 2016. As a result of this redesign, qualifying scores on the new SAT test will need to be approved in order to accept the SAT as a substitute test for entry into a teacher preparation program.

On April 24, 2017, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure unanimously recommended that the Board of Education approves the following qualifying scores on the SAT as substitute tests for the Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators Tests:

- SAT Taken Prior to April 1, 1995 – a score of 1000 with at least 450 on the verbal and 510 on the mathematics tests;
- SAT Taken After April 1, 1995 and Prior to March 1, 2016 – a score of 1100 with at least 530 on the verbal and 530 on the mathematics tests;
- SAT Taken after March 1, 2016 – a total score of 1170 with at least 580 on Evidence-based Reading and Writing Section and 560 on the Math Section.

The Board of Education received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation that qualifying scores on the SAT as a substitute test for the Praxis Core Assessment for Entry into a Teacher Preparation Program.

**H. First Review of Nominations to Fill Vacancies on Board of Education Advisory Committees**

Ms. Emily Webb, Director for Board Relations, presented this item to the Board for first review. The presentation included the following information:

The qualifications for Board advisory committees along with the terms of membership are outlined in the Board’s bylaws. The terms of the Advisory Board appointments are for three years unless otherwise noted. According to the bylaws, members may be reappointed, with no member serving more than two consecutive three-year terms.

The Board of Education currently has five advisory committees:
There were two rounds of calls for nominations. The calls were shared with school divisions via Superintendent’s Memo, as well as education associations and individuals who have asked to be notified of the Board’s business. In some cases, the calls were shared within the specialty areas of each committee.

The Board received over 50 applications during the call for nominations. Once the nomination period was closed, the applications were reviewed by Department staff that work with the advisory committees. Staff made recommendations for appointment and reappointment based on the qualifications and on the required categories for membership while also looking for diversity on the committee, regional and otherwise. The terms will begin July 2017 and end June 2020 unless otherwise noted. The list of nominees recommended for appointment and reappointment can be found at: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/05-may/agenda-items/item-h.pdf

The Board of Education received for first review the nominations to fill vacancies on its advisory committees.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. Gecker made a motion to go into executive session under Virginia Code §2.2-3711(A) (41), for the purpose of discussion and consideration of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses, and that Susan Williams and Mona Siddiqui, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education; as well as staff members Dr. Steven Staples, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, Vijay Ramnarain and Kerry Miller, whose presence will aid in this matter, participate in the closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 11:00a.m.

Mr. Gecker made a motion that the Board reconvened in open session at 12:50pm. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Mr. Gecker made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member’s knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements under this chapter and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered.
Any member who believes there was a departure from these requirements shall so state prior to the vote, indicating the substance of the departure that, in his or her judgement, has taken place. The statement of the departure will be recorded in the minutes.

Board roll call:

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

The Board made the following motions:

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Tammy Simmons Moore. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to issue a license in Case #1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and carried unanimously.  
Dr. Wilson made a motion to deny a license Georgianna Paige Gambaro. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Ms. Holton made a motion to revoke the license of Kathleen Anne Jackson. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Ms. Adkins made a motion to revoke the license of Domonic Anthony Leuzzis. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Zevlin Layeon Staten. The motion was seconded by Mr. Romero and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Atkinson motion to defer action in Case #1. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson and carried unanimously.

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to revoke the license of Kyle James Toth. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and carried unanimously.

WORK SESSION
The Board convened a public work session at 3:45 p.m. on Tuesday, May 22, 2017, at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, with the following members present: Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Gecker, Mrs. Atkinson, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Lodal, Ms. Holton, Dr. Wilson, and Ms. Adkins. The following department staff also participated: Dr. Steven Staples, superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Cynthia Cave, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, and Emily Webb, director for board relations. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Board’s Comprehensive Plan. Dr. Cave and Ms. Webb provided an overview of the current Comprehensive Plan. You can view their presentation at http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/work-session/05-may/comprehensive-plan-2017.pdf.

Dr. Cannaday discussed the need for alignment between the Board’s mission, Comprehensive Plan, and Annual Report. He also stated that several of the priorities/goals in the current Comprehensive Plan that do not have metrics to measure their success.

Mr. Dillard suggested that civic readiness be added to goal two.

Mr. Romero suggested that family engagement be added to priority three.

Ms. Holton stated that many of the priorities and goals still apply but that the Board must ensure that their work is closely aligned to these priorities and goals. Additionally, she stated that she was pleased to see that the Board had accomplished or was working on many of the strategies that were outline in the 2012-2017 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Holton stated that one goal that should be added to the Comprehensive Plan is for the Board to boost schools in high-poverty areas. She said that the Board has an opportunity to influence discussions over funding to help ensure adequacy of resources.

Ms. Adkins said that she would like to keep goal four in the updated Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gecker suggested that the Board change priority two to focus on matching resources and human resourced with the needs of schools. He also suggested that the Board add a goal about funding and resources for schools.

Mrs. Lodal agreed with Mr. Dillard about adding civic readiness to goal two. She stated that goal four should be expanded to increase educational options for young learners. Mrs. Lodal also suggested that a goal be added to recruit and nurture qualified teachers to serve all students which could include strategies such as more competitive salaries and quality professional development.

Dr. Wilson stated that each priority and goal must have metrics to measure success.

Dr. Cannaday suggested that goal 6 be removed but imbedded in other areas of the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested to the Board that they think about how they can best drive
change in the governor’s office and General Assembly. Dr. Cannaday also suggested that the Board revisit the mission statement in the Comprehensive Plan at their July meeting.

Ms. Holton suggested a goal be revised or added to highlight closer alignment between academics, career and technical education, higher education, and the workforce.

Ms. Adkins suggested that the Board create the Profile of the Virginia Educator, similar to that of the Profile of the Virginia Graduate.

The session was opened to the public. No public comment was accepted. No votes were taken. The work session concluded at 4:45 p.m.

**WORK SESSION / RETREAT**

Board of Education members met for an all-day work session at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 24, 2017, in the Washington Room at the Virginia529 offices, located at 9001 Arboretum Pkwy, North Chesterfield, VA 23236. The session was opened to the public. No public comment was accepted. No votes were taken. The following members present:

- Dr. Billy Cannaday, President
- Mr. Dan Gecker, Vice President
- Mrs. Diane Atkinson
- Mr. Jim Dillard
- Mr. Sal Romero

- Mrs. Elizabeth Lodal
- Dr. Jamelle Wilson
- Ms. Anne Holton
- Ms. Kim Adkins

The following Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) staff participated in the meeting:

- Dr. Steve Staples, Superintendent of Public Institution
- Kent Dickey, Deputy Superintendent for Finance and Operations
- Dr. Steve Constantino, Chief Academic Officer and Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- Dr. Cindy Cave, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications
- Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent for Student Assessment and School Improvement
- Patty Pitts, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Licensure
- John Eisenberg, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education and Student Services
- Dr. Jennifer Piver-Renna, Senior Executive Director for Research
- Emily Webb, Director, Board Relations
- Lolita Hall, Director, Career, Technical, and Adult Education
- Dr. Christine Harris, Director, Humanities and Early Childhood
- Dr. Tina Manglicmot, Director, STEM
- Zachary Robbins, Director, Policy
- Bev Rabil, Director, School Improvement
The meeting convened with remarks from Dr. Cannaday regarding the focus of the Board’s work, revisions to Part VIII of the Standards of Accreditation.

Dr. Jennifer Piver-Renna presented a review of possible school quality indicators and example school accreditation matrices. The possible school quality indicators for consideration are:

- Graduation Completion Index (GCI)
- Dropout rate
- Chronic Absenteeism
- Achievement for English Reading and Writing
- Achievement for Math
- Achievement for Science
- Achievement gaps in English Reading and Writing
- Achievement gaps in Math
- College and Career Readiness Index

You can access Dr. Piver-Renna’s presentation online at: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/work-session/05-may/indicator-review.pdf.

Discussion:

- Ms. Adkins asked why chronic absenteeism is excluded from high school. Dr. Piver-Renna stated this was because chronic absenteeism can more easily be influenced at the elementary/middle level. Additionally, high schools have other school quality indicators, such as dropout rate and College and Career Readiness Index, that are not required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- Mr. Gecker asked if achievement gaps could look at something other than test scores, like graduation rate gaps. Dr. Staples stated that the state assessments are our most comprehensive data collection at this time.
- Ms. Atkinson asked how the workplace learning will be measured under the College and Career Readiness Index. She wanted to ensure that the measure of success was more than just participation. Dr. Piver-Renna stated that they haven’t decided how “success” will be measured.
- Mrs. Atkinson also asked what the rationale is for not using social studies for elementary and middle schools for academic performance? Dr. Staples stated that ESSA doesn’t
require this measure and that close alignment with ESSA is a consideration. Additionally, it is expected that social studies Standards of Learning assessments will be moving towards performance assessments.

- Mr. Dillard expressed an interest in adding civic readiness to the college and career readiness indicator. Dr. Cannaday and Mrs. Lodal agreed.
- Mr. Romero asked about measuring how schools are working to reduce suspension. He also asked how to measure social/emotional growth. Dr. Staples stated that these are items the Board could add to the matrix in the future, but currently VDOE doesn’t have the data collection for social/emotional measures. Dr. Cave added that chronic absenteeism does include suspension.
- Ms. Holton asked about the unintended consequences of the achievement gaps indicator. She asked if there was a better way to measure achievement gaps that are not school assessments. She is concerned that, for schools with very high levels of poverty, they will have a very difficult time closing the achievement gap. Dr. Staples explained that by adding growth, the matrix will recognize the movement towards the state standard, which accounts for her concern.
- Dr. Cannaday is concerned that low performing schools and schools with very high poverty cannot attract and keep highly qualified teachers.
- Ms. Lodal asked where and how can the Board address the issue of highly qualified staff. Additionally, she asked how Virginia and local school divisions can attract good teachers who will stay long term. She believes that a strong school leader is very important.
- Mr. Gecker stated that the purpose of the accountability system is to change the outcomes. Additionally, he asked what measurements are available for rating the quality of teachers and school leadership.
- Ms. Holton stated that the school quality indicators may discourage teachers from going to some of these schools that have high poverty or are struggling. She asked how the Board can work against this challenge. Additionally, she asked how the Board can ensure that adding more school quality indicators won’t make things worse for challenged schools. She stated that it is important to have flexibility within the Standards of Accreditation to be able to address unintended consequences after implementation.
- Ms. Adkins stated that using growth in the indicators may encourage good teachers to want to participate in schools that are struggling. She stated that she does not see this as a potential unintended consequence, as other Board members had shared.
- Ms. Holton stated her preference to eliminate the dropout indicator, as the GCI includes students who remain in school after 4 years if not graduating. Mrs. Loving-Ryder stated that it be would difficult to aggregate the graduation rate and dropout indicator because there are point values assigned to each type of category in the GCI. Dr. Piver-Renna said it may be easier to disaggregate the graduation rate.
- Ms. Holton stated that she would like to use alternative assessments for measuring growth. Mrs. Loving-Ryder stated that it would be possible to administer assessments at other times of the year; however this would be a funding issue.
• Discussing the exemplar performance level, Ms. Holton preferred the Colorado model plus the high overall achievement.

As part of this discussion, the Board conversed about potential Phase II school quality indicators. Possible Phase II school quality indicators include:
• Teacher quality;
• School leader quality;
• Student discipline;
• School climate;
• Social-emotional skills; and
• Achievement on assessments other than SOL assessments.

Following the discussion on potential school quality indicators and possible Phase II school quality indicators, the Board took a short break followed by an activity to assess the consensus of school quality indicators currently being considered for the school accreditation matrix. Board members were asked to place stickers on the school quality indicators where they still had questions or concerns. The following indicators had five or more stickers:
• Achievement for English Reading and Writing;
• Achievement for Math;
• Graduation Completion Index;
• College and Career Readiness Index;
• Achievement gaps for English Reading and Writing;
• Achievement gaps for Math; and
• Chronic Absenteeism.

Regarding student growth in the achievement indicators, Ms. Holton advocated for the use of alternative assessments.
• Mrs. Atkinson stated that, if the Board decided to permit alternative assessments to measure student growth, the Board must ensure that all schools have access and availability.
• Dr. Wilson expressed concern about implementation and the timeline for using alternative assessments for growth.
• Mr. Romero asked about using the WIDA-ACCESS test to assess growth for English Language Learner students. He also emphasized that, for ELL students, reading and writing skills take longer to gain proficiency than speaking and listening skills.
• Staff to recommend the use of alternative assessments that are valid and reliable to measure growth.

Regarding the Graduation Completion Index indicator, Ms. Holton proposed altering the GCI to limit the number of students that can be counted in the “other” category, which are those students not earning a standard or advanced diploma.
• Mr. Dillard asked why students who take longer than 4 years to graduate are distinguished, as they are still graduating, even if they take an additional year. Ms. Loving-Ryder indicated that those students are still captured in the data but counted as graduating in a later cohort.

• Dr. Cannaday asked for data on how many students are in the “other” category, specifically those that are still in school but not graduating within 4 years.

With regards to the College and Career readiness index, several Board members expressed interest in adding “civic readiness” to this indicator.

• Mrs. Atkinson stated that she would like the workplace learning experience to be more than just student participation. She believes that the measure of success needs to be more clearly defined.

When discussing Achievement Gaps, Ms. Holton expressed concern that the indicator would be responsible for putting many schools in “the red.” Mrs. Atkinson responded that this indicator will and should highlight these schools so that VDOE can provide them support and technical assistance.

• Mrs. Loving-Ryder stated that VDOE has been looking at the achievement gaps since 2002. Ms. Holton asked if VDOE has been calculating achievement gaps the same way since 2002. Ms. Loving-Ryder responded no. Dr. Staples stated that growth is a factor in all these outcomes, which is a substantive change, so the schools that are in “the red” for achievement gaps are not meeting the benchmark nor are they showing growth.

With regards to the Chronic Absenteeism indicator, Mrs. Atkinson expressed concern about students with health issues (those on homebound instruction) being counted in the indicator. She stated that the Board wants to drive improvement for all schools and students but there is nothing a school can do to improve the attendance of children with health issues.

• Dr. Staples asked if staff can amend the definition so that students with health issues are not captured in the data.

• Mr. Romero expressed concern that inclusion of this indicator will require additional resources for schools. He asked if VDOE is looking at potential models that have been proven effective in impacting attendance.

• Mr. Gecker stated that this indicator will highlight the importance of attendance for schools and hopefully for each individual student.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Dr. Cannaday welcomed Secretary of Education Dietra Trent. Secretary Trent introduced Governor McAuliffe to the Board and audience. Governor McAuliffe offered brief remarks reassuring the Board to “be bold” in their actions and offered his support and encouragement. Following Governor McAuliffe’s remarks, the Board took a break for lunch.
The Board reconvened after lunch for a presentation from Mrs. Loving-Ryder entitled: “Overview of 2016-17 Technical Assistance for Divisions and Schools.” You can access her presentation at http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2017/work-session/meeting_materials.shtml#may24.

- Mr. Gecker asked about the effectiveness of the interventions provided by the Office of School Improvement (OSI), and specifically asked how many schools have been moved out of denied accreditation. Ms. Rabil stated that four schools moved out of the denied accreditation from 2015-2016 (about 15%).
- Mr. Romero asked if OSI offers professional development for cultural competency and race/gender/cultural bias. Ms. Rabil stated that the Office of Student Services held several trainings across the state in these areas.
- Dr. Staples stated that an important part of OSI’s work is getting schools to accept their rating, rather than making excuses, and developing a plan to improve. This process often takes a long time in some cases because no school wants to be denied accreditation.
- Mr. Gecker asked what it would take to get the remaining schools (the other 85%) out of the accreditation denied status. Ms. Rabil replied that more resources would be necessary, a need for more skilled contractors working in schools and more VDOE staff in the OSI office. She stated that it is also necessary for OSI to help prioritize what work is most important or will be most effective as schools can always identify a lot of problems/challenges but prioritization is necessary and requires assistance.
- Dr. Cannaday asked who needs to be involved in the initial plan with a school that has been denied accreditation. Ms. Rabil stated that, first; the local school board must receive training from the Virginia School Boards Association. Dr. Cannaday followed by asking if the information shared at VSBA’s local school board training is the same information that the local school superintendent receives. He believes that they need to receive the same information. Ms. Rabil stated that she does not work directly with local school boards in her current role. Mrs. Atkinson emphasized that the local school board must understand their role in the school improvement process, so that they don’t micromanage the work on the school and local superintendent.
- Mrs. Loving-Ryder indicated that continuing the work in the schools of OSI contractors is important, and that OSI needs more staff to assist school divisions.
- Dr. Staples stated that denied accreditation status does not have to occur to get schools to the table. He said that if VDOE can start working with schools before they get to denied status, there is success in developing an improvement plan.
- Ms. Holton asked if the Board can withhold the at-risk add-on money if a school is not following through with their plan.
- Mrs. Lodal requested data on the cost of contractors working with schools for a year, as well as a projection of the cost for the resources (staff) needed for OSI. She also stated that VDOE should utilize retired teachers to work with schools.
- Ms. Adkins stated that she does not believe withholding funding from schools is an effective tool.

- Mrs. Lodal asked if the colors (green, yellow, red) were absolutely necessary for the accreditation matrix. She stated that the colors are useful as a visual representation, but doesn’t believe they should be included in the regulations.
- Dr. Wilson asked about the definition of “near standard” in Level Two. She stated that there needs to be assurance that local school divisions will understand precisely what “near standard” means. Dr. Cave responded that the performance benchmarks will be set for each level in the regulations.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if the guidelines referenced in the SOA must be appended and are they subject to the Administrative Process Act (APA) process or does the Board have the flexibility to update as required. Dr. Staples responded that revisions to Board guidelines would not need to go through the APA process. Dr. Cave stated that there has discussion among staff and the governor’s office about whether to include the performance benchmarks in the regulations versus Board guidelines. Susan Williams, Assistant Attorney General for VDOE, responded that it is a balance between how much information should be in the regulations versus Board guidelines.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked about the transition period from the old accreditation system to the new accreditation system. Dr. Cave stated that there will be a one-year transition period where schools will either be accredited under the old system or the new system, whichever one benefits the school. The accreditation designations in the new system will be accredited, accredited with conditions or denied accreditation.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked if schools that are all Level One (green), will they need to do a complete needs assessment. Ms. Holton said that she doesn’t want the Board to require unnecessary paperwork for schools. Dr. Wilson clarified that there is a difference between the comprehensive plan and the comprehensive needs assessment. Dr. Staples said that is an accurate statement. Dr. Staples continued that continuous improvement for ALL schools was a goal from the outset of this revision which is why all schools will be required to conduct a needs assessment. Ms. Holton requested a clarification in the regulations that a needs assessment does not need to be completed every year because the required comprehensive plans are not required every year. Mrs. Loving-Ryder stated that VDOE will perform a review of all needs assessments. Several Board members expressed displeasure around this requirement. Ms. Holton stated that she believed this would be a waste of agency resources. Mrs. Atkinson suggested that schools that are green on an indicator, the needs assessment should not be submitted to VDOE. Mrs. Lodal stated that schools will not want to complete a needs assessment if no one is going to review it. Mrs. Loving-Ryder emphasized that staff initially imagined a peer review process for the needs
assessment for schools in green. Ms. Holton suggested requiring a division-led review of needs assessments that would be subject to VDOE guidance, as requiring VDOE to review all needs assessments would stretch staff resources too thin. Ms. Rabil stated that an OSI-led review process is important for schools who are yellow or red in an academic achievement indicator.

After a brief break, Dr. Cave continued her presentation and discussion on the revisions to Part VIII of the SOA.

- Ms. Holton suggested clarification in the regulations between ESSA designations (targeted and comprehensive schools) and the performance benchmark levels. Dr. Staples replied that specifics of ESSA should not be included in the regulations in case that law changes. Ms. Holton emphasized that the state accreditation system and federal accountability system should be aligned.

- Mrs. Atkinson asked, regarding Level Three, what would trigger the start of the MOU process from the corrective action plan process. Mrs. Loving-Ryder responded that the MOU process is the next step after the corrective action plan and it must be supported by the local school board and state board.

- Ms. Adkins asked why there is the option to withhold at-risk funding, as there is already a provision where the Board can take a school division to circuit court for not complying. Additionally, Ms. Atkinson asked if the language should read “may withhold” instead of “shall withhold.” Dr. Cave stated that this is a requirement in the Appropriations Act, and the language in the law says “shall.”

- Ms. Holton stated that the current version of Part VIII of the SOA still requires a lot of revisions and is not in final form yet.

- Dr. Cannaday suggested to staff that they review language again to ensure consistency throughout and ensure the language reflects the Board’s intent. Dr. Staples requested that Board members provide feedback to staff over the next week when they note inconsistencies in language or intent.

- Ms. Holton stated that there is no explicit language in the regulations that outline how a school can get out of the “denied accreditation” status. She suggested that this be clarified in the next revision.

Dr. Cannaday provided closing remarks and outlined the Board’s timeline for approval. He stated that it was the Board’s intention to have final review at the June meeting for submission through the executive review process of the APA immediately following. Hearing no additional questions or comments, the meeting adjourned at 4:23p.m.

Following the Board work session, staff prepared a high-level overview of the requests and outcomes from Board discussion. The summary is provided below:

- Add civic readiness to the College and Career Readiness Index.
- Look at how VDOE measures success in College and Career Readiness for work-based learning experiences. The Board may not want to only measure participation.
- Provide language that would offer greater flexibility around how VDOE measures growth.
- Adjust the exemplar status to reflect already high achieving, high-poverty schools (i.e. Colorado model).
- Review the WIDA-ACCESS test for ELL students to determine if listening and speaking could determine growth for accreditation.
- In regards to chronic absenteeism, establish criteria for students with severe health issues to ensure that they don’t impact a school’s rating.
- Direct VDOE to look at the capacity of staff to implement tiered levels of support. Consider having the local division carry out some of these activities per Board guidelines.
- More clearly articulate the tiered interventions associated with Level 3 schools.
- Confirm alignment between the interventions of state accreditation and ESSA.
- Provide clarity on how schools that have been denied accreditation can receive a status of accredited or accredited with conditions.
- More clearly articulate the list of actions that the Board can take before a school reached the denied level (at the MOU level).

**DINNER MEETING**

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, May 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m., at the Berkley Hotel with the following members present: Ms. Adkins, Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Ms. Holton, Mr. Gecker, Mrs. Lodal, Mr. Romero and Dr. Wilson. The following department staff also attended: Dr. Steven Staples, Superintendent of Public Instructions, and Ms. Emily Webb, Director of Board Relations.

Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 7:10 p.m.

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

Ms. Adkins shared with members the loss of a devoted education advocate, Mr. Worth Harris Carter, Jr. Mr. Carter was the founder of Carter Bank & Trust. He also served on the following public school, college, and university boards: Martinsville City School Board – 21 years (11 years as Chairman); Averett University – 8 years; Ferrum College – 8 years; Mary Baldwin College – 8 years; and the University of Richmond – 4 years. Mr. Carter was a very devoted person whom spent most of his spare time in the education system.
Ms. Holton had the opportunity to visit Nathanael Greene Primary School in Greene County during Teacher Appreciation Week. Ms. Holton was very impressed with the school and the interaction with staff and students.

**ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION**

There being no further business of the Board of Education, Dr. Cannaday adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

[Signature]

President