

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

January 11, 2006

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Conference Rooms D and E, Richmond, with the following members present:

Mr. Thomas M. Jackson, Jr., President	Dr. Gary L. Jones
Dr. Mark E. Emblidge, Vice President	Mr. Andrew J. Rotherham
Mrs. Isis M. Castro	Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw
Mr. David L. Johnson	Dr. Ella P. Ward
Mr. Thomas G. Johnson, Jr.	
	Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Acting Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Jackson, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9:17 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Jackson asked for a motion to add the following item to the agenda: 2006 Executive Budget Review. Mrs. Saslaw made the motion and seconded by Dr. Jones. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Emblidge made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 30, 2005, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

Cassidra Bennett
Angela Ciolfi
Tim Moore
Linda Moore

ACTION/DISCUSSION ON BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULATIONS

Final Review of Regulations Governing the Re-enrollment of Students Committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice (8 VAC 20-660-10 et seq.)

Dr. Cynthia Cave, director, of student services, presented this item. Before Dr. Cave's presentation, Mr. Jackson noted that at the November Board meeting, JustChildren proposed three additional amendments to the proposed regulations in the interest of clarity and emphasis. The proposed amendments are as follows:

- Replace the language in Part III, 8 VAC 20-660-40 C.(1), that is, "The re-enrollment plan shall make it possible for the student to enroll and receive instruction in the receiving school district within two school days of release." with "The re-enrollment plan shall be implemented by the receiving school division within two days of the student's release."
- Add an ending clause to the last sentence in Part III, 8 VAC 20-660-40 A.(4) as follows: "The student shall be consulted in the development of the plan and have the opportunity to participate, by telephonic or electronic means, in the meeting where the final re-enrollment plan is developed."
- Use a consistent and standard definition for "eligible" when referring to students or youth affected by the regulations. JustChildren suggested the following language be used in place of "eligible": "who is of school attendance age or is eligible for special education services pursuant to Section 22.1-213 of the Code of Virginia."

Mr. Jackson asked for a motion on the proposed items. No motion was made and the proposed items were not considered for action.

Dr. Cave noted that the Code of Virginia in §22.1-1 provides a definition of "person of school age" as "a person who will have reached his fifth birthday on or before September 30 of the school year and who has not reached twenty years of age on or before August 1 of the school year." Section 22.1-5 of the Code allows school boards to accept students "for whom English is a second language who entered school in Virginia for the first time after reaching their twelfth birthday, and who have not reached 22 years of age on or before August 1 of the school year." Dr. Cave said that should the above suggestion to use a standard definition of "eligible" be accepted, Part I, Definitions, 8 VAC 20-660-10 would be amended to add the following: "Eligible" means of school age or eligible for special education services as defined in §§22.1-1, 22.1-5, and 22.1-213 of the Code of Virginia."

Dr. Jones made a motion to approve the *Regulations Governing the Re-enrollment of Students Committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice* and authorize staff of the Department of Education to proceed with notification of stakeholders and provision of

information to school divisions. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

First Review of Additions to the Board-Approved List of Instructional Models/Programs that Include Instructional Methods to Satisfy Provisions in Regulations Establishing Accrediting Standards for Public Schools in Virginia

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent for instruction, presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that on January 6, 2003, the Board of Education approved revisions to the criteria for identifying and selecting models/programs that include instructional methods. The revisions are based on the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) emphasis on the use of scientifically-based research as a criterion for evaluating programs, particularly those programs purchased with federal funds.

Dr. Wallinger said that the models/programs must meet the following criteria:

1. Scientifically-based evidence of effectiveness: The effectiveness of models/programs is justified based on scientific research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge on the models/programs. The major components of the model/program include instructional methods and practices that have been verified through scientifically-based research. The research that documents improvement in student achievement has presented convincing evidence that the observed results were based on the model/program intervention. The effectiveness of the model/program in improving student achievement has been demonstrated in Virginia and is based on effective research-based strategies. Gains in student achievement on Virginia's Standards of Learning tests have been sustained over time.
2. Implementation and capacity for technical assistance: The model/program has explained the essential ingredients necessary to make the program fully operational, including estimates of the costs, with respect to time and money, and the requirements for implementation. The program managers have described in detail their capacity, in terms of technical assistance, to provide the staff development, consultation, and support necessary for successful implementation in a number of Virginia schools.
3. Replicability: The effectiveness of the model/program has been demonstrated through multiple investigations in numerous locations with low-achieving students.
4. Correlation with or adaptability to the Virginia Standards of Learning in English or mathematics: The content of the model/program correlates with the Virginia Standards of Learning in English or mathematics or the model/program can be adapted to the Virginia Standards of Learning.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and adopt two additional programs for the board-approved list. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. The additions are as follows:

**Virginia Board of Education Approved Models/Programs that Include Instructional Methods that Have Proven to be Successful with Low-Achieving Students
English/Reading**

Model/Program	K - 3	4 - 8	9 - 12
Supplemental/Intervention:			
Destination Reading	X		
SuccessMaker Enterprise	X	X	

First Review of Addition to the Board-Approved List of Supplemental Educational Services Providers Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Dr. Wallinger also presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) requires states to identify and maintain a list of supplemental educational services providers. Supplemental educational services include tutoring and academic enrichment services that are provided in addition to daily instruction outside of the regular school day. A supplemental educational services provider can be a non-profit entity, a for-profit agency, or another school division. The services must be of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children in mastering the English and Mathematics Standards of Learning, and achieving proficiency on Standards of Learning tests. NCLB requires that states maintain an approved list of supplemental educational services providers across the state and by school division from which parents can select.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and accept the addition of Extended Learning Opportunities to the revised board-approved list of supplemental educational services providers. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously. The addition is as follows:

Provider	Focus Area and Grade Level	Service Area
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	Mathematics (3-5)	Arlington County

First Review of the Proposal to Establish Mountain Vista Governor's School Serving Students in School Divisions from Clarke, Culpeper, Fauquier, Frederick, Rappahannock, and Warren Counties and the City of Winchester

Dr. Barbara McGonagill, specialist, governor's schools and gifted education, introduced Dr. David Martin, superintendent of Fauquier County Public Schools.

Dr. Martin said that it has been his pleasure serving as the executive superintendent in the development of the Mountain Vista Governor's School for Science, Mathematics and Technology. On behalf of the communities and school divisions in Clarke, Culpeper, Fauquier, Frederick, Rappahannock, and Warren Counties, and the

City of Winchester, Dr. Martin expressed appreciation for the planning grant that was awarded last year which gave them the opportunity to work collaboratively on the project.

Dr. Martin also acknowledged the following groups of individuals, who traveled from various school divisions and in attendance, for their commitment and expertise to the project: (1) school board members and superintendents; (2) central office personnel and teachers; (3) representatives of higher education and community members, and (4) students and parents.

Dr. Martin said that the Mountain Vista Governor's School was developed out of an expressed need to provide a rigorous curriculum and to identify students whose instructional needs could not be met in the regular high school curriculum. Dr. Martin said that the research behind the development of the proposal addresses several areas: (1) it offers gifted students a governor's school opportunity to study in a supportive collaborative and regional community of academic peers; (2) it provides services for gifted students beyond what is offered in current high schools; (3) it fosters regional cooperation between the educational communities of high school and higher education with business and professional community; (4) it creates unique opportunities for service and leadership in both the school and community; (5) it enhances economic development by increasing intellectual capital and recruitment of business to the commonwealth; (6) it enables Virginia students to be more competitive when applying to colleges/universities; (7) it provided a model of higher education standards and regional cooperation; and (8) it is congruent with the Governor Warner's Senior Year Plus Initiative and The Early Scholars Program, which offers the opportunity to earn 40 college credits through a dual enrollment program on a college campus as well as the option to take advanced placement examinations.

Dr. Martin introduced Dr. Sylvia Wadsworth, former director of the Commonwealth Governor's School, who facilitated the Mountain Vista Governor's School process, during her semi-retirement. Dr. Wadsworth briefly highlighted the Mountain Vista Governor's School curriculum framework.

The Board also heard from the following individuals: (1) Mr. Bob Seagate, a teacher at the Mountain Vista Governor's School; (2) Burt Richards, a student from Warren County High School; (3) Kelsey Parrish, a senior at Clarke County High School; and (4) John Sygielski, president of Lord Fairfax Community College.

After the various presentations, Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and approve the proposal, thus enabling the Governing Board to proceed to the 2006 General Assembly for operational funding. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Johnson and carried unanimously. The audience applauded the motion.

First Review of Timeline for the Review and Approval of the Revised Foreign Language Standards of Learning

Dr. Linda Wallinger, assistant superintendent, presented this item. Dr. Wallinger said that the Board of Education adopted a schedule for review and revisions to the Standards of Learning at its September 28, 2000, meeting. Accordingly, the foreign language standards are scheduled for revision in 2007.

Mrs. Castro made a motion to waive first review and grant approval for the Department of Education to proceed with the revision process for the Foreign Language Standards of Learning. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

The schedule for review of Foreign Language Standards of Learning is as follows:

**SCHEDULE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
FOREIGN LANGUAGE STANDARDS OF LEARNING**

February 2006	<p>A Superintendent's Memorandum is distributed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• announces the schedule of the review process;• announces the availability of a Standards of Learning review/comment page on the Department of Education Web site;• requests that division superintendents share information about the Web site with instructional staff; and• requests that division superintendents submit nominations for review team members. <p>The Department of Education posts on its Web site a Standards of Learning review/comment page for the 2000 Foreign Language Standards of Learning. The page will be active for 30 days.</p>
April 2006	<p>The Department of Education aggregates and conducts a preliminary analysis of the comments entered on the Web page.</p>
July-August 2006	<p>The Standards of Learning review team meets for two days to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• analyze statewide Web page input;• review national documents and reports as necessary; and• make recommendations for potential changes.
August 2006 September 2006	<p>The Department of Education prepares the review team's comments in a draft. The Department of Education and the steering committee (a subgroup of the review team) meet to discuss and review the draft Foreign Language Standards of Learning for first review by the Board of Education.</p>
October 2006	<p>The Department of Education presents the draft document to the board for first review.</p>
November 2006	<p>The proposed Standards of Learning document is distributed for public comment. The document is placed on the Virginia Department of Education Web site for review.</p>
January 2007 February 2007	<p>Public hearings are held as prescribed by the Board of Education. The Superintendent of Public Instruction presents the proposed Foreign Language Standards of Learning to the Board of Education for final review and adoption. The final document is posted on the Department of Education Web site within three weeks of adoption.</p>
April 2007	<p>Printed copies of the approved Foreign Language Standards of Learning are distributed to 6-12 schools and local school division central offices.</p>

First Review of the Annual Report for State-Funded Remedial Programs

Mrs. Kathleen Smith, director of the office of school improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Smith said that 8-VAC-20-630-50 requires each local division to annually collect and report to the Department of Education, online or on forms provided by the Department, the following data pertaining to eligible students:

1. The number of students failing a state sponsored test required by the Standards of Quality or Standards of Accreditation;
2. A demographic profile of students attending state-funded remedial programs;
3. The academic status of each student attending state-funded remedial programs;
4. The types of instruction offered;
5. The length of the program(s);
6. The cost of the program(s);
7. The number of disabled students and those with limited English proficiency;
8. As required, the pass rate on Standards of Learning assessments; and,
9. The percentage of students at each grade level who have met their remediation goals.

Mrs. Smith said that a total of 106,441 students attended remedial programs in 2004 at a cost of \$378 per pupil. Mrs. Smith presented the following data for the summer 2004 remedial summer programs that were collected after the results of the 2005 Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments were released.

Type of Programs(s) Offered in the Summer of 2004 or in the case of year-round schools (2004-2005)	Percentage of Localities
An integrated summer remedial program in K-5 or intercession program in the case of year-round schools (2004-2005)	86%
A summer remedial program or intercession program in the case of year-round schools (2004-2005) in one or more content areas grades K-8	94%
A summer remedial program or intercession program in the case of year-round schools (2004-2005) in one or more content areas for secondary programs	95%

Several Board members requested clarification of the explanation in the footnote on page three of what school divisions should report. Mrs. Smith noted that the footnote on page three states what the Code requires and that the remediation goal can be the student's performance on a local assessment or the SOL test. Mrs. Smith said what actually was reported was what students made on a local assessment or SOL goal.

Dr. Ward made a motion to waive first review and submit the report, as amended to include a clarification in the footnote on page three, to the Governor and General

Assembly as required by §22.1-99.2B of the Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. David Johnson and carried unanimously.

First Review of a Proposal to Revise the Accreditation Guidelines to Clarify the Pass Rates Required for the New Reading and Mathematics Tests in Grades 4, 6, and 7 in the 2006-2007 Accreditation Ratings

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for assessment and reporting, presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that in the 2005-2006 school year new tests in reading and mathematics are being administered in grades 4, 6, and 7 to meet the requirements of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that the current *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* do not specifically address the calculation of accreditation ratings using these tests, and clarification as to the pass rates that are required for full accreditation is needed.

The standards for accrediting public schools in Virginia differentiate the pass rates required for full accreditation for the grade 3 and grade 5 English tests as 75% and the grade 3 history/social science and science tests as 50%. The pass rate required for full accreditation for all other content areas is 70%.

Mrs. Loving-Ryder stated that based on the statement in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (8 VAC 20-131-300.C.) that “a school will be rated Fully Accredited when its eligible students meet the pass rate of 70%...,” the pass rates required for the reading and mathematics tests in grades 4, 6, and 7 for full accreditation would be 70%. Alternatively, in schools that include students who have taken a third- or fifth-grade reading test as well as those who have taken a reading test in grades 4, 6, or 7, the scores of all English tests taken in the school may be combined and the resulting pass rate tested against the 75% benchmark. The proposed additions to the accreditation guidelines would apply only to the 2006-2007 accreditation ratings based on the test results from the 2005-2006 school year.

Mr. David Johnson made a motion to accept for first review the proposed clarification in calculating the 2006-2007 accreditation ratings. The motion stated that the pass rates required for the reading and mathematics tests in grades 4, 6, and 7 for full accreditation will be 70%. Alternatively, in schools that include students who have taken a third-or fifth-grade reading test as well as those who have taken a reading test in grades 4, 6, or 7, the scores of all English tests taken in the school may be combined and the resulting pass rate tested against the 75% benchmark. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously. Final approval will be discussed at the February Board meeting.

Overview of the Governor's Introduced Budget for Direct Aid to Public Education in the 2006-2008 Biennium.

Mr. Dan Timberlake, assistant superintendent for finance, presented this item. Mr. Timberlake's report included the following:

The Introduced 2006-2008 Direct Aid to Public Education Budget Includes Rebenchmarking Updates

- The Governor's introduced Direct Aid for Public Education budget includes the technical rebenchmarking costs adopted by the Board of Education on September 21, 2005.
- The rebenchmarking costs approved by the Board represent changes in funding based on standard technical revisions made to Direct Aid accounts for each year of the 2006-2008 biennium.
- These cost projections do not reflect any changes in policy or technical methodology. Technical updates adopted by the Board of Education include:
 - Student membership projections - preliminary
 - Expenditure data from the Annual School Report
 - Transportation costs.
 - Superintendent, nurses, and school board costs
 - Special and Vocational Education child counts
 - English as a Second Language enrollment
 - Funded salary amounts
 - Prevailing textbook and health care costs
 - Test score and free lunch eligibility data
 - Inflation factors
 - Incentive and categorical accounts
- The rebenchmarked budget represents the state cost of continuing the current Direct Aid programs in the 2006-2008 biennium with the required revisions and updates to input data using the approved funding methodologies.
- Based on these changes, the estimated state cost for public education increased by \$986 million for the biennium.

Other Technical Updates to the 2006-2008 Direct Aid to Public Education Budget

- The Governor's introduced budget also includes other technical updates for which data was not available at the time of rebenchmarking.
- These updates do not involve changes in policy or funding methodology:

•Update ADM and Fall Membership Projections

The introduced budget reflects funding necessary to cover increases and decreases in projections of March 31, 2007, and March 31, 2008, average daily membership (ADM). The projected ADM used in the rebenchmarking base was reforecast by the Department of Education based on September 30, 2005, fall membership.

This update decreased the projected ADM from the budget approved by the Board of Education for fiscal years 2007 and 2008, resulting in a cost savings of \$8.8 million in fiscal year 2007, and \$15.1 million in fiscal year 2008.

- **Update composite index for the 2006-2008 biennium**

The data elements used to calculate the composite index for 2006-2008 are based on data from 2003.

Updating the composite index, a measure of local ability-to-pay used to distribute funding to school divisions, for the 2006-2008 biennium increases the state share of cost by \$20.0 million in fiscal year 2007, and \$21.3 million in fiscal year 2008.

- **Update lottery proceeds for public education**

The updated lottery estimate for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 assumes that the North Carolina lottery will be fully operational, in both years, resulting in a \$15.7 million decrease in lottery profits from the fiscal year 2006 base.

The total lottery estimate is \$426.1 million each year. The net effect of the decreased estimate and offsets is a decrease of \$6.1 million in both years of the biennium.

- **Update sales tax projections**

The introduced budget reflects the most recent estimate of the one percent sales tax and the one-eighth percent sales tax revenue dedicated to public education for fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

The updated estimate increases the net state share of cost by \$77.1 million in fiscal year 2007 and \$107.9 million in fiscal year 2008.

- **Update fringe benefit rates from VRS**

The total state share of cost to update fringe benefit rates is \$82.5 million in fiscal year 2007 and \$83.4 million in fiscal year 2008.

The introduced budget uses the following fringe benefit rates in the cost calculations:

- . Instructional VRS - 9.20%
- . Prevailing Nonprofessional VRS - 7.48%
- . Retiree Health Care Credit - 0.56%
- . Group Life - 0.49%

- **Update triennial census information**

The triennial census count is used to distribute the state sales and use tax proceeds to school divisions as part of the Basic Aid funding formula.

The 2005 triennial census update results in a net increase statewide in Basic Aid funding of \$3.9 million in fiscal years 2007 and 2008. This reflects a statewide increase of 34,655 students over the 2002 count of school-age population.

- **Update costs of incentive-based programs**

The Governor's introduced budget includes updates to reflect projected participation in incentive-based programs, which are primarily formula driven and subject to changes in fall membership, participation rates, free lunch eligibility, and test scores.

Funding for incentive-based programs is decreased by \$17.1 million in fiscal year 2007, and by \$9.7 million in fiscal year 2008.

- **Update costs of categorical programs**
Categorical programs exceed the foundation of the Standards of Quality and are mandated by state or federal statute. The Governor's introduced budget updates the cost of continuing categorical programs in 2006-2008.

Funding for these programs is increased by \$5.2 million in fiscal year 2007 and by \$8.3 million in fiscal year 2008.

Other Increased Funding in the 2006-2008 Direct Aid to Public Education Budget

- The Governor's introduced budget includes four areas of additional funding:

- **Three percent salary increase for public school employees**

The Governor's introduced budget provides funding for a compensation supplement of three percent, effective December 1, 2006, covering SOQ instructional and support positions and affected incentive accounts.

In order to receive state funds, a local match would have to be provided based on composite index. If appropriated, the state funds would be paid to school divisions that certify that equivalent salary increases have been granted locally in each fiscal year.

The state share of cost in fiscal year 2007 is \$61.4 million; in fiscal year 2008, \$106.1 million.

- **Update funding for Supplemental Education programs**

An additional \$100,000 each year in funding supports an increase in Project Discovery and a one-time grant of \$500,000 is provided in fiscal year 2007 for the Communities in Schools program.

- **Update funding for Education for a Lifetime programs**

The Governor's introduced budget includes \$5.9 million in additional funding in fiscal year 2007 and \$5.3 million in fiscal year 2008 for these programs. Examples of these programs include:

- Incentives for Hard-to-Staff Schools
- Virginia Teacher Corps
- Turnaround Specialists
- Virtual Advanced Placement School
- Leadership Development Grants
- Race to GED program
- Path to Industry Certification

- **Cost of competing adjustments for additional localities**

In recognition of the Northern Virginia labor market and certain localities contiguous to Planning District 8, the Governor's introduced budget includes increased funds to support a cost of competing adjustment for qualifying localities.

This funding recognizes 10 percent in 2007 and 25 percent in 2008 of the full cost of competing allowance differential for SOQ related positions in Planning District 8. For fiscal year 2007, an increased state share of cost of \$1.4 million and for fiscal year 2008, \$3.5 million.

- After accounting for all of the technical and policy based adjustments, total state support for public education included in Governor Warner's introduced budget for the 2006–2008 biennium is increased by approximately \$1.5 billion over the fiscal year 2006 base.

Major Data Elements Used in 2006-2008 Direct Aid to Public Education Budget Calculations

Student Enrollment Data:

- **Average Daily Membership (ADM)** -Latest Projections for FY 2007 and FY 2008 from November 2005, incorporating actual 2005 fall enrollment
- **Fall Membership** -Actual September 30, 2005 data
- **Special Education Child Count** -December 1, 2004, Child Count
- **Vocational Education Child Count** -2004-2005 School Year Data
- **Prevention, Intervention and Remediation** - Three year average of SOL English and Math Scores from 2001-02; 2002-03; 2003-04

Expenditure Data:

- 2003-2004 Annual School Report

Fringe Benefit Rates:

- **Instructional VRS** - 9.20%
- **Prevailing Non-Professional VRS** - 7.48%
- **Social Security** - 7.65%
- **Group Life Insurance** - 0.49%
- **Retiree Health Care Credit** - 0.56%
- **Health Care Premium** - \$4,031

Other Data Elements:

- **Composite Index Data** - Base-year 2003 data
- **Textbook Per Pupil Amount** (*with Inflation*) - \$101.81

The Board thanked Mr. Timberlake for his presentation.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Mr. Jackson's Announcement

Mr. Jackson announced that he has decided not to seek reappointment to the Board. Mr. Jackson said his decision was not made out of a lack of love for the material that the Board deals with every month but with time limitations and travel issues, and being blessed with a very active law practice, he does not have the necessary time to devote to the critically important work of the Board for the next four years. Mr. Jackson thanked Board members for giving him the privilege to serve as their president. He said they have been wonderful to work with and that their faith in him has been a tremendous boost for him to perform in the position as president.

Mr. Jackson thanked the staff at the Department of Education and said that words could not express his feelings towards the staff. He said that one of the reasons he agreed to serve as president was because he knew how talented and capable the DOE staff is and with full knowledge that the staff would undergird his work. Mr. Jackson said no other state in America has a better staff to work with than the staff in Virginia.

Mr. Jackson said that one of the most precious gifts given by those in the education community is their trust in him. Mr. Jackson said that he and other members of the Board have been allowed to walk through the General Assembly with a trust that

what they were doing was right. This always gave Board members an extra momentum to accomplish things they felt were important. He said that trust in various groups in the community from school boards, to superintendents, to principals, VEA, PTA, guidance counselors, etc. has enabled him to make changes and get things done that were necessary.

Mr. Jackson said that he has had a wonderful experience working with Dr. DeMary and subsequently with Dr. Wright. Mr. Jackson said that Dr. Wright has stepped in and is terrific in her own right and extremely confident and capable of serving in the position in which she currently sits as acting superintendent. In closing, Mr. Jackson thanked everyone for the opportunity. He said what makes opportunities worthwhile are the people that you interact with during those opportunities and everyone has been very special to him.

Comments from Board Members in Response to Mr. Jackson's Announcement

Dr. Emblidge responded to Mr. Jackson's announcement by saying that it has been an honor working with him and that he will be missed from the Board. Dr. Emblidge congratulated Mr. Jackson on his excellent work with the General Assembly and that it was an honor working with him.

Dr. Jones congratulated Mr. Jackson on a job well done. Dr. Jones said he has had the opportunity to serve under the outstanding leadership of three presidents on the Board, and no one can match Mr. Jackson's demeanor, fairness, resourcefulness, and political acumen. Dr. Jones said that Mr. Jackson had the political experience and leadership essential for Governor Warner's programs and budgeting commitment to succeed. Dr. Jones told Mr. Jackson that all of these things go without notice for the most part because he has a down-home humility about himself which is very admirable. Dr. Jones said he will miss Mr. Jackson and hopes that he will stay in contact to keep everybody on the same team.

Dr. Ward commended Mr. Jackson on the way he embraced new members on the Board. Dr. Ward said Mr. Jackson treated new members with fairness, dignity, and respect for what they were bringing to the Board and made them feel a part of the team. Dr. Ward said it has been a wonderful experience working with Mr. Jackson, and he will miss him.

Mr. David Johnson said that the young people in the Commonwealth of Virginia, by his decision, has lost a true friend, a person who for a lifetime has believed in public education and who has worked very hard to improve public education both as a citizen and legislator, as a member of the Board, and as president of the Board. Mr. Johnson said he has not known anyone in his 40 years of observance who has done a better job as president.

Mrs. Saslaw said that Mr. Jackson has been very understanding of the new members on the Board. Mrs. Saslaw said Mr. Jackson's connections with the General Assembly, his understanding of educational issues, his honesty and support of educational goals have been unparalleled, and she hopes that Mr. Jackson will continue to give service to the educational community.

Mrs. Castro thanked Mr. Jackson for understanding and listening and said it has been a pleasure working with him.

Mr. Rotherham said that he echoes everything that has been said and he hopes this will not be the last we hear from Mr. Jackson on education or in public life in Virginia.

Mr. Thomas Johnson said a lot of eloquent words has been said and the nicest things are the personal feelings from Board members, and he will be missed.

Dr. Patricia Wright expressed appreciation on behalf of Department of Education staff. Dr. Wright said they enjoyed their relationship with Mr. Jackson. It has been a true partnership, and she appreciated his leadership. Dr. Wright said she and staff wish the best for Mr. Jackson.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. Emblidge made a motion to go into executive session under Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711.A.1, specifically to discuss personnel matters involving identifiable employees and prospective employees. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. The Board went into executive session at 11:03 a.m.

Dr. Emblidge made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 11:57 a.m.

Dr. Emblidge 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 by Virginia law were discussed in the executive session to which this certification motion applies, and (2) only such public business matters as were considered by the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mr. David Johnson – Yes	Mr. Thomas Johnson – Yes
Dr. Ward – Yes	Mr. Castro – Yes
Dr. Emblidge – Yes	Mrs. Saslaw – Yes
Dr. Jones – Yes	Mr. Rotherham – Yes
Mr. Jackson – Yes	

Dr. Emblidge made the following motions: Mr. President, I move that the Board of Education take the following actions relative to the licensure cases presented during the executive session:

Cases #1 - That the Board of Education approve the issuance of provisional license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Case #2 - That the Board of Education approve the issuance of a provisional license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Case #3 - That the Board of Education revoke the license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Case #4 - That the Board of Education revoke the license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Case #5 - That the Board of Education revoke the license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Case #6 - That the Board of Education issue a license. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE FINE ARTS STANDARDS OF LEARNING

The following persons spoke during public hearing: Mack Dameron, Darryl Waller, and McLeod Parker. The public hearing adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Mr. Jackson adjourned the meeting at 12:09 p.m.

Secretary

President