COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Board of Education Agenda

Date of Meeting: March 24, 2011       Time: 9 a.m.
Location: Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, James Monroe Building
          101 North 14th Street, Richmond, Virginia

9:00 a.m. FULL BOARD CONVENES

Moment of Silence

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes of the February 17, 2011, Meeting of the Board

Public Comment

Action/Discussion Items

A. Final Review of Proposed Revisions to Virginia School Bus Specifications

B. Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Cut Score and Implementation Dates for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test

C. Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Cut Score for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment

D. Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Approve a Cut Score on the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment


F. Final Review of Guidelines to Implement the Provisions of Section 22.1-302(A) of the Code of Virginia Pertaining to the Employment of Substitute Teachers

G. Final Review of Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process
Action/Discussion Items (continued)

H. Final Review of Proposed *Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools*

I. First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Alexandria City Public Schools

J. First Review of a Request for Continuation of an Alternative Accreditation Plan from Danville City Public Schools for J. M. Langston Focus School

K. First Review of a Request for Continuation of an Alternative Plan from Richmond City Public Schools for Richmond Alternative School

L. First Review of Revised *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers and Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers*

M. First Review of Process for State Approval of Textbooks for K-12 English/Language Arts and K-12 Science

Report

N. Report on Legislative and Budget Actions by the 2011 General Assembly

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

ADJOURNMENT

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT OF BUSINESS SESSION:

- Public Hearing on the Proposed Revisions to the *Regulations Governing Career and Technical Education* (8 VAC 20-120-10 et seq.)
PUBLIC NOTICE

The Board of Education members will meet for dinner at 6:30 p.m. at the Crowne Plaza Hotel on Wednesday, March 23, 2011. Items for the Board agenda may be discussed informally at that dinner. No votes will be taken, and it is open to the public. The Board president reserves the right to change the times listed on this agenda depending upon the time constraints during the meeting.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

1. The Board of Education is pleased to receive public comment at each of its regular monthly meetings. In order to allow the Board sufficient time for its other business, the total time allotted to public comment will generally be limited to thirty (30) minutes. Individuals seeking to speak to the Board will be allotted three (3) minutes each.

2. Those wishing to speak to the Board should contact Dr. Margaret Roberts, Executive Assistant for Board Relations at (804) 225-2924. Normally, speakers will be scheduled in the order that their requests are received until the entire allotted time slot has been used. Where issues involving a variety of views are presented before the Board, the Board reserves the right to allocate the time available so as to ensure that the Board hears from different points of view on any particular issue.

3. Speakers are urged to contact Dr. Roberts in advance of the meeting. Because of time limitations, those persons who have not previously registered to speak prior to the day of the Board meeting cannot be assured that they will have an opportunity to appear before the Board.

4. In order to make the limited time available most effective, speakers are urged to provide multiple written copies of their comments or other material amplifying their views.
Topic: Final Review of Proposed Revisions to Virginia School Bus Specifications

Presenter: Mr. Kent C. Dickey, Deputy Superintendent for Finance and Operations

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2025  E-Mail Address: Kent.Dickey@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)
___ Board review required by
      ___ State or federal law or regulation
      ___ Board of Education regulation
      ___ Other: _____________________

___ Action requested at this meeting  ___ Action requested at future meeting:

Previous Review/Action:

___ No previous board review/action
___ Previous review/action
date January 13, 2011
action First Review

Background Information:

The Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation, as approved in January 2004, deleted the sections that detailed the technical specifications for school buses and made them a separate document (Virginia School Bus Specifications) that requires periodic approval by the Board of Education. This permits the Department of Education to revise and update the bus specifications more efficiently than would be permitted under the process for revising regulations. It also permits the specifications to be updated more frequently to recognize new practices and technology. The Virginia School Bus Specifications are presented to the Board of Education for approval as necessary. The last revisions to the specifications were approved by the Board on September 17, 2009. The design and manufacture of school buses and school activity buses must conform to the specifications in effect on the date of procurement by school divisions.

The revised specifications proposed in this item represent changes that are needed at this time, and reflect changes to increase the safety and efficiency of bus components and equipment, to incorporate recommendations from the latest national specifications document, and to provide clarification. Other changes were made for consistency with requirements in the Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation and the Code of Virginia. None of the proposed changes represent significant deviations from standard industry practices. All of the recommended specifications comply with the safety requirements of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
The Board accepted proposed school bus specifications for first review at its January 13, 2011, meeting, and they were posted on the Department’s Web site for 30 days to provide school divisions and other interested parties the opportunity to review them and offer comments. The first review version of the specifications were developed in consultation with the department’s Specifications Committee, which is comprised of pupil transportation representatives from school divisions across the state.

**Summary of Major Elements:**

Public comments were received from one school division and one bus vendor. The comments and recommended actions are summarized in Attachment A. Comments dealt mainly with clarifications or technical component changes. The full specifications document with proposed changes is shown in Attachment B. Proposed additions to the specifications are underlined and proposed deletions are indicated by strikethroughs.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the proposed *Virginia School Bus Specifications*.

**Impact on Resources:**

There is no impact on DOE’s resources to initiate these specifications. It is not anticipated that the proposed changes to the specifications will impose significant costs or administrative burdens on school divisions.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

No additional review or action is needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>VDOE Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Page 6**  
**13. Exhaust System** | **Micro Bird**  
“Pg 13. Exhaust System”  
Paragraph E. and H. seems to be contradictory.  
Paragraph E seems to prevent the tailpipe to exit to the left of the emergency door but paragraph H allows it.  
Could the tailpipe exit to the left side of the frame and to the left or right side of the rear [E]mergency door? | There is no contradiction. Paragraph E is specific to those vehicles that have a “special service entrance.” |
| **Page 20**  
**B. Rear Emergency Door Type B, C, and D vehicles.** | **Micro Bird**  
“Pg 20 B. Rear Emergency Door Type B C and D vehicles.”  
This section seems to apply only to Type B, C, and D vehicles, thus item 4 seems to also apply to Type A vehicles.  
We suggest to have a general section applicable to all emergency doors plus 1 separate section for specific requirements applicable to Type B, C and D vehicles and one section for Type A.” | Strike “Type A” reference from paragraph B. 4.  
. . . The lower portion of the rear emergency door on Types A, B, C and D vehicles shall be equipped with a minimum of 240 350 square inches of approved safety glazing. . . .  
And add reference to “Type A” in new paragraph C.3  
The lower portion of the rear emergency door shall be equipped with a minimum of 350 square inches of approved safety glazing. |
Public Comment and Proposed Changes to *Virginia School Bus Specifications*, March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>VDOE Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Security locking system.</td>
<td>Micro Bird “Pg 22 D. Security locking system. A locking system to lock the emergency door(s) or roof hatch(es) exists and the entrance door may be installed. I think the word “exists” should have read “exits”. Strike word “identification”</td>
<td>Concur with public comment. D. Security locking system. 1. A locking system to lock the emergency door(s) or roof hatch(es) <strong>exists</strong> and the entrance door may be installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.49. Heaters. Heating and Air Conditioning Systems</td>
<td>Micro Bird “Pg 27 Heating and air conditioning systems Paragraph F. To make it more clear and consistent with the chassis heating system specification, it could read: F. Water circulation cut-off valves in the supply and return lines, a minimum of ¾ inch diameter (except Type A), shall be at or near the engine. ...”</td>
<td>Concur with public comment. <strong>48.49. Heaters. Heating and Air Conditioning Systems</strong> F. Water circulation cut-off valves in the supply and return lines, a minimum of ¾ inch diameter (except Type A), shall be at or near the engine. A water flow-regulating valve in the pressure line for convenient operation by the driver is also required. All valves shall be ¼ turn ball type. The driver and passenger heaters may operate independently of each other for maximum comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Item</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>VDOE Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 46</td>
<td>Micro Bird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Ventilation and Air Conditioning.</td>
<td>“Pg 46 D.C. Auxiliary fans shall meet the following requirements: 1. Fans for left and right sides of the windshield shall be placed in a location where they can be adjusted for maximum effectiveness and where they do not obstruct vision to any mirror. Note: Type A buses may be equipped with one fan; 2. Fans shall have 6-inch (nominal) diameter; and 3. Fan blades shall be enclosed in a protective cage. Each fan shall be controlled by a separate switch. This seems to be inconsistent with p. 20 Defroster which says: D. Exception: Type A vehicle, auxiliary fan is not required. Is an auxiliary fan optional or mandatory in type A vehicle?”</td>
<td>Type A school buses “may be equipped with one fan.” They are not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Auxiliary fans shall meet the following requirements: 1. Fans for left and right sides of the windshield shall be placed in a location where they can be adjusted for maximum effectiveness and where they do not obstruct vision to any mirror. Note: Type A buses may be equipped with one fan;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.43. Defrosters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Exception: Type A vehicle, auxiliary fan is not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Comment and Proposed Changes to *Virginia School Bus Specifications*, March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>VDOE Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 47</strong></td>
<td><strong>76. Windshield and Windows.</strong></td>
<td>Leave as in current specifications. Tint as specified in specifications includes that of aftermarket vendors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. All glass in windshield, windows, and doors shall be of approved safety glass, so mounted that permanent mark is visible, and of sufficient quality to prevent distortion of view in any direction. Windshield shall be AS1 and all other glass shall be AS2.

B. Plastic glazing material of a thickness comparable to AS2 glass, meeting ANSI Standard Z 26.1 and FMVSS 205 (*Glazing Materials*), 49 CFR § 571.205, may be used in side windows behind the driver’s compartment.

---

**Micro Bird**  
"Pg 47 Windshield and windows  
A... Windshield shall be AS1 and all other glass shall be AS2.  
and  
E. Approved tinted glass or plastic glazing material may be used consistent with the Code of Virginia.

One of the characteristics of an AS2 glass is that it shall show a regular luminous transmittance of not less than 70 % which is actually a clear glass (non tinted). This is the AS rating for windows required for driving visibility (windshield and windows to the left and right of the driver).

Paragraph A and E are in conflict. A glass cannot be AS2 rated and tinted at the same time. If the intent is to allow passenger compartment windows to be tinted:

We suggest that windows installed at level requisite for driving visibility (left side driver’s door, entrance door and window installed forward the entrance door) shall be AS2, and all other window in the passenger’s compartment shall be AS3.

Both AS2 and AS3 refers to tempered glass but AS3 may be tinted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>VDOE Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 48</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79. Wiring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Circuits</td>
<td><strong>Micro Bird</strong></td>
<td>Concur with public comment. Change to read:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wiring shall be arranged in at least 12 regular circuits as follows:</td>
<td>Pg 48 Wiring</td>
<td>B. Circuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Booster pump</td>
<td>l. Booster pump</td>
<td>1. Wiring shall be arranged in at least 12 regular circuits as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l. Booster pump (Type A exempt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80. Activity Buses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Micro Bird</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concur with public comment. Delete item E. 2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Seats.</td>
<td>Pg 50-51</td>
<td>E. Seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Other types of seats and increased spacing, which meet all regulations of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection) and 302 (Flammability of Interior Materials) may be used in lieu of regular school bus seats.</td>
<td>Paragraph 1 and 2 are redundant. Paragraph 2 may be deleted.</td>
<td>1. Other types of seats and increased spacing, which meet all regulations of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection) and 302 (Flammability of Interior Materials) may be used in lieu of regular school bus seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seating on activity buses: Other types of seats and increased spacing may be used provided all provisions of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection), 49 CFR §571.222, are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Seating on activity buses: Other types of seats and increased spacing may be used provided all provisions of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection), 49 CFR §571.222, are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Comment and Proposed Changes to *Virginia School Bus Specifications*, March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Item</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>VDOE Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 52</strong> 85. Heaters.</td>
<td><strong>Micro Bird</strong> p. 52</td>
<td>Leave as currently outlined in specifications. Item 85 allows for an exception to the use of 60,000 BTU heaters on lift buses in differing capacities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. An additional heater shall be installed in the rear portion of the bus behind wheel wells as required in Item 48 I, except a 50,000 minimum BTU heater may be used in bodies originally designed for 31-66 passenger capacity and 34,000 minimum BTU heaters may be used in bodies of 30 passengers or less. Hose to rear heater, when under body shall be encased in metal tube. |

**Shenandoah County Public Schools**

Fans, it would be great to have each bus come with two fans, no additional charge. Leave as in current specifications. The current requirement is for two fans on all buses except type A.

### Page 1 2. Alternator.

**Shenandoah County Public Schools**

2. Alternator (Our thoughts are that all buses should come with the minimum 200 Amp Alternator). We are forced to upgrade and after we replace with the 200 Amp we are seeing a longer life cycle. Leave as in current specifications. The alternator ampere is a minimum requirement and the school division may increase amperes as needed.

### Page 46 73. Ventilation and Air Conditioning.

**Shenandoah County Public Schools**

Fans, it would be great to have each bus come with two fans, no additional charge. Leave as in current specifications. The current requirement is for two fans on all buses except type A.
Virginia School Bus Specifications

Section 1
Notice/General Information

These Specifications define certain, but not all, components required on a school bus (body and chassis) purchased by Virginia public school divisions.

Any variation from the Specifications, in the form of additional equipment or changes in style of equipment, without prior approval of the Pupil Transportation Service, Department of Education, is prohibited.

The responsibility for compliance with these school bus Specifications rests with dealers and manufacturers. If any dealers or manufacturers sell school bus vehicles that do not conform to any or all of these Specifications, a general notice will be sent to all school divisions advising that equipment supplied by such dealer or manufacturer will be disapproved for school transportation until further notice. A copy of the notice will be sent to the dealer or manufacturer and will remain in effect until full compliance by the dealer or manufacturer is assured.
General Information

1. All public school buses (bodies and chassis) and school activity buses used to transport children to and from school or school-related events purchased, leased or contracted for by any public school board in Virginia, on or after the effective date of this document, as specified in 8VAC20-70-460, shall:
   a. Meet or exceed the minimum requirements of these Specifications;
   b. Meet all applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; and,
   c. Meet or exceed the current National School Transportation Specifications and Procedures (also referred to herein as the National Specifications) except when in conflict with the requirements herein. In such cases, the requirements specified in this document shall prevail.

2. The requirements specified herein are the minimum requirements for school buses in Virginia. The date used to determine the applicability of these Specifications shall be defined as the date the vendor receives the purchase order or signs a valid sales contract with the purchaser.

3. Any variation from the Specifications, in the form of additional equipment or changes in style of equipment, without prior approval of the Department of Education (DOE), is prohibited.

4. DOE may request the school bus (body and chassis) manufacturer to certify that its product meets these minimum standards on items which are not covered by FMVSS certification requirements of 49 CFR, Part 567, Certification.
SCHOOL BUS DEFINITIONS

TYPE A:

Type “A” school bus is a conversion bus constructed utilizing a cutaway front-section vehicle with a left side driver’s door. This definition includes two classifications: Type A1, with Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) 14,500 pounds or less; and Type A2 with a GVWR greater than 14,500 pounds and less than or equal to 21,500 pounds.

TYPE B:

Type “B” school bus is constructed utilizing a body on a stripped chassis. The entrance door is behind the front wheels. This definition includes two classifications: Type B1, with a GVWR of 10,000 pounds or less, designed for carrying more than 10 persons and Type B2, with a GVWR greater than 10,000 pounds.

TYPE C:

Type “C” (“Conventional”) school bus is a body installed upon a flat-back cowl chassis with a hood and fenders. This definition includes two classifications: Type C1, with a GVWR range of 17,500 pounds and a design seating capacity range from 16 to 30 persons; and Type C2 with a GVWR of more than 21,500 pounds, designed for carrying more than 30 persons. The engine is in front of the windshield and the entrance door is behind the front wheels. Both Type C1 and Type C2 must be equipped with dual rear tires.

TYPE D:

Type “D” (“Transit”) school bus means a bus with a body constructed using a stripped chassis. The entrance door is ahead of the front wheels. The bus is also known as a rear engine or front engine transit style school bus.
“Multifunction School Activity Bus (MFSAB)” (school activity bus) means a school bus whose purposes do not include transporting students to and from home or school bus stops, as defined in 49 CFR 571.3. This subcategory of school bus meets all FMVSS for school buses except the traffic control devices, identification, color, use of cruise control, and seating requirements (see item 80).
Section 2

Virginia School Bus Specifications
SPECIFICATIONS FOR SCHOOL BUSES

THE BUS CHASSIS

1. Air Cleaner.
   A. The engine intake air cleaner system shall be furnished and properly installed by the chassis manufacturer to meet the engine manufacturer’s specifications.
   B. An air cleaner restriction indicator shall be furnished and installed by chassis manufacturer.

2. Alternator.
   A. All buses shall be equipped with a heavy duty truck or bus type alternator having a minimum output rating of 130 amperes for Type A buses, and 160 amperes for Type B and above, alternator shall be capable of producing a minimum of 50 percent of its maximum rated output at the engine manufacturer’s recommended idle speed.
   B. Buses equipped with electrically powered wheelchair lift, air conditioning or other accessories may be equipped with a device that monitors the electrical system voltage and advances the engine idle speed when the voltage drops to, or below, a pre-set level.
   C. Belt drive shall be capable of handling the rated capacity of the alternator with no detrimental effect on other driven components. Direct/gear-drive alternator is permissible in lieu of belt drive.

3. Axles.
   A. The front and rear axle and suspension systems shall have a gross axle weight rating at ground commensurate with the respective front and rear weight loads that will be imposed by the bus.
   B. Rear axle shall be single speed, full-floating type.

4. Battery.
   A. The storage batteries shall have minimum cold cranking capacity rating (cold cranking amps) equal to the cranking current required for 30 seconds at 0 degrees Fahrenheit and a minimum reserve capacity rating of 120
minutes at 24 \( \text{amps} \). Higher capacities may be required, depending upon optional equipment and local environmental conditions.

B. Batteries shall be mounted in a slide out tray on the left side of the body in a compartment designed for storage batteries. When in the stored position, the tray shall be retained by a securing mechanism capable of holding the tray [with battery(ies)] in position when subjected to a 5g load from any direction. The battery compartment door or cover if separate from the tray shall be hinged at the front or top. It shall be secured by a positive operated latching system or other type fastener. The door may be an integral part of the battery slide tray. The door or cover must fit tightly to the body, and not present sharp edges or snagging points. Battery cables shall meet SAE requirements. Battery cables shall be of sufficient length to allow the battery tray to fully extend.

C. Exception: Type A units – Batteries may be located in standard manufacturer’s position.

D. Buses may be equipped with a battery shut-off switch. The switch is to be placed in a location not readily accessible to the driver or passengers.

5. Brakes.

A. Four-wheel brakes, adequate at all times to control bus when fully loaded, shall be provided in accordance with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

B. The chassis brake system shall conform to the provisions of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) 105 (Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems), 106 (Brake Hoses), and 121 (Air Brake Systems) as applicable.

C. Chassis shall be equipped with auxiliary brakes capable of holding vehicle on any grade on which it is operated under any conditions of loading on a surface free from snow or ice. Operating controls of such auxiliary brakes shall be independent of operating controls of service brakes.

D. Buses having full compressed air systems shall be equipped with a minimum 13.2 cfm engine oil-fed air compressor.
   1. Air supply for air compressor shall be taken from the clean side of engine air cleaner system.
   2. A desiccant type air dryer with automatic purge and drain cycle and a heating element shall be installed on all air brake buses.
3. Air brake systems shall include system for anti-compounding of the service and parking brakes.

E. Buses using hydraulic brakes shall have power assist brakes. Hydraulic line pressure shall not exceed recommendation of chassis or brake manufacturer.


A. The front bumper on buses of Type A-2 (with GVWR greater than 14,500 pounds), Type B, Type C, and Type D shall be pressed steel channel painted black at least 3/16 inches thick and not less than 8 inches wide (high). It shall extend beyond the forward-most part of the body, grille, hood and fenders and shall extend to the outer edges of the fenders at the bumper’s top line. Type A buses having a GVWR of 14,500 pounds or less may be equipped with an OEM-supplied front bumper. The front bumper shall be of sufficient strength to permit being pushed by another vehicle on a smooth surface with a 5 degree (8.7 percent) grade, without permanent distortion. The contact point on the front bumper is intended to be between the frame rails, with as wide a contact area as possible. If the front bumper is used for lifting, the contact points shall be under the bumper attachments to the frame rail brackets unless the manufacturer specifies different lifting points in the owner’s manual. Contact and lifting pressures should be applied simultaneously at both lifting points.

B. The front bumper shall be of sufficient strength to permit pushing a vehicle of equal gross vehicle weight, per Section B, without permanent distortion to the bumper, chassis or body.

C. The bumper shall be designed or reinforced so that it will not deform when the bus is lifted by a chain that is passed under the bumper (or through the bumper if holes are provided for this purpose) and attached to both tow hooks/eyes. For the purpose of meeting this specification, the bus shall be empty and positioned on a level, hard surface and both tow hooks/eyes shall share the load equally.

A. Front bumper shall be heavy-duty, channel steel at least eight inches in height with 3/16-inch thickness, painted black, and shall be furnished by chassis manufacturer as part of chassis.

B. Front bumper shall extend to outer edges of fenders at bumper top line (to assure maximum fender protection) and be of sufficient strength to permit pushing, lifting or towing without permanent distortion to bumper, chassis, or body.

C. Exceptions:
1. Type A vehicles having a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) of 14,500 pounds or less—bumper shall be manufacturer’s standard painted black.

2. Type D vehicles—same as above, except that the front bumper shall be furnished by body manufacturer.

3. Activity vehicles—may be painted a different color other than black. (See Item 80.)

7. Clutch.
   A. Torque capacity shall be equal to or greater than the engine torque output. Clutch facing shall be non-asbestos.
   B. A starter interlock shall be installed to prevent actuation of the starter if the clutch pedal is not depressed.

8. Color.
   A. Chassis, including wheels, front bumper, rails and lettering shall be black. Backs of mirrors should be non-gloss black. The balance of the bus should be yellow.
   B. Hood, cowl, and fenders shall be National School Bus Yellow (NSBY).
   C. All paint shall meet the lead-free standards.
   D. Exception: Activity vehicles shall not be painted NSBY. (See Item 80.)

9. Drive Shaft.
   A. Drive shaft shall be protected by metal guard or guards to prevent it from whipping through floor or dropping to ground if broken.

10. Electrical System.
    A. Battery. See Item 4.
    B. Alternator. See Item 2.
    C. Lights and signals. See Item 20, 21.
    D. Wiring. See Item 79.
E. Power terminal. Chassis manufacturer shall provide an electric power source terminal for bus body power connection. Wiring from the power source in wiring terminal shall have a current carrying capacity of 125 amperes continuous (minimum 4 gauge wire). If the bus is to be equipped with Air Conditioning or Wheelchair Lift, current carrying capacity shall be increased to 150 amperes continuous.

This conductor shall be routed to cover the least distance practicable between points of termination. It should be of continuous size protected by fusible links, fuses, circuit breakers, or a resettable electronic circuit protection device, no more than 24 inches from the battery. The terminal shall be of the single post-type, minimum of one-fourth inch (1/4”) stud and located in an accessible location for service, subject to approval of the Department of Education.

F. Light terminal. The chassis manufacturer shall provide a wire terminal adjacent to or in the under dash area of the left side panel accessible to the body company for connection of rear brake lights, tail lights, turn signal lights, and back-up lights. A terminal strip consisting of individual terminals with each terminal properly identified shall be provided to meet this requirement.

G. Fuse. All fuses shall be located in fuse block and properly identified for the circuit protected.

H. Each chassis circuit shall be color-coded and a diagram of the circuits shall be included with the chassis.

I. Wiring harness. All conductors from the alternator to the battery shall be continuous in length. The conductors shall be sized to provide at least a 25 percent greater current carrying capacity than the design output of the alternator (minimum 4 gauge wire). The conductor between the alternator and the battery shall be routed in a manner that will provide the least distance between points of termination. A separate ground conductor from alternator to engine shall be provided (minimum four-gauge).

J. Buses using multiplexed electrical systems may meet the intent of these specifications without the use of specified equipment, subject to the approval of the Department of Education.

11. **Electronic Engine Speed Limiter.**

A. An electronic engine speed limiter shall be provided and set to limit engine speed not to exceed the maximum revolutions per minute as recommended by the engine manufacturer. Bus road speed shall not exceed a maximum of 60 miles per hour.
12. Engine.

A. The engine shall be of the internal-combustion, four-stroke cycle type.

B. All gasoline-powered buses shall have an automatic fire extinguisher suppression system in the engine compartment. (See item 15. Fire Suppression Systems.)


A. Exhaust pipe, muffler, after treatment system, and tail pipe shall be outside the bus body and attached to the chassis so that any other chassis component is not damaged.

B. Tail pipe shall be constructed of seamless or electrically welded tubing of 16-gauge steel or equivalent.

C. Size of tail pipe shall not be reduced after it leaves muffler.

D. Exhaust system shall be properly insulated from fuel tank and tank connections by securely attached metal shield at any point where it is 12 inches or less from tank or tank connections.

E. Muffler shall be constructed of corrosion-resistant material.

F. Types A and B chassis may be furnished with the manufacturer’s standard tail pipe configuration.

G. Exhaust shall exit to the rear and opposite side of vehicles with special service entrances. The exhaust on Type A shall exit behind the rear wheel and to the opposite side of the special service entrance.

H. The tail pipe and after treatment system shall be constructed of 16-gauge steel tubing of equal diameter.

I. The tail pipe may be flush with, or shall not extend more than 2 inches beyond, the perimeter of the body for side-exit pipe or the bumper for rear-exit pipe. The exhaust system shall be designed such that exhaust gas will not be trapped under the body of the bus.

J. The tail pipe shall exit to the left or right of the emergency exit door in the rear of the vehicle or to the left side of the bus in front of or behind the rear drive axle. The tail pipe shall not exit beneath any fuel filler location, emergency door or lift door.
14. Fenders, Front.

A. Total spread of outer edges of front fenders, measured at fender line, shall exceed total spread of front tires when front wheels are in straight-ahead position.

B. Front fenders shall be properly braced and free from any body attachment.

15. Fire Suppression Systems

A. All gasoline-powered school buses shall have an automatic fire suppression system in the engine compartment. The manufacturer may provide an automatic fire extinguisher system in the engine compartment.

B. Fire suppression system nozzles shall be located in the engine compartment, under the bus, in the electrical panel or under the dash, but they shall not be located in the passenger compartment. The system must include a lamp or buzzer to alert the driver that the system has been activated.

C. All non gasoline-powered school buses may be equipped with a fire suppression system as an option.

16. Frame.

A. Frame lengths shall be established in accordance with the design criteria for the complete vehicle.

B. Making holes in top or bottom flanges or side units of the frame and welding to the frame shall not be permitted except as provided or accepted by the chassis manufacturer.

C. Frames shall not be modified for the purpose of extending the wheel base.

D. Any secondary manufacturer that modifies the original chassis frame shall provide a warranty at least equal to the warranty offered by the original equipment manufacturer (OEM), and shall certify that the modification and other parts or equipment affected by the modification shall be free from defects in material and workmanship under normal use and service intended by the OEM.

17. Fuel Tank.

A. Fuel tank shall be rated for the appropriate passenger capacity of the vehicle, per manufacture and FMVSS, but shall not be less than 30 gallons. The tank shall be filled and vented to the outside of the body and
the fuel filler should be placed on the right side in a location where accidental fuel spillage will not drop or drain on any part of the exhaust system.

B. Fuel lines shall be mounted to the chassis frame in such a manner that the frame provides the maximum possible protection from damage.

C. Fuel tank may be mounted between the frame rails or outboard on the right side of the vehicle.

D. The actual draw capacity of each fuel tank shall be a minimum of 83 percent of the tank capacity.

E. Exception: Type A Vehicles – fuel tank shall be manufacturer’s standard, mounted, filled, and vented outside of body. Special needs buses will allow for left side fuel filler.

F. Installation of alternative fuel tanks and fuel systems shall comply with all applicable Federal Motor Vehicles Safety Standards (FMVSS), CFR’s, all applicable fire codes, and standards of the National Fire Protection Association.

47.18. Heating System, provision for.

A. The chassis engine shall have plugged openings for the purpose of supplying hot water for the bus heating system. The opening shall be suitable for attaching ¾ inch pipe thread/hose connector. The engine shall be capable of supplying water having a temperature of at least 170°F at a flow rate of 50 pounds per minute at the return end of 30 feet of one-inch inside diameter automotive hot water heater hose. (SBMTC School Bus Manufacturers Technical Council (SBMTC) -001 Standard Code for Testing and Rating Automotive Bus Hot Water Heating and Ventilating Equipment.)

B. Exception: Type A buses shall be manufacturer’s standard.


A. The bus shall be equipped with a horn(s) of standard make with the horn(s) capable of producing a complex sound in bands of audio frequencies between 250 and 2,000 cycles per second, and tested in accordance with SAE J377, Horn – Forward Warning – Electric – Performance, Test, and Application.
49.20. Instrument and Instrument Panel.

A. Chassis shall be equipped with the following instruments and gauges:
   1. Speedometer which will show speed;
   2. Odometer which will show accrued mileage, including tenths of miles, tenths of miles can be accrued with trip odometer;
   3. Ammeter or voltmeter with graduated scale;
   4. Oil pressure gauge;
   5. Water temperature gauge;
   6. Fuel gauge;
   7. Upper- High beam headlamp indicator; and
   8. Tachometer.

B. All instruments or gauges shall be mounted on instrument panel in such manner that each is clearly visible to driver in normal seated position. Lights in lieu of gauges are not acceptable.

C. Exception: Type A vehicles – the ammeter, or voltmeter and its wiring are to be compatible with generating capacity. Tachometer is not required.

D. Multi-function gauges must have prior approval of the Department of Education.


A. Each chassis shall be equipped with not less than two headlights – beam controlled, and stop and tail lights, and two front turn signal lamps mounted on front fenders. Front turn signal lamps on Type D bodies shall be the same as the rear turn signals unless the turn signals are incorporated as a part of the headlight assemblies or otherwise incorporated into the front end design as approved by the Department of Education.

B. Lights shall be protected by fuse or circuit breakers.

C. Self-canceling directional signal switch shall be installed by the chassis manufacturer. The directional signals shall activate only when ignition is in “on” position.
D. Daytime Running Lights (DRL) are required.

E. Brake air pressure gauge (air brakes), brake indicator lamp (vacuum/hydraulic brakes), or brake indicator lamp (hydraulic/hydraulic) are required.

F. Turn signal indicator is required.

G. Glow-plug indicator lamp is required, where appropriate.

H. Instruments and controls must be illuminated as required by FMVSS 101 (Controls and Displays).

24-22. Oil Filter.

A. An oil filter with a replaceable element shall be provided and connected by flexible oil lines if it is not a built-in or an engine-mounted design. The oil filter shall have a capacity in accordance with the engine manufacturer’s recommendation.

22-23. Openings.

A. All openings in floorboard or firewall between chassis and passenger-carrying compartment, such as for gearshift lever and auxiliary brake lever, shall be sealed.


A. Gross vehicle weight (GVW) (i.e., wet weight, plus body weight, plus driver’s weight of 150 pounds, plus weight of maximum seated pupil load based on not less than 120 pounds per pupil) shall not exceed maximum gross vehicle weight rating as established by manufacturer.

B. Actual GVW shall not exceed the chassis manufacturer’s GVWR for the chassis, nor shall the actual weight carried on any axle exceed the chassis manufacturer’s Gross Axle Weight Rating (GAWR).

C. The manufacturer’s GVWR for a particular school bus shall be furnished by manufacturers in duplicate (unless more copies are requested) to the state agency having student transportation jurisdiction. The state agency shall, in turn, transmit such ratings to other state agencies responsible for development or enforcement of state standards for school buses.
24.25. Retarder System (Optional).
   A. A retarder system, if used, shall limit the speed of a fully loaded school bus to 19.0 mph on a 7 percent grade for 3.6 miles.

   A. Bus shall be equipped with front and rear double-acting shock absorbers compatible with manufacturer’s rated axle capacity.

26.27. Springs.
   A. Springs or suspension assemblies shall be of ample resiliency under all load conditions and of adequate strength to sustain loaded bus without evidence of overload.
   B. Springs or suspension assemblies shall be designed to carry their proportional share of gross vehicle weight.
   C. Rear springs shall be of progressive, variable, parabolic or air ride type.
   D. Stationary eye of the front spring shall be protected by full wrapper leaf in addition to main leaf.
   E. The capacity of springs or suspension assemblies shall be commensurate with the chassis manufacturer’s GVWR and chassis specification minimums.
   F. Exception: Type A vehicles – springs that are regular equipment on vehicle to be purchased may be used.

27.28. Steering Gear.
   A. Steering gear shall be approved by chassis manufacturer and designed to assure safe and accurate performance when vehicle is operated with maximum load and maximum speed.
   B. No changes shall be made in steering apparatus that are not approved by chassis manufacturer.
   C. There shall be clearance of at least two inches between steering wheel and cowl instrument panel, windshield, or any other surface.
   D. Power steering is required and shall be of the integral type with integral valves.
E. The steering system shall be designed to provide a means for lubrication of all wear-points that are not permanently lubricated.

28.29. Tires and Rims.

A. Tire and rim sizes, based upon current standards of the Tire and Rim Association of America, Inc. (TRA), shall be required.

B. Total weight imposed on any tire shall not be above the current standard of the TRA.

C. Dual rear tires shall be provided on all vehicles.

D. All tires on given vehicles shall be of the same size and shall meet or exceed the load range rating of the TRA for required GAWR.

E. Spare tire, if required, shall be suitably mounted in accessible location outside passenger compartment.

29.30. Towing Attachment Points.

A. Front and/or rear towing devices (i.e., tow hooks, tow eyes, or other designated towing attachment points) shall be furnished to assist in the retrieval of buses that are stuck and/or for towing buses when a wrecker with a “wheel lift” or an “axle lift” is not available or cannot be applied to the towed vehicle.

B. Towing devices shall be attached to the chassis frame either by the chassis manufacturer or in accordance with the chassis manufacturer’s specifications.

C. Each rear towing device shall have a strength rating of 13,500 pounds each for a combined rating of 27,000 pounds with the force applied in the rearward direction, parallel to the ground, and parallel to the longitudinal axis of the chassis frame rail.

D. The towing devices shall be mounted such that they do not project forward of the front bumper or rearward of the rear bumper.

Note: Type A buses are exempt from this requirement for front tow hooks or eyes due to built-in crush zones. Tow eyes or hooks shall be furnished and attached so they do not project beyond the front bumper.
30.31. Transmission.

A. Mechanical type transmission shall be synchromesh except first and reverse gears. Its design shall provide not less than four forward and one reverse speeds. With five-speed transmission, fifth gear shall be direct.

B. Automatic transmissions are permissible when equipped with a parking pawl or approved parking brake system.

C. Automatic transmissions incorporating a parking pawl shall have a transmission shifter interlock controlled by the application of the service brake to prohibit accidental engagement of the transmission. All non-parking pawl transmissions shall incorporate a park brake interlock that requires the service brake to be applied to allow release of the parking brake.

31.32. Turning Radius.

A. Chassis with a wheel base of 264 inches or less shall have a right and left turning radius of not more than 42 ½ feet, curb to curb measurement.

B. Chassis with a wheel base over 264 inches shall have a right and left turning radius of not more than 44 ½ feet curb to curb measurement.

32.33. Weight Distribution.

A. Shall be established by chassis manufacturers’ engineering department.

33.34. Wheels.

A. Disc wheels are required.

THE BUS BODY

34.35. Aisle.

A. Minimum clearance of all aisles, including aisle (or passageway between seats) leading to emergency door shall be 12 inches. Aisles shall be unobstructed at all times.

B. Aisle supports of seat backs shall meet FMVSS 222.

35.36. Back-up Alarm.

A. An automatic audible alarm shall be installed behind the rear axle and shall comply with the published Backup Alarm Standards (SAE J994b), providing a minimum of 112 dBA, or shall have a variable volume feature.
that allows the alarm to vary from 87 dBA to 112 dBA sound level, staying at least 5 dBA above the ambient noise level.


A. Sizes are based on knee-room clearance between rows of forward-facing seats, overall width, center aisle width, and average rump width.

37.38. Bumper, Rear.

A. Rear bumper shall be of pressed steel channel at least 3/16 inch by 9 ½ inches.

B. It shall be wrapped around back corners of bus. It shall extend forward at least 12 inches, measured from rear-most point of body at floor line.

C. Bumper shall be attached to chassis frame in such manner that it may be easily removed, shall be so braced as to develop full strength of bumper section from rear or side impact, and shall be so attached as to prevent hitching of rides.

D. Rear bumper shall extend beyond rear-most part of body surface at least one inch, measured at floor line.

E. Exception: Type A vehicles – Rear bumper shall be standard type furnished by chassis manufacturer as part of chassis on conversions. Body manufacturer will furnish bumper on cutaway chassis.


A. School bus body including hood, cowl, external speakers and fenders shall be painted uniform color – National School Bus Yellow (NSBY). Prior to the application of the finish coats to the bus body, hood and cowl, external speakers and fenders, all surfaces shall be cleaned of grease, foreign matter, excessive body caulking, sealing material and treated as per paint manufacturer’s recommendation for proper adhesion and painted NSBY.

B. Grill shall be NSBY, silver, or gray, if painted; otherwise it shall be chrome or anodized aluminum.

C. Rear bumper, body trim, and rub rails shall be painted black. Must meet color requirements specific to bus. (See “Bus Chassis” Item 8 for specific specifications.)
D. The roof of the bus may be painted white extending down to the drip rails on the sides of the body except that front and rear roof caps shall remain NSBY.

E. All paint shall meet the lead-free standards.

F. Paint shall be applied for a total dry thickness of at least 1.8 mils over all painted surfaces.

Exception: Activity vehicle bus – Activity vehicle bus shall not be painted NSBY. Bumpers, body trim and rub rails may be painted a different color other than black. (See Item 80.)

G. Retro-reflective tape. Material shall be Type V or better, as determined by the American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM: D4956-90). “Standard specifications for reflective sheeting for traffic control.”

1. The rear of the bus body shall be marked with strips of retro-reflective NSBY material to outline the perimeter of the back of the bus using material which conforms with the requirements of FMVSS 131 (School Bus Pedestrian Safety Devices, Table 1). The perimeter marking of rear emergency exits per FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release), and/or the use of retro reflective “SCHOOL BUS” signs partially accomplishes the objective of this requirement. To complete the perimeter marking of the back of the bus, strips of at least 1 ¾ inch retro-reflective NSBY material a minimum of 1” and a maximum of 2” in width, shall be applied horizontally above the rear windows and above the rear bumper, extending from the rear emergency exit perimeter, marking outward to the left and right rear corners of the bus. Vertical strips shall be applied at the corners connecting these horizontal strips.

2. “SCHOOL BUS” signs shall be marked with retro reflective NSBY material comprising background for lettering of the front and/or rear “SCHOOL BUS” signs.

3. Sides of the bus body shall be marked with at least 1 ¾ inch a minimum of 1” and a maximum of 2” in width retro reflective NSBY material, extending the length of the bus body and located (vertically) between the floor line and the beltline.


A. Communication systems. If communication systems are used on school buses, the systems shall be subject to written policies adopted by the local
school board. Installation shall be subject to the Department of Education fleet assessment.

1. The radio mounting shall be in the driver’s compartment in a safe, secure location, so as not to interfere with normal bus operation.

2. Mounting shall be permanent. Temporary mountings will not be acceptable.

3. Wiring shall be protected by a proper fuse or circuit breaker and permanently connected to an accessory circuit shut off by ignition switch. Plug-in type connections are not acceptable.

4. Antenna shall be permanently mounted so as not to interfere with driver’s vision of roadway. Antenna lead-in cable shall be permanently secured with the proper clamps, grommets, and sealant. Antenna cable may not pass through window opening.

B. Public address system. For use by driver, the system contains an inside speaker and/or an external speaker that is of special use when driver needs to caution pupils about surrounding dangers at school bus stops. Inside speakers shall be recessed type.

C. AM/FM radios, cassette players or CD players. If AM/FM radios, cassette players, or CD players are installed, they shall be properly mounted by the body manufacturer or local shop personnel. All wiring shall be properly connected and concealed and any speakers shall be of recessed type.

No internal speakers, other than the driver’s communication systems, may be installed within 4 feet of the driver’s seat back in its rearmost upright position.

D. Camera. Both equipment and installation shall be subject to the Department of Education fleet assessment.

1. The equipment must be installed in an area at the front of the bus.

2. The equipment is outside the federal head impact zone, FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection).

3. The equipment is located in an area not likely to cause student injury.

4. The equipment will have no sharp edges or projections.
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40.41. Construction, Type B, C, and D Vehicles.

A. Construction of body shall meet all requirements of FMVSS 220 (School Bus Rollover Protection), 49 CFR § 571.220, FMVSS 221 (School Bus Joint Strength), 49 CFR § 571.221, and all other applicable federal standards.

B. Construction shall be of prime commercial quality steel or other material with strength at least equivalent to all steel as certified by bus body manufacturer. All such construction materials shall be fire resistant.

C. Construction shall provide reasonable dust proof and watertight unit.

D. Bus body (including roof bows, body posts, strainers, stringers, floor, inner and outer linings, rub rails and other reinforcements) shall be of sufficient strength to support entire weight of fully loaded vehicle on its top or side if overturned. Bus body as unit shall be designed and built to provide impact and penetration resistance.

E. Side posts and roof bows. There shall be a body side post and roof bow fore and aft of each window opening. This may be a continuous bow or two separate pieces effectively joined.

F. Floor shall be of prime commercial quality steel of at least 14-gauge or other metal or other material at least equal in strength to 14-gauge steel. Floor shall be level from front to back and from side to side except in wheel housing, toe board, and driver’s seat platform areas. When plywood is used, it shall be of ½-inch exterior B.B. Grade or equivalent and securely fastened to the existing steel floor.

G. Roof strainers. Two or more roof strainers or longitudinal members shall be provided to connect roof bows, to reinforce flattest portion of roof skin, and to space roof bows. These strainers may be installed between roof bows or applied externally. They shall extend from windshield header and, when combined with rear emergency doorpost, are to function as longitudinal members extending from windshield header to rear floor body cross member. At all points of contact between strainers or longitudinal members and other structural material, attachment shall be made by means of welding, riveting or bolting.

H. Floor sills. There shall be one main body sill at each side post and two intermediate body sills on approximately 10-inch centers. All sills shall be of equal height, not to exceed three inches. All sills shall extend width of body floor except where structural members or features restrict area.
Main body sill shall be equivalent to or heavier than 10-gauge and each intermediate body sill shall be equivalent to or heavier than 16-gauge, or each of all sills shall be equivalent to or greater than 14-gauge. All sills shall be permanently attached to floor.

Connections between sides and floor system shall be capable of distributing loads from vertical posts to all floor sills.

I. All openings between chassis and passenger-carrying compartment made due to alternations of body manufacturer shall be sealed. (See Item 5960).

J. A cover shall be provided for the opening to the fuel tank fill pipe.

K. A moisture and rustproof removable panel shall be provided in the floor for access to the fuel tank sender gauge. It shall be designed for prolonged use and adequate fastening to the floor.

44.42. Construction, Type A Vehicles.

A. Construction of body shall meet all requirements of FMVSS 220 (School Bus Rollover Protection), 49 CFR § 571.220, and all other applicable federal standards.

B. Body joints created by body manufacturer shall meet the 60 percent joint strength provision required in FMVSS 221 (School Bus Body Joint Strength), 49 CFR § 571.221, for Type B, C, and D buses.

C. Construction shall be of prime commercial quality steel or other material with strength at least equivalent to all steel as certified by bus body manufacturer. All such construction materials shall be fire resistant.

D. Construction shall provide reasonably dustproof and watertight unit.

E. Bus body (including roof bows, body posts, strainers, stringers, floor, inner and outer linings, rub rails and other reinforcements) shall be of sufficient strength to support entire weight of fully loaded vehicle on its top or side if overturned. Bus body as unit shall be designed and built to provide impact and penetration resistance.

F. Floor. Plywood of ½ inch exterior B.B. Grade or equivalent shall be applied over the existing steel floor and securely fastened. Floor shall be level from front to back and from side to side except in wheel housing, toe board, and driver seat platform areas.
G. Roof strainers. Two or more roof strainers or longitudinal members shall be provided to connect roof bows to reinforce flattest portion of roof skin, and to space roof bows. These strainers may be installed between roof bows or applied externally. They shall extend from windshield header to rear body header over the emergency door. At all points of contact between strainers of longitudinal members and other structural material, attachment shall be made by means of welding, riveting, or bolting.

After load as called for in Static Load Test Code has been removed, none of the following defects shall be evident:

1. Failure or separation at joints where strainers are fastened to roof bows;
2. Appreciable difference in deflection between adjacent strainers and roof bows; or
3. Twisting, buckling, or deformation of strainer cross-section.

H. Area between floor and window line shall be restructured inside to include at least four vertical formed reinforcement members extending from floor to window line rail. They shall be securely attached at both ends.

I. Rear corner reinforcements. Rear corner framing of the bus body between floor and window sill and between emergency door post and last side post shall consist of at least one structural member applied horizontally to provide additional impact and penetration resistance equal to that provided by frame members in areas of sides of body. Such member shall be securely attached at each end.

J. All openings between chassis and passenger carrying compartment made due to alterations by body manufacturers shall be sealed. (See Item 59 60.)

42.43. Defrosters.

A. Defrosting and defogging equipment shall direct a sufficient flow of heated air onto the windshield, the window to the left of the driver and the glass in the viewing area directly to the right of the driver to eliminate frost, fog and snow. (Exception: The requirements of this standard do not apply to the exterior surfaces of double pane storm windows.)

B. The defrosting system shall conform to SAE J381, Windshield Defrosting Systems Test Procedure and Performance Requirements – Trucks, Buses, and Multipurpose Vehicles.
C. The defroster and defogging system shall be capable of furnishing heated, outside ambient air, except that the part of the system furnishing additional air to the windshield, entrance door and step well may be the recirculating air type.

D. Exception: Type A vehicle, auxiliary fan is not required.

43.44. Doors.

A. Service Door.

1. Service door shall be manually or power-operated, under control of driver, and so designed as to afford easy release and prevent accidental opening. No parts shall come together so as to shear or crush fingers.

2. Service door shall be located on right side of bus opposite driver and within his direct view.

3. Service door shall have minimum horizontal opening of 24 inches and minimum vertical opening of 68 inches.

4. Service door shall be of split-type, outward opening type.

5. All door glass shall be approved safety glass. Bottom of lower glass panel shall not be more than 10 inches from the bottom of the door. Top of upper glass panel shall not be more than three inches from top of door opening.

6. Vertical closing edges shall be equipped with flexible material to protect children’s fingers.

7. All doors shall be equipped with padding at the top of each door opening. Pad shall be at least three inches wide and one inch thick and extend the full width of the door opening.

8. For power-operated entrance doors, the emergency release valve, switch or device to release the service door must be placed above, to the immediate left, or to the immediate right of the entrance door and must be clearly labeled in a color contrast with the background of the label. The emergency release valve, switch or device shall work in the absence of power.

B. Rear Emergency Door Type B, C, and D vehicles.

1. Emergency door shall be located in center of rear end of bus.
2. Rear emergency door shall have minimum horizontal opening of 24 inches and minimum vertical opening of 45 inches measured from floor level.

3. Rear emergency door shall be hinged on right side and shall open outward and be equipped with an adequate strap or stop to prevent door from striking lamps or right rear of body. Such strap or stop shall allow door to open at least at a 90-degree angle from closed position.

   Exception: Type D vehicles with rear engines – Emergency door shall be located on the left side, shall be hinged on the front side and open outward. Door shall meet all requirements of FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release), 49 CFR § 571.217.

4. The upper portion of the emergency door shall be equipped with approved safety glazing, the exposed area of which shall be at least 400 square inches. The lower portion of the rear emergency door on Types A, B, C and D vehicles shall be equipped with a minimum of 240-350 square inches of approved safety glazing. This glass shall be protected by a metal guard on the inside. This guard shall be free of any sharp edges that may cause injury to passengers.

5. There shall be no steps leading to emergency door.

6. When not fully latched, emergency door shall actuate signal audible to driver by means of mechanism actuated by latch.

7. Words “EMERGENCY DOOR,” both inside and outside in black letters two inches high, painted or vinyl, shall be in compliance with FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release).

8. The emergency door shall be designed to open from inside and outside bus. It shall be equipped with a slide bar and cam-operated lock located on left side of door and fastened to the door framing.

   The slide bar shall be approximately 1 ¼ inches wide and 3/8 inch thick and shall have a minimum stroke of 1 ¼ inches. The slide bar shall have a bearing surface of a minimum of 3/4 inch with the door lock in a closed position. Control from driver’s seat shall not be permitted. Provision for opening from outside shall consist of non-detachable device so designed as to prevent hitching to, but to
permit opening when necessary. Door lock shall be equipped with interior handle and guard that extend approximately to center of door. It shall lift up to release lock.

9. All doors shall be equipped with padding at the top edge of each door opening. Pad shall be at least three inches wide and one inch thick and extend the full width of the door opening.

10. There shall be no obstruction higher than ¼ inch across the bottom of any emergency door opening. Fasteners used within the emergency exit opening shall be free of sharp edges or burrs.

C. Rear emergency door, Type A vehicles.

1. Emergency door shall be located in center of rear end of bus and shall be equipped with fastening device for opening from inside and outside body, which may be quickly released but is designed to offer protection against accidental release. Control from driver’s seat shall not be permitted. Provision for opening from outside shall consist of device designed to prevent hitching to but to permit opening when necessary.

2. No seat or other object shall be placed in bus which restricts passageway to emergency door to less than 12 inches.

3. The lower portion of the rear emergency door shall be equipped with a minimum of 350 square inches of approved safety glazing.

D. Security locking system.

1. A locking system to lock the emergency door(s) or roof hatch(es) exits exits and the entrance door may be installed.

2. The system shall meet requirements of FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release) and be equipped with an interlock in the chassis starting circuit and an audible alarm to indicate when an emergency exit is locked while the ignition switch is in the “on” position.

3. A cutoff switch on the interlock circuit or any exit equipped with a lock and hasp shall not be allowed.

4. The entrance door lock system shall not permit hooking or snagging during passenger egress/ingress.
44.45. Emergency Equipment.

A. Fire Extinguisher.

1. The bus shall be equipped with one dry-chemical fire extinguisher of at least five-pound capacity with pressure indicator, mounted in extinguisher manufacturer’s bracket of automotive type, and located in full view and in an accessible place in the front of the bus.

2. The fire extinguisher shall bear label of Underwriters’ Laboratories, Inc., showing a rating of 2A 10BC, or greater.

3. Fire extinguisher shall have aluminum, brass, or steel valves, heads, check stems, siphon tubes, levers, safety pins, chain, handles and metal hanging brackets. Plastic shall not be used for those named parts.

B. First Aid Kit.

1. Bus shall carry Grade A metal first-aid kit, unit-type, mounted in full view and in an accessible place in the front of the bus and identified as a first-aid kit.

2. The first-aid kit shall contain the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandage compress (sterile gauze pads) 4-inch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandage compress (sterile gauze pads) 2-inch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhesive absorbent bandage (nonadhering pad) 1 x 3 inch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular bandage, 40-inch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauze bandage, 4 inch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorbent-gauze compress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiseptic applicator (swab type) 10 per unit (Zephiran Chloride/Green Soap type)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee sting applicator (swab type) 10 per unit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair medical non-latex examination gloves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth-to-mouth airway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Warning Devices.

1. Bus shall be equipped with a kit containing three reflectorized triangular warning devices meeting requirements of FMVSS 125 (Warning Devices), 49 CFR § 571.125.

2. Kit shall be securely mounted.
D. Body Fluid Clean-up Kit.

1. Each bus shall carry a Grade A metal or rigid plastic kit, mounted in an accessible place and identified as a body fluid clean-up kit with a directions for use sheet attached to the inside cover.

2. The kit shall be moisture proof and properly mounted or secured in a storage compartment.

3. Contents shall include, but not be limited to, the following items:
   a. One pair non-latex gloves
   b. One pick-up spatula or scoop
   c. One face mask
   d. Infectious liquid spill control powder
   e. Anti-microbial hand wipes – individually wrapped
   f. Germicidal disinfectant wipes – tuberculocidal
   g. Plastic disposal bag with tie

E. Seat Belt Cutter.

1. Each bus shall be equipped with a durable webbing cutter having a full width handgrip and a protected, replaceable or non-corrodible blade. The required belt cutter shall be mounted in a location accessible to the seated driver in an easily detachable manner.

45.46. Emergency Exits.

A. Each emergency exit shall comply with FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release), 49 CFR § 571.217, regarding the number of exits, types of exits and location of exits based on the capacity of the vehicle.

   a. A dedicated aisle of at least 12 inches in width, referenced to the rear of the emergency exit door is required.
b. Side emergency exit doors shall be hinged on the forward edge.

c. When not fully latched, side emergency exit door shall actuate a signal audible to the driver by means of a mechanism actuated by the latch when the ignition switch is on.

d. A security locking system designed to prevent vandalism may be installed provided it meets all specifications of Item 43 44 D.

2. Roof Exits/Vents.

a. All vehicles shall be equipped with a minimum of one emergency roof exit/vent approved by the Department of Education.

b. When not fully latched, this exit shall actuate a signal audible to the driver by means of a mechanism actuated by the latch when the ignition switch is on.

c. A roof exit/vent security locking system designed to prevent vandalism may be installed provided it meets all specifications of Item 43 44 D.

d. When a single roof exit is installed, it shall be located as near as practicable to the longitudinal midpoint of the passenger compartment, and shall be installed such that the centerline of the hatch is on the longitudinal centerline of the bus.

e. If two roof exits are utilized, they shall be located as near as practicable to the points equidistant between the longitudinal midpoint of the passenger compartment and the front and the rear of the passenger compartment.

NOTE: No removal or cutting of any roof structural component shall occur during installation. If the installation required by subdivisions 2 d and 2 e of this section cannot be accomplished as described, then prior approval by the Department of Education will be required through a written request from the local school division.

f. Roof exits/vents shall have rustproof hardware.
g. Roof exits/vents shall be hinged in the front and be equipped with an outside release handle.

3. Emergency exit windows.
   a. Push-out emergency windows are permissible, if required by FMVSS 217 (Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release), 49 CFR § 571.217.
   b. When not fully latched, the emergency exit window shall actuate a signal audible to the driver by means of a mechanism actuated by the latch.
   c. No emergency exit window shall be located directly in front of a side emergency exit door.
   d. The rear emergency window shall have a lifting assistance device that will aid in lifting and holding the rear emergency window open.

46-47. Floor Covering.

A. Floor in under seat area, including tops of wheel housings, driver’s compartment and toe board shall be covered with fire-resistant rubber floor covering or an approved equivalent, having minimum overall thickness of .125 inch. Driver’s compartment and toe board area shall be trimmed with molding strips behind the cowl face line.

B. Floor covering in aisle shall be of aisle-type fire resistant rubber or an approved equivalent, nonskid, wear-resistant and ribbed. Minimum overall thickness shall be .1875 inch measured from tops of ribs and have a calculated burn rate of 0.1 or less, using the test methods, procedures and formulas listed in FMVSS 302 (Flammability of Interior Materials). Rubber floor covering shall meet federal specifications ZZ-M71d.

C. Floor covering shall be permanently bonded to floor, and shall not crack when subjected to sudden changes in temperature. Bonding or adhesive material shall be waterproof and shall be of the type recommended by manufacturer of floor-covering material. All seams shall be sealed with waterproof sealer.

D. All floor covering seams shall be covered with trim and fastened with screws.

E. On Types B, C, and D buses, a flush-mounted, screw-down plate that is secured and sealed shall be provided to access the fuel tank sending
unit and/or fuel pump. This plate shall not be installed under flooring material.

47.48. Handrails.

A. At least 1 handrail shall be installed. The handrail(s) shall assist passengers during entry or exit, and shall be designed to prevent entanglement, as evidenced by the passing of the NHTSA string and nut test.

48.49. Heaters. Heating and Air Conditioning Systems

A. Hot water heaters of fresh air or combination fresh air and recirculating type, with power defrosters, are required.

B. Heaters shall bear nameplate rating affixed by heater manufacturer on top of heater shell.

C. Heaters shall be capable of maintaining inside temperature of 50° F, with an outside temperature of 20° F when the bus is loaded to one-half capacity.

D. The heater wiring shall be connected to the cold side of the ignition switch through a continuous duty solenoid relay.

E. The power defroster shall deliver a sufficient amount of heated air distributed through a windshield duct, nozzle or nozzles to defog and de-ice the entire windshield, and to defog the driver’s window. The duct, nozzle, or nozzles shall be designed to prevent objects from being placed in any manner that would obstruct the flow of air.

F. Water circulation cut-off valves in the supply and return lines, a minimum of ¾ inch diameter (except Type A), shall be at or near the engine. A water flow-regulating valve in the pressure line for convenient operation by the driver is also required. All valves shall be ¼ turn ball type. The driver and passenger heaters may operate independently of each other for maximum comfort.

G. Heater hoses, including those in engine compartment, shall be supported in such manner that hose chafing against other objects will not occur nor shall suspended water lines interfere with routine vehicle maintenance.

H. All water hoses in driver or passenger area shall be shielded.

I. An auxiliary heater of recirculating type, having a minimum capacity of 60,000 BTU output, shall be installed under the second seat behind the
wheel housing. There shall be a grille or guard over exposed heater cores to prevent damage by pupils’ feet.

J. Exception: Type A and D vehicles.

1. Front heater with high output and defroster shall be furnished by the chassis manufacturer.

2. The body manufacturer shall provide an additional under seat heater near the rear of the bus.

K. All heater cores shall be the coiled tubing fin type approved by the Department of Education.

**Passenger Compartment Air Conditioning (Optional)**

The following specifications are applicable to all types of school buses that may be equipped with air conditioning. This section is divided into two parts. Part 1 covers performance specifications and Part 2 covers other requirements applicable to all buses.

1. **Performance Specifications**

   **Standard Performance:** The installed air conditioning system should cool the interior of the bus from 100 degrees to 80 degrees Fahrenheit, measured at three points (minimum) located four feet above the floor on the longitudinal centerline of the bus. The three required points shall be: (1) three feet above the center point of the horizontal driver seat surface, (2) at the longitudinal midpoint of the body, and (3) three feet forward of the rear emergency door or, for Type D rear-engine buses, three feet forward of the end of the aisle. Note for the Type A vehicles placement of the rear thermocouple should be centered in the bus over the rear axle. The independent temperature reading of each temperature probe inside the bus shall be within a range of +/- 3 degrees Fahrenheit of the average temperature at the conclusion of the test.

   **High Performance:** The installed air conditioning system should cool the interior of the bus from 100 degrees Fahrenheit to 70 degrees Fahrenheit, measured at three points (minimum) located four feet above the floor on the longitudinal centerline of the bus. The three required points shall be: (1) three feet above the center point of the horizontal driver seat surface, (2) at the longitudinal midpoint of the body, and (3) three feet forward of the emergency door or, for Type D rear-engine buses, three feet forward of the end of the aisle. The independent temperature reading of each temperature probe inside the bus shall be within a range of +/- 3 degrees Fahrenheit of the average temperature at the conclusion of the test.
The test conditions under which the above performance standards must be achieved shall consist of (1) placing the bus in a room (such as a paint booth) where ambient temperature can be maintained at 100 degrees Fahrenheit; (2) heat-soaking the bus at 100 degrees Fahrenheit at a point measured 2 feet horizontally from the top of the windows on both sides of the bus, with windows open for two hours; and (3) closing windows, turning on the air conditioner with the engine running at 1250 +/- 50 RPM, and cooling the interior of the bus to 80 degrees Fahrenheit (standard performance) or 70 degrees Fahrenheit (high performance), within 30 minutes while maintaining 100 degrees Fahrenheit outside temperature.

The manufacturer shall provide facilities for the user or user’s representative to confirm that a pilot model of each bus design meets the above performance requirements.

2. Other Requirements

a. Evaporator cases, lines and ducting (as equipped) shall be designed in such a manner that all condensation is effectively drained to the exterior of the bus below the floor level under all conditions of vehicle movement and without leakage on any interior portion of the bus;

b. Evaporators and ducting systems shall be designed and installed to be free of projections or sharp edges. Ductwork shall be installed so that exposed edges face the front of the bus and do not present sharp edges;

c. On school buses equipped with Type-2 seatbelts having anchorages above the windows, the ducting (if used) shall be placed at a height sufficient to not obstruct occupant securement anchorages. This clearance shall be provided along the entire length (except at evaporator locations) of the passenger area on both sides of the bus interior;

d. The body may be equipped with additional insulation, including sidewalls, roof, firewall, rear, inside body bows and plywood or composite floor insulation to reduce thermal transfer;

e. All glass (windshield, service and emergency doors, side and rear windows) may be equipped with maximum integral tinting allowed by the Code of Virginia for the respective locations, except that windows rear of the driver’s compartment, if tinted, shall have approximately 28% light transmission;
f. Electrical generating capacity shall be provided to accommodate the additional electrical demands imposed by the air conditioning system.

g. Air intake for any evaporator assembly(ies), except for front evaporator of Type A-1, shall be equipped with replaceable air filter(s) accessible without disassembly of evaporator case.

h. For all buses (except Type D rear engine transit) equipped with a rear evaporator assembly, evaporator shall not encroach upon head impact zone, but may occupy an area of less than 26.5 inches from the rear wall and 14 inches from the ceiling.

i. For Type D rear engine transit buses equipped with a rear evaporator over the davenport, the evaporator assembly may not interfere with rear exit window and may not extend above the rear seating row.


A. All exterior metal door hinges shall be designed to allow lubrication to be channeled to the center 75 percent of each hinge loop without disassembly, unless they are constructed of stainless steel, brass or non-metallic hinge pins or other designs that prevent corrosion.

50-51. Identification of School Buses.

A. All lettering shall be of black paint or vinyl decal and conform to “Series B” for Standard Alphabets for Highway Signs. The words “SCHOOL BUS” shall be on reflective yellow background. See Diagrams 1 and 2. For purposes of identification, school buses shall be lettered as follows:

1. Both the front and rear of the body shall bear the words, “SCHOOL BUS” in black letters eight inches in height.

2. The bus number shall be placed just back of the front warning sign on the left side, just behind the entrance door on the right side and be 4 inches high. The number is required on the left side of the front bumper (driver’s side). The number shall be placed on the rear body of the bus and shall be 4 inches high.

3. (Name of) County Public Schools or (Name of) City Public Schools shall be placed on each side of the bus body at the beltline and be 4 inches high.
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4. Type of Fuel – Identification of fuel type shall be in 2 inch lettering adjacent to the fuel filler opening.
   
a. A sign with black letters on clear or school bus yellow background, indicating the type of alternative fuel being used, may be placed on the side of the bus near the entrance door. No sign shall be more than 4-3/4 inches long or more than 3-1/4 inches high.

5. Options - The following lettering and signs are options, but if equipped, they must conform to these specifications:
   
a. The bus number may be placed in the center of the bus roof with black (12-inch minimum) numbers.

b. The bus number (4 inches minimum) shall be placed on the inside rear header with black paint or vinyl decals. It shall not interfere with the Emergency Door letterings.

c. Battery - The location of the battery identified by the word “Battery” or “Batteries” on the battery compartment door in 2 inch lettering.

d. Traffic Warning Lights Sign – Shall be placed in between the top and bottom glass on the rear emergency door, and lettered “STOP WHEN RED LIGHTS FLASH.” The sign shall be marked with retro-reflective NSBY material comprising background for black letters, 4 inches in height. On a rear-engine Type D bus, the sign shall be placed in the center of the engine door.
   Exception: The sign shall not be mounted on any activity vehicle.

e. Stop for Railroad Crossing Sign – The sign shall be placed on the rear of the bus.

f. Identification Sign for Students – A sign with symbols and/or numbers displaying identification information for the students of the bus or route served shall be mounted on the right side of the bus near the entrance door. The sign shall be no larger than 121 square inches.

g. American Flag Decals – Non-reflective, American Flag decals, no larger than 6 inches by 10 inches shall be placed on the exterior of the bus, on both sides and/or at the rear of the bus. The decals shall be centered between the top two
rub rails and mounted so that the right edge of the decal is no closer than 3 inches from the bus number or so that the left edge of the decal is no further than 12 inches from the bus number. A rear decal shall be centered in the rear of the bus.

Exception: Type A buses shall mount the decals below the second rub rail and centered below the bus number on both sides.

h. Bus Safety Hotline Sign – A sign with yellow lettering on black background may be mounted in the center of the rear bumper with the letters “School Bus Safety Hotline Call (area) xxx-xxxx.” The sign is not to exceed 3 ¼ inches high x 10 inches wide.

6. No manufacturer or vendor logos, signs or other items not approved in the Specifications shall be displayed.

54.52. Inside Height.

A. Inside body height shall be 72 inches or more, measured metal to metal, at any point on longitudinal center line from front vertical bow to rear vertical bow. Exception: Type A conversion van – Inside body height shall be 62 inches minimum. Does not apply to air conditioning equipment.

B. Exception: Type A conversion van – Inside body height shall be 62 inches minimum.

52.53. Insulation.

A. Ceilings and walls shall be coated with proper materials to deaden sounds and to reduce vibrations to a minimum. Thermal insulation (minimum R-value of 5.5) shall be used to insulate walls and roof between inner and outer panels.

53.54. Interior.

A. Interior of bus shall be free of all unnecessary projections likely to cause injury. This standard requires inner lining on ceilings and walls. Ceiling panels shall be constructed so as to contain lapped joints with all exposed edges hemmed to minimize sharpness. If lateral panels are used, forward panels shall be lapped by rear panels.
54.55. License Plates.

A. All vehicles shall be constructed so that mounting and securing of license plates will be compliant with FMVSS and the Code of Virginia, Section 46.2-716.

55.56. Lights and Signals.

A. No lights or signals other than specified here shall be installed on school buses, except those required by federal regulations. All lights and reflectors shall be approved by the Superintendent of the Virginia State Police.

1. Clearance lights. Body shall be equipped with two red clearance lamps at rear, two amber clearance lamps at front, and intermediate side marker lamps on buses 30 feet or more in length controlled by headlight switch. They may be of armour type.

2. Identification lamps. Three amber lamps shall be mounted on front and three red lamps on rear of body controlled by the headlight switch.

3. Stop and tail lamps. Bus shall be equipped with two matched stop and tail lamps of heavy duty type, which shall be in combination, emitting red light plainly visible from a distance of at least 500 feet to rear, and mounted on rear end with their centers not less than 12 nor more than 24 inches from plane side of body, and not less than six or more than 18 inches below D-glass in rear of body. They shall be approximately seven inches in diameter or, if a shape other than round, a minimum 38 square inches of illuminated area and shall meet SAE specifications. These lights shall be on the same horizontal line with the turn signal units and shall not flash.

4. Back-up lamps. The bus body shall be equipped with 2 white rear back-up lamps that are at least 4 inches in diameter or, if a shape other than round, a minimum of 12 square inches of illuminated area and shall meet FMVSS 108 (Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment). If back-up lamps are placed on the same horizontal line as the brake lamps and turn signal lamps, they shall be to the inside.

5. Interior lamps. Interior lamps shall be provided which adequately illuminate aisles and step well.

6. Turn signal units. Bus shall be equipped with Class A, flashing turn signal units of heavy-duty type. These signals shall be
independent units equipped with amber lenses on all faces. The
turn signals/directional signal units shall activate only when
ignition is in “on” position. A pilot light or lights shall indicate
when these lights are activated. The front lights shall be mounted
near the front corners of chassis on each side. The rear lights shall
be seven inches in diameter, or if a shape other than round, the
lights must be 38 square inches in area and mounted not less than
six nor more than 18 inches from plane of the side of the body and
not less than six nor more than 18 inches below D-glass in rear of
body. They shall be on the same horizontal line with the stop and
tail lights required in 3 above.

a. In addition to the turn signals described above, two amber
lenses metal turn signal lamps of armour-type with a
minimum of four candlepower each shall be mounted on
the body side at approximate seat level height and located
just to the rear of the entrance door on the right side of the
body and approximately the same location on the left side.
They are to be connected to and function with the regular
turn signal lamps. Such lamps shall provide 180° angle
vision and if painted, they shall be black.

b. Exception: Type A – Turn signals shall be chassis
manufacturer’s standard.

7. Hazard warning signal. The turn signal units shall also function as
the hazard warning system. The system shall operate
independently of the ignition switch and, when energized, shall
cause all turn signal lamps to flash simultaneously.

8. Reflex reflectors. (Class A) Two amber lights and two amber
reflectors (they may be combined) shall be mounted, one on each
side, near the front of the chassis. Two three-inch red reflectors
shall be mounted, one on each side near the rear of the body and
two three-inch red reflectors shall be mounted on the rear above
the bumper. Two intermediate amber three-inch reflectors, one on
each side near the middle of the bus, shall be mounted on buses 30
feet or more in length. They shall be mounted in accordance with
FMVSS 108 (Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated
Equipment).


a. A non-sequential system for the traffic warning lights shall
be installed that allow the red traffic warning lights to
activate when the door opens. When doors close all lights shall immediately deactivate.

b. Buses shall be equipped with four red lights and four amber lights. One amber light shall be located near each red light, at the same level, but closer to the vertical centerline of the bus. All lights shall comply with SAE standards for school bus warning lamps.

c. The traffic warning light system shall be wired so that the amber lights are activated manually by a hand operated switch. When door is opened, amber lights will automatically deactivate and red traffic warning lights, warning sign with flashing lights and crossing control arm shall be activated. When door is closed, all lights shall be deactivated. There shall be a rocker style momentary switch that when depressed and released deactivates the red traffic warning lights, crossing arm and stop arm. The driver need not depress or reactivate the switch in any way for the continued operation of the non-sequential system. This feature will allow for railroad crossing operations and momentary deactivation in the case that the lights are activated and no stops need to be made. There shall also be a control switch that would allow for deactivation of this feature during maintenance operation. These switches shall be labeled according to their functions and shall meet standards of FMVSS 101 (Controls and Displays).

d. The control circuit shall be connected to the cold side of the ignition switch with the master push button cancel switch mounted on the accessory console, clearly distinguished, visible and accessible to the driver.

e. The flasher and the relay shall be fastened in a compartment in the driver area and be easily accessible for servicing. The location of the flasher shall be approved by the Department of Education.

f. System shall contain an amber pilot light for amber lamps and a red pilot light for red lamps, clearly visible to the driver, to indicate when system is activated.

g. A black border 1 ¼ to 3 inches wide shall be painted around the lights and must be equipped with a black painted hooded housing.
h. All electrical connections shall be soldered or connected by an acceptable SAE method.

i. All switches and pilot lights shall be properly identified by labels.

j. There shall be an interrupt feature in the system to interrupt the traffic warning sign and the crossing control arm when their use is not desired. This feature shall consist of a double throw relay and a momentary switch.

k. Manual switch, cancel switch and interrupt switch shall be momentary switches.

l. There shall be no controls and/or switches located in the steering wheel for operation of any system except controls and/or switches of the horn or optional cruise control. All controls and/or switches shall be labeled according to their function and shall meet the standards of FMVSS 101 (Controls and Displays).

NOTE: Cruise control option is for activity buses only.

m. Option: Additional side-mounting warning lights for school divisions approved for participation in the Board of Education’s approved pilot program. Additional warning lights may be mounted on the front sides of the school bus above the entrance door and the driver’s window. Lights shall work in conjunction with the standard warning light system and shall meet FMVSS and SAE standards or must be of a type approved by the Virginia State Police.

Optional Equipment

a. Fog lights – Must be mounted by the manufacturer, meet FMVSS requirements and comply with Virginia Code.

10. School bus traffic warning sign must conform to FMVSS 131 (School Bus Pedestrian Safety Devices).

a. Warning sign shall be mounted on the left side near the front of the bus immediately below the window line.

b. Sign shall be of the octagon series, 18 inches in diameter, and be equipped with wind guard. The sign shall have a red background with a ½ inch white border, and the word
“STOP” on both sides in white letters, six inches high and one inch wide. The sign shall be reflective.

c. Sign shall have double-faced alternately flashing red lights, four inches in diameter, located at the top and bottom most portions of the sign, one above the other.

d. The sign shall be connected and energized through the red traffic warning lamps.

e. Air operated signs require air pressure regulator in addition to control valve. Source of supply shall be the main air tank with a pressure protection valve at the tank.

f. Sign and components shall comply with all provisions of SAEJ 1133.

g. A second school bus traffic warning sign on the left side near the rear of the bus, may be mounted on all 64 65, or larger sized passenger Type C and D school buses.

11. School Bus Crossing Control Arm.

   a. An approved crossing control arm shall be mounted on the right end of the front bumper with mounting brackets appropriate for the bumper configuration.

   b. The arm shall be activated in conjunction with the traffic warning sign.

   c. The arm when in the stored position shall have a magnetic or other suitable latch to secure the arm against the bumper.

   d. Source of supply for air-operated arms shall be the main air supply tank with pressure protection valve at tank.

   e a. Appropriate grommets or a loom shall be used where wires or tubes go through holes in bumper and firewall.

   f b. School buses shall be equipped with a crossing control arm mounted on the right side of the front bumper. When opened, this arm shall extend in a line parallel to the body side and aligned with the right front wheel.

   g c. All components of the crossing control arm and all connections shall be weatherproofed.
The crossing control arm shall incorporate system connectors (electrical, vacuum or air) at the gate and shall be easily removable to allow for towing of the bus. Source of supply for air-operated arms shall be the main air supply tank with pressure protection valve at tank.

The crossing control arm shall be constructed of non-corrodible or nonferrous material.

There shall be no sharp edges or projections that could cause injury or be a hazard to students. The end of the arm shall be rounded.

The crossing control arm shall extend a minimum of 70 inches (measured from the bumper at the arm assembly attachment point) when in the extended position. The crossing control arm shall not extend past the end of the bumper when in the stowed position.

The crossing control arm shall extend simultaneously with the traffic warning sign(s) and shall be connected and energized through the traffic warning lamps.

An automatic recycling interrupt switch may be installed for temporarily disabling the crossing control arm.

The assembly shall include a device attached to the bumper near the end of the arm to automatically retain the arm while in the stowed position. That device shall not interfere with normal operations of the crossing control arm.

12. Strobe Warning Light.

Each bus shall be equipped with a white flashing strobe light meeting the following requirements:

1. Shall have self-contained power supply.

2. Construction: Base shall be Lexan™ or other polycarbonate or corrosion resistant metallic material. Lens shall be clear Lexan™ or other polycarbonate material or equal or better strength, resilience, and durability. Unit shall be sealed to protect against intrusion of dust and moisture. All external fasteners including mounting screws shall
be stainless steel. Unit shall have mounting gasket to isolate the light assembly from vibration.

3. Electrical characteristics: Shall have a flash energy of minimum 8 joules. Shall have 80 (plus or minus 10) single or double flashes per minute. Shall have integral fuse or circuit breaker protection and reverse polarity protection. Maximum current draw shall be 2 amperes at 12 volts.

4. Dimensions and location: Overall height of unit shall be approximately 4 inches to 6 inches, with lens diameter approximately 4 inches to 6 inches. Mounting location is to be centered (laterally) on roof of bus, approximately 48 inches (longitudinally) from rear edge of rear roof cap.

5. SAE specifications: Shall meet SAE J575 and J1318.

6. Body circuitry: Shall include a separate, clearly labeled driver’s panel mounted switch, with a clearly labeled pilot light.

56.57. Metal Treatment.

A. All metal parts that will be painted shall be chemically cleaned, etched, zinc-phosphate-coated, and zinc-chromate or epoxy-primed or conditioned by equivalent process.

57.58. Mirrors.

A. Interior rear view mirror at least 6 x 30 inches, metal encased safety glass of at least 1/8 inch thickness, which will afford good view of pupils and roadway to rear and shall be installed in such a way that vibration will be reduced to a minimum. It shall have rounded corners and protected edges.

B. Exception: Type A - Interior mirror to be 6 x 16 inches.

C. All buses shall have a mirror system that conforms to FMVSS 111 (Rearview Mirrors), 49 CFR § 271.111 as amended.

D. Thermostatically controlled heated exterior mirrors are permissible.

E. Motorized exterior mirrors may be used.
58.59. Mounting.

A. Chassis frame shall extend to rear edge of rear body cross member. Bus body shall be attached to chassis frame in such manner as to prevent shifting or separation of body from chassis under severe operating conditions.

B. Body front shall be attached and sealed to chassis cowl in such manner as to prevent entry of water, dust, and fumes through joint between chassis cowl and body.

C. Insulating material shall be placed at all contact points between body and chassis frame on Types A, B, C and D buses. Insulating material shall be approximately ¼ inch thick and shall be so attached to chassis frame or body member that it will not move under severe operating conditions.

59.60. Openings.

A. Any openings in body or front fenders of chassis resulting from change necessary to furnish required components shall be sealed. (See Item 22 23 and Item 40 41 i and Item 44 42 j.)

60.61. Overall Length.

A. Overall length of bus shall not exceed 40 feet when measured from bumper to bumper.

61.62. Overall Width.

A. Overall width of bus shall not exceed 100 inches, including traffic-warning sign in closed position. Outside rearview mirrors are excluded.

62.63. Rub Rails.

A. There shall be one rub rail located on each side of the bus at seat cushion level which extends from the rear side of the entrance door completely around the bus body (except the emergency door or any maintenance access door) to the point of curvature near the outside cowl on the left side, or to the front corner of the bus body.

B. There shall be one additional rub rail located on each side at, or no more than 10 inches above, the floor line. The rub rail shall cover the same longitudinal area as the upper rub rail, except at the wheel housings, and it shall extend only to the radii of the right and left rear corners.
C. Both rub rails shall be attached at each body post and at all other upright structural members.

D. Each rub rail shall be four inches or more in width in their finished form, shall be constructed of 16-gauge steel or suitable material of equivalent strength and shall be constructed in corrugated or ribbed fashion.

E. Both rub rails shall be applied outside the body or outside body posts. (Pressed-in or snap-on rub rails do not satisfy this requirement.) For Type A-1 vehicles using the body provided by the chassis manufacturer or for types A-2, B, C and D using the rear engine compartment, rub rails need not extend around the rear corners.

F. There shall be a rub rail or equivalent bracing located horizontally at the bottom edge of the body side skirts.

63.64. Seat Belt for Driver.

A. A locking retractor type 2-lap belt/shoulder harness seat belt shall be provided for the driver. Each belt section shall be booted so as to keep the buckle and button-type latch off the floor and within easy reach of the driver. Belt shall be anchored in such a manner or guided at the seat frame so as to prevent the driver from sliding sideways from under the belt.

64.65. Seats.

A. All seats shall have minimum cushion depth of 14 inches.

B. In determining seating capacity of bus, allowable average rump width shall be 13 inches. (See Item 36.)

C. All seats shall conform to FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection).

D, C. Seating plans for buses with wheelchair positions - see Item 92A. All school bus seating shall be of a three-to-three arrangement with the exception of the last row seat to the left of any rear emergency door. This seat shall meet the standards set forth in FMVSS 222 for last row seating and ingress and egress of standards of FMVSS 217 for emergency door and aisle clearance at that position. There shall be provided a full width barrier in front of each seating position. Type D, Rear engine buses shall be exempt from the last row requirements.

Exception – Type A – 16 passenger may have two-to-two seating arrangement, with 30 inch seats.
Floor track seat securement may be used and the manufacturer shall supply minimum and maximum seat spacing dimensions (applicable to the bus) which comply with FMVSS No 222. This information shall be on a label permanently affixed to the bus.

Passenger seat cushion retention system shall meet FMVSS 222.

No bus shall be equipped with jump seats or portable seats.

Seat spacing shall meet FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection).

Seat and back cushions of all seats shall be designed to safely support designated number of passengers under normal road conditions encountered in school bus service. Covering of seat cushions shall be of material having 42 ounce finished weight, 54-inch width, and finished vinyl coating of 1.06 broken twill. Material on polyester drill and polyester cotton twill knit backing with equal vinyl coating which meets or exceeds the laboratory test results for the 42 ounce 1.06 covering may be used. Padding and veering on all seats shall comply with provisions of FMVSS 302 (Flammability of Interior Materials), 49 CFR § 571.302.

Minimum distance between steering wheel and backrest of driver’s seat shall be 11 inches. Driver’s seat shall have fore-and-aft adjustment of not less than four inches and up and down adjustment of three inches. It shall be manually adjustable and strongly attached to floor.

The driver’s seat supplied by the body manufacturer shall be a high back seat. The seat back shall be adjustable to 15 degrees minimum, without requiring the use of tools. The seat shall be equipped with a head restraint to accommodate a 5th percentile female to a 95th percentile adult male, as defined in FMVSS No. 208, Occupant Crash Protection.

Type A buses may utilize the standard driver’s seat provided by the chassis manufacturer.

Minimum of 36-inch headroom for sitting position above top of undepressed cushion line of all seats shall be provided. Measurement shall be made vertically not more than seven inches from sidewall at cushion height and at fore-and-aft center of cushion.

Backs of all seats of similar size shall be of same width at top and of same height from floor and shall slant at same angle with floor.

Seat back heights shall be between 24 and 27 inches measured from seating reference point.
Exception: Seats with optional child safety restraining systems shall comply with FMVSS 222 (*School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection*).

### 65.66 Barrier.

A. A padded barrier shall be installed at rear of driver’s seat in such a position as not to interfere with adjustment of driver’s seat.

B. A padded barrier shall be installed at rear of entrance step well. Barrier to coincide with length of the right front seat cushion with minimum width of 26 inches and shall have a modesty panel to extend from bottom of barrier to floor.

C. All restraining barriers and passenger seats shall be constructed with materials that enable them to meet the criteria of the School Bus Seat Upholstery Fire Block Test. Padding and veering shall comply with provisions of FMVSS 302 (*Flammability of Interior Materials*), 49 CFR § 571.302.

### 66.67 Steps.

A. First step at service door shall be not less than 10 inches and not more than 16 inches from ground, based on standard chassis specifications.

B. Service door entrance may be equipped with two-step or three-step step well. Risers in each case shall be approximately equal.

C. Steps shall be enclosed to prevent accumulation of ice and snow.

D. Steps shall not protrude beyond side bodyline.

E. Grab handle not less than 20 inches in length shall be provided in unobstructed location inside doorway, but shall not be attached so that it will interfere with the opening of the glove compartment door. This handle shall be designed to eliminate exposed ends that would catch passenger clothing and shall be so placed in a position to aid small children entering the bus.

F. Step covering. All steps, including the floor line platform area, shall be covered with an elastomer floor covering having a minimum overall thickness of 0.187 inch.

1. The step covering shall be permanently bonded to a durable backing material that is resistant to corrosion.
2. Steps, including the floor line platform area, shall have a 1 ½ inch nosing that contrasts in color by at least 70 percent measured in accordance with the contrasting color specification in 36 CFR, Part 1192, ADA, *Accessibility Guidelines for Transportation Vehicles*.

3. Step treads shall have the following characteristics:
   a. Abrasion resistance: Step tread material weight loss shall not exceed 0.40 percent, as tested under ASTM D-4060, *Standard Test Method for Abrasion Resistance of Organic Coatings by the Taber Abraser*, (CS-17 Wheel, 1,000 gram, 1,000 cycle)
   b. Weathering resistance: Step treads shall not break, crack, or check after ozone exposure (7 days at 50 phm at 40 degrees C) and Weatherometer exposure (ASTM D-750, *Standard Test method for Rubber Deterioration in Carbon-Arc Weathering Apparatus, 7 days*)
   c. Flame resistance: Step treads shall have a calculated burn rate of .01 or less using the test methods, procedures and formulas listed in FMVSS No. 302 (*Flammability of Interior Materials*).

G. There shall be a “no-smoking” sign placed on the top step riser of the entrance step well. The letters shall be red in color with a white background and a length of 9 ½ inches and lettering height of 1 ¼ inches.

67-68. Stirrup Steps.

   A. If the windshield and lamps are not easily accessible from the ground, there may be at least 1 folding stirrup step or recessed foothold installed on each side of the front of the body for easy accessibility for cleaning. There also may be a grab handle installed in conjunction with the step. Steps are permitted in or on the front bumper in lieu of the stirrup steps if the windshield and lamps are easily accessible for cleaning from that position.

68-69. Storage and Luggage Compartments.

   A. Vehicles may be equipped with luggage compartments or tool compartments in the body skirt provided they do not reduce ground clearance to less than 14 ½ inches from bottom of compartment and that the addition of the compartments does not exceed the vehicles’ GVWR.
B. Optional: Drivers storage compartment may be above the driver’s area and must not impede ingress and egress. It shall not violate any federal safety standard or the Code of Virginia.

69.70. Sun Shield.

A. Interior adjustable transparent sun shield, darkest shade available, not less than 6 x 30 inches shall be installed in position convenient for use by driver.

B. Exception: Type A vehicles – Manufacturer’s standard is acceptable.

70. Tail-Pipe.

A. Tail pipe shall extend to but not more than 2 inches beyond outer edge of rear bumper. (See Item 13 B.)

71. Trash Container and Hold Device. (Optional)

A. When requested or used, the trash container shall be secured by a holding device that is designed to prevent movement and to allow easy removal and replacement. It shall be soft, pliable, and installed in an accessible location in the driver’s compartment, not obstructing passenger access to the entrance door.

72. Undercoating.

A. Entire underside of bus body, including floor sections, cross members, and below floor line side panels, shall be coated with rust-proofing compound for which compound manufacturer has issued notarized certification of compliance to bus body building that compounds meet or exceed all performance requirements of SAE J1959, Federal Specification TT-C-520 using modified test procedures for following requirements:

1. Salt spray resistance—pass test modified to 5.0 percent salt and 1,000 hours.

2. Abrasion resistance—pass.

3. Fire resistance—pass.

B. Undercoating compound shall be applied with suitable airless or conventional spray equipment to the undercoating manufacturer recommend film thickness and shall show no evidence of voids in cured film. Undercoating is expected to prevent rust under all bus service conditions for minimum of five years.
C. The undercoating material shall not cover any exhaust components of the chassis.

73. **Ventilation and Air Conditioning.**

A. Body shall be equipped with suitable, controlled ventilating system of sufficient capacity to maintain proper quantity of air under operating conditions without opening of windows except in extremely warm weather.

B. Static-type, non-closable, exhaust roof ventilators shall be installed in low-pressure area of roof panel.

C. Air conditioning units may be installed on an optional basis. Application requires heavier electrical components and assessment by the Department of Education, on an individual unit basis.

D. Auxiliary fans shall meet the following requirements:

1. Fans for left and right sides of the windshield shall be placed in a location where they can be adjusted for maximum effectiveness and where they do not obstruct vision to any mirror. Note: Type A buses may be equipped with one fan.

2. Fans shall have 6-inch (nominal) diameter; and

3. Fan blades shall be enclosed in a protective cage. Each fan shall be controlled by a separate switch.

74. **Water Test.**

A. Each and every school bus body, after it is mounted on chassis ready for delivery, shall be subjected to a thorough water test in which water under pressure equal to a driving rain is forced against the entire bus body from various directions. Any leaks detected are to be repaired before the bus is declared ready for delivery.

75. **Wheel Housings.**

A. Wheel housings shall be of full open type.

B. Wheel housings shall be designed to support seat and passenger loads and shall be attached to floor sheets in such manner as to prevent any dust or water from entering the body. Wheel housings shall be constructed of 16-gauge (or thicker) steel.
C. Inside height of wheel housings above floor line shall not exceed 12 inches.

D. No part of a raised wheel housing shall extend into the emergency door opening.

E. Wheel housings shall provide clearance for dual wheels as established by National Association of Chain Manufacturers. Mounting of housings in the wheel area must be free of protruding screws and bolts.

F. Exception: Type A vehicles – Standard does not apply to conversion vans.

76. Windshield and Windows.

A. All glass in windshield, windows, and doors shall be of approved safety glass, so mounted that permanent mark is visible, and of sufficient quality to prevent distortion of view in any direction. Windshield shall be AS1 and all other glass shall be AS2.

B. Plastic glazing material of a thickness comparable to AS2 glass, meeting ANSI Standard Z 26.1 and FMVSS 205 (Glazing Materials), 49 CFR § 571.205, may be used in side windows behind the driver’s compartment.

C. Windshield shall have horizontal shade band consistent with SAE J-100 or have full tinted glass and Code of Virginia.

D. Each full side window shall provide unobstructed emergency opening at least nine inches high and 22 inches wide, obtained either by lowering of window or by use of knock-out type split-sash windows.

E. Approved tinted glass or plastic glazing material may be used consistent with the Code of Virginia.

F. Windshield shall comply with all federal and state regulations.

77. Windshield Washers.

A. Windshield washers meeting federal requirements shall be provided and shall be controlled by a switch accessible to the driver. Reservoir shall be mounted outside passenger compartment.
78. Windshield Wipers.

A. Bus shall be equipped with variable-speed windshield wipers of air or electric-type powered by a motor or motors of sufficient power to operate wipers.

B. Blades and arms shall be of such size that minimum blade length will be 12 inches with longer blades being used whenever possible.

C. The wipers shall meet the requirements of FMVSS 104 (*Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*).

79. Wiring.

A. All wiring shall conform to current standards of Society of Automotive Engineers.

B. Circuits

1. Wiring shall be arranged in at least 12 regular circuits as follows:
   a. Head, tail, stop (brake) and instrument panel lamps
   b. Clearance lamps
   c. Dome and step well lamps
   d. Starter motor
   e. Ignition
   f. Turn-signal units
   g. Alternately flashing red signal lamps
   h. Horns
   i. Heater and defroster
   j. Emergency door buzzer
   k. Auxiliary fan
   l. Booster pump (*Type A exempt*)
2. Any of the above combination circuits may be subdivided into additional independent circuits.

3. Whenever possible, all other electrical functions (such as electric-type windshield wipers) shall be provided with independent and properly protected circuits.

4. Each body circuit shall be color coded or numbered and a diagram of the circuits shall be attached to the body in a readily accessible location.

C. A circuit breaker shall be provided for each circuit except starter motor and ignition circuits.

D. A continuous duty solenoid relay operated by the ignition switch, for Circuits i, j, k, and l.

E. All wires within body shall be insulated and protected by covering of fibrous loom (or equivalent) that will protect them from external damage and minimize dangers from short circuits. Whenever wires pass through body member, additional protection in form of appropriate type of insert shall be provided.

F. All light circuits shall be such as to provide, as nearly as possible, bulb design voltage at light bulb terminals.

G. Buses using multiplexed electrical systems may meet the intent of these specifications without the use of specified equipment, subject to the approval of the Department of Education.

H. There shall be a manual noise suppression switch installed in the control panel. The switch shall be labeled and alternately colored. This switch shall be an on/off type that deactivates body equipment that produces noise, including, at least, the AM/FM radio, heaters, air conditioners, fans and defrosters. This switch shall not deactivate safety systems, such as windshield wipers or lighting systems.

**SPECIFICATIONS FOR ACTIVITY BUSES**

80. **Activity Buses.**

A. Activity buses shall meet all Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards for school buses except as noted in Items 80.B through 80.F.

(Note: Any variation from the specifications, in the form of additional equipment or changes in style of equipment, without prior approval of the DOE, is prohibited.)
B. Identification.

1. The activity bus body shall be identified “Activity Bus”, lettered 8 inches in height in the front and rear of the vehicle.

2. The name of the school division or individual school shall be lettered in at least 4 inch height in the beltline area.

3. All lettering and numbering shall be painted or be vinyl decals of a contrasting color of the body and conform to FMVSS and Virginia School Bus Specifications, and shall meet all reflectivity standards.

4. No manufacturer or vendor logos, signs or other items not approved in the Virginia School Bus Specifications shall be displayed.

C. Color.

1. The activity bus shall not be painted NSBY. The local school division may determine the color of the body of the vehicle and the color scheme may utilize up to 2 colors. This combination may be in addition to a white painted roof. It is recommended that light colors be used for the body color to enhance visibility by other vehicles. Markings shall be contrasted against selected colors for ease of identification during periods of reduced visibility other than darkness. NOTE: The NSBY color shall not be used as a part of any color scheme.

D. Lights and Warning Devices.

1. All activity buses shall meet all state and FMVSS for school bus lighting and warning device requirements with the following exceptions:

   a. The 8 lamp, traffic warning light system shall not be equipped.

   b. The flashing lighted stop arm and the crossing control arm shall not be equipped.

E. Seats.

1. Other types of seats and increased spacing, which meet all regulations of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and
Virginia School Bus Specifications
Final Revisions, March 2011

Crash Protection) and 302 (Flammability of Interior Materials) may be used in lieu of regular school bus seats.

2. Seating on activity buses: Other types of seats and increased spacing may be used provided all provisions of FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection), 49 CFR §571.222, are met.

F. Cruise Control.

1. Optional equipment and shall may only be used on activity trips buses and be operated in accordance with regulation speeds.

NOTE: Cruise control option is for activity buses only; not permitted to be on yellow school buses.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR WHEELCHAIR LIFT SCHOOL BUSES

81. General Requirements.

A. School buses or school vehicles designed for transporting children with special transportation needs shall comply with Virginia’s standards applicable to school buses and Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards as applicable to their GVWR category.

B. Any school bus that is used for the transportation of children, who are confined to a wheelchair or other restraining devices that prohibit use of the regular service entrance, shall be equipped with a power lift, unless a ramp is needed for unusual circumstances.

C. Lift shall be located on the right side of the body, in no way attached to the exterior sides of the bus but confined within the perimeter of the school bus body when not extended.

82. Aisles.

A. All aisles leading to the emergency door from wheelchair area shall be a minimum of 30 inches in width. A wheelchair securement position shall never be located directly in front of (blocking) a power lift door location.

83. Communications.

A. Special education buses shall be equipped with a two-way communication system. (See Item 39 40 A.)
84. Fastening Devices.

A. Unless otherwise specified below, fastening devices shall conform to FMVSS 222 (School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection), 49 CFR § 571.222, as amended.

1. Wheelchair fastening devices shall be provided and attached to the floor or walls or both to enable securement of wheelchairs in the vehicle. The devices shall be of the type that requires human intervention to unlatch or disengage. The fastening devices shall be designed to withstand forces up to 3,000 pounds per tie down leg or clamping mechanism or 12,000 pounds total for each wheelchair.

2. Additional fastening devices may be needed to assist the student due to the many different configurations of chairs and exceptionalities.

85. Heaters.

A. An additional heater shall be installed in the rear portion of the bus behind wheel wells as required in Item 48 I, except a 50,000 minimum BTU heater may be used in bodies originally designed for 31-66 passenger capacity and 34,000 minimum BTU heaters may be used in bodies of 30 passengers or less. Hose to rear heater, when under body shall be encased in metal tube.

86. Identification.

A. Buses with wheelchair lifts used for transporting children with physical disabilities shall display universal handicapped symbols located on the front and rear of the vehicle below the window line. Such emblems shall be white on blue, shall be a minimum of nine inches and a maximum of 12 inches in size, and shall be of a high-intensity retro reflective material meeting the requirements of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) FP-85, Standard Specifications for Construction of Roads and Bridges on Federal Highway Projects. They shall be placed so as not to cover lettering, lamps or glass.

87. Passenger Capacity Rating.

A. In determining the passenger capacity of a school bus for purposes other than actual passenger load (e.g., vehicle classification or various billing/reimbursement models), any location in a school bus intended for securement of a wheelchair during vehicle operation shall be regarded as
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Attachment B

four designated seating positions, and each lift area shall count as four designated seating positions.

88. Wheelchair Lift.

   A. The wheelchair lift shall be located on the right side of the bus body.
      Exception: The lift may be located on the left side of the bus if, and only if, the bus is only used to deliver students to the left side of one-way streets.

   1. A ramp device may be used in lieu of a mechanical lift if the ramp meets all the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as found in 36 CFR §1192.23, Vehicle ramp.

   2. A ramp device that does not meet the specifications of ADA, but does meet the specifications of paragraph C of this section, may be installed and used, when, and only when, a power lift system is not adequate to load and unload students having special and unique needs. A readily accessible ramp may be installed for emergency exit use. If stowed in the passenger compartment, the ramp must be properly secured and placed away from general passenger contact. It must not obstruct or restrict any aisle or exit while in its stowed or deployed position.

   3. All specially equipped school buses shall provide a level-change mechanism or boarding device (e.g., lift or ramp), complying with paragraph B or C of this section, with sufficient clearances to permit a wheelchair user to reach a securement location.

   B. Vehicle lift and installation.

   1. General: Vehicle lifts and installations shall comply with the requirements set forth in FMVSS 403 (Platform Lift Systems for Motor Vehicles), and FMVSS 404 (Platform Lift Installations in Motor Vehicles).

   2. Design loads: The design load of the lift shall be at least 800 pounds. Working parts, such as cables, pulleys and shafts, which can be expected to wear, and upon which the lift depends for support of the load, shall have a safety factor of at least six, based on the ultimate strength of the material. Non-working parts, such as platform, frame and attachment hardware that would not be expected to wear, shall have a safety factor of at least three, based on the ultimate strength of the material.
3. Lift capacity: The lifting mechanism and platform shall be capable of operating effectively with a wheelchair and occupant mass of at least 800 pounds.

4. Controls: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.7, Control systems.)

5. Emergency operations: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.9, Backup operation.)

6. Power or equipment failures: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.2.2, Maximum platform velocity.)

7. Platform barriers: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.4.7, Wheelchair retention.)

8. Platform surface: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.4.2, S6.4.3, Platform requirements.)

9. Platform gaps and entrance ramps: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.4.4, Gaps, transitions and openings.)

10. Platform deflection: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.4.5, Platform deflection.)

11. Platform movement: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.2.3, Maximum platform acceleration.)

12. Boarding direction: The lift shall permit both inboard and outboard facing of wheelchair and mobility aid users.

13. Use by standees: Lifts shall accommodate persons who are using walkers, crutches, canes or braces, or who otherwise have difficulty using steps. The platform may be marked to indicate a preferred standing position.

14. Handrails: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.4.9, Handrails.)

15. Circuit breaker: A resettable circuit breaker shall be installed between the power source and the lift motor if electrical power is used. It shall be located as close to the power source as possible, but not within the passenger/driver compartment.

16. Excessive pressure: (See 49 CFR 571.403, S6.8, Jacking prevention.)
17. Documentation: The following information shall be provided with each vehicle equipped with a lift:

a. A phone number where information can be obtained about installation, repair and parts. (Detailed written instructions and parts list shall be available upon request.)

b. Detailed instructions regarding use of the lift shall be readily visible when the lift door is open, including a diagram showing the proper placement and positions of wheelchair/mobility aids on the lift.

18. Training materials: The lift manufacturer shall make training materials available to ensure the proper use and maintenance of the lift. These may include instructional videos, classroom curriculum, system test results or other related materials.

19. Identification and certification: Each lift shall be permanently and legibly marked or shall incorporate a non-removable label or tag that states it conforms to all applicable requirements of the current National School Transportation Specifications and Procedures. In addition and upon request of the original titled purchaser, the lift manufacturer or an authorized representative shall provide a notarized Certificate of Conformance, either original or photocopied, which states that the lift system meets all the applicable requirements of the current National School Transportation Specifications and Procedures.

C. Vehicle ramp

1. If a ramp is used, it shall be of sufficient strength and rigidity to support the special device, occupant and attendant(s). It shall be equipped with a protective flange on each longitudinal side to keep the special device on the ramp.

2. The surface of the ramp shall be constructed of nonskid material.

3. The ramp shall be equipped with handles and shall be of weight and design to permit one person to put the ramp in place and return it to its storage place.

4. Ramps used for emergency evacuation purposes may be installed in raised floor buses by manufacturers. They shall not be installed as a substitute for a lift when a lift is capable of serving the need.
89. **Ramps.**

A. When a power lift system is not adequate to load and unload students having special and unique needs, a ramp device may be installed.

1. If a ramp is used, it shall be of sufficient strength and rigidity to support the special device, occupant, and attendants. It shall be equipped with a protective flange on each longitudinal side to keep special device on the ramp.

2. Floor of ramp shall be of nonskid construction.

3. Ramp shall be of weight and design, and equipped with handles, to permit one person to put ramp in place and return it to its storage place.

90. **Regular Service Entrance.**

A. In Type D vehicles, there shall be three step risers, of equal height, in the entrance well.

B. An additional foldout step may be provided which will provide for the step level to be no more than six inches from the ground level.

C. Three step risers in Type C vehicles are optional.

91. **Restraining Devices.**

A. Seat frames may be equipped with attachments or devices to which restraining harnesses or other devices may be attached. Attachment framework or anchorage devices, if installed, shall conform to FMVSS 210 (*Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*), 49 CFR § 571.210, and FMVSS No. 213 (*Child Restraint Systems*).

92. **Seating Arrangements.**

A. Flexibility in seat arrangements to accommodate special devices shall be permitted due to the constant changing of passenger requirements. All seating shall meet the requirements of FMVSS 222 (*School Bus Passenger Seating and Crash Protection*).

B. There shall be a padded barrier forward of any standard seating position and between lift-gate and first seat to rear of lift-gate. A wheelchair position immediately forward of lift-gate shall have a barrier between lift and wheelchair. (See Item 65.)
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93. Special Light.

A. Lights shall be placed inside the bus to sufficiently illuminate lift area and shall be activated from door area. An outside light to be activated when lift door is open and deactivated when lift door is closed is permissible.

94. Special Service Entrance.

A. Bus bodies may have a special service entrance constructed in the body to accommodate a wheelchair lift for the loading and unloading of passengers.

B. The opening to accommodate the special service entrance shall be at any convenient point on the right (curb side) of the bus and far enough to the rear to prevent the doors, when open, from obstructing the right front regular service door (excluding a regular front service door lift).

C. The opening shall not extend below the floor level. Outboard type lifts shall be used.

D. The opening, with doors open, shall be of sufficient width to allow the passage of wheelchairs. The minimum clear opening through the door and the lift mechanism shall be 30 inches in width.

E. A drip molding shall be installed above the opening to effectively divert water from entrance.

F. Entrance shall be of sufficient width and depth to accommodate various mechanical lifts and related accessories as well as the lifting platform.

G. Doorposts and headers from entrance shall be reinforced sufficiently to provide support and strength equivalent to the areas of the side of the bus not used for service doors.

H. Special service entrance doors shall be equipped with padding at the top edge of the door opening. Pad shall be at least three inches wide and one inch thick and extend the full width of the door opening.

95. Special Service Entrance Doors.

A. A single door of a minimum 43 inches may be used.

B. All doors shall open outwardly.

C. All doors shall have positive fastening devices approved by Pupil Transportation Services to hold doors in the open position.
D. All doors shall be weather sealed and on buses with double doors, they shall be so constructed that a flange on the forward door overlaps the edge of the rear door when closed.

E. When dual doors are provided, the rear door shall have at least a one-point fastening device to the header. The forward mounted door shall have at least three-point fastening devices. One shall be to the header, one to the floor line of the body, and the other shall be into the rear door. These locking devices shall afford maximum safety when the doors are in the closed position. The door and hinge mechanism shall be of a strength that will provide for the same type of use as that of a standard entrance door.

F. Door materials, panels, and structural strength shall be equivalent to the conventional service and emergency doors. Color, rub rail extensions, lettering and other exterior features shall match adjacent sections of the body.

G. Each door shall have windows set in a waterproof manner compatible within one inch of the lower line of adjacent sash.

H. Doors shall be equipped with a device that will actuate a flashing visible signal located in the driver’s compartment when doors are not securely closed and ignition is in “on” position. A cluster light “LIFT” is allowed.

I. A switch shall be installed so that the lifting mechanism will not operate when the lift platform doors are closed.

96. Special Optional Equipment.

A. Special seats for attendants may be installed on an optional basis. The location, restraints, and so forth shall be assessed and approved on an individual unit basis. All equipment shall be secured properly.
**MINIMUM LETTERING AND LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Clearance lights (see item 56 A(1))</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Name of Division (see item 51 A(3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Octagonal Stop Arm (2nd optional-see item 56-10(g))</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bus Numbers (see item 51 A(2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Front Turn Signals, (amber lenses)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Universal Handicapped Symbol, Wheelchair Lift Equipped Buses (see item 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pupil Warning Lights, Side By Side Amber and Red, Flat Back Design Quartz Halogen Bulb</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Identification Lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Reflectors (see item 56 A(8))</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Battery Box (see item 51 A (5c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Emergency Exit</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Pupil Crossing Arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Double Faced Flashing Red Lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>SCHOOL BUS, Front And Rear, 8 inch letters on retroreflective yellow background</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Cross/Side View Mirror System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Diagram 1**

![Diagram of a school bus with labels for various features as described in the text.](image)
### Minimum Lettering and Lighting Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Clearance lights (see item 56 A(1))</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Bus Numbers (see item 51 A(2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Seven inch Tail Lights</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Universal Handicapped Symbol, Wheelchair Lift Equipped Buses (see item 86 for exact size and location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Seven Inch Turn Signals (amber lenses)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Identification Lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4 inch Stop / Tail Lights</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Back-up Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pupil Warning Lights, Side By Side Amber and Red, Flat Back Design Quartz Halogen Bulb</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fuel Door (see item 51 A(4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Reflectors (see item 56 A(8))</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Wheelchair Lift Landing Light (see item 93(A))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>License Plate Lamp</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Cross/Side View Mirror System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Emergency Exit Signs</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Roof-mounted White Flashing Strobe Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>SCHOOL BUS, Front And Rear, 8 inch letters on retroflective yellow background</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Rear Door Lettering (optional see item 51 A 5 (e))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Name of Division (see item 51 A(3))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Diagram 2*
Addendum

Air-Conditioning (Optional):

The following specifications are applicable to all types of school buses that may be equipped with air conditioning.

1. Performance Specifications.

The installed air conditioning system should cool the interior of the bus from 100 degrees to 80 degrees Fahrenheit, measured at three points (minimum) located four feet above the floor on the longitudinal centerline of the bus. The three required points shall be: (1) near the driver’s location, (2) at the longitudinal midpoint of the body, and (3) two feet forward of the emergency door, or for Type D rear-engine buses, 2 feet forward of the end of the aisle.

The test conditions under which the above performance must be achieved shall consist of (1) placing the bus in a room (such as a paint booth) where ambient temperature can be maintained at 100 degrees Fahrenheit; (2) soaking the bus at 100 degrees Fahrenheit with windows open for at least one hour; and (3) closing windows, turning on the air conditioner with the engine running at the chassis manufacturer’s recommended low idle speed, and cooling the interior of the bus to 80 degrees Fahrenheit, or lower, within 30 minutes while maintaining 100 degrees Fahrenheit outside temperature.

Alternately, and at the user’s discretion, this test may be performed under actual summer conditions, which consist of temperatures above 85 degrees Fahrenheit, humidity above 50 percent with normal sun loading of the bus and the engine running at the engine manufacturer’s recommended low idle speed. After a minimum of one hour of heat soaking, the system shall be turned on and must provide a minimum of a 20 degree temperature drop in the 30 minute time limit.

The manufacturer shall provide facilities for the user or user’s representative to confirm that a pilot model of each bus design meets the above performance requirements.
### Minimum Chassis Specification Chart

**Type A Bus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVWR (Pounds) (Minimum)</td>
<td>10,000 lbs</td>
<td>10,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum engine size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic speed limiter set to maximum of 60 MPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>diesel engines</strong></td>
<td>6.0 Liter</td>
<td>6.0 Liter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gasoline engines</strong></td>
<td>5.4 Liter</td>
<td>5.4 Liter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbase (inches)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum fuel tank, gallons</td>
<td>30 gallons</td>
<td>30 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires*</td>
<td>See Item 28</td>
<td>See Item 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rims</td>
<td>Disc 6.0 X 16</td>
<td>Disc 6.0 X 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Transmission Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 speed automatic</td>
<td>4 speed automatic</td>
<td>4 speed automatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternators amps</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Per standards for severe duty</td>
<td>Per standards for severe duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>Power-meeting Virginia Specification</td>
<td>Power-meeting Virginia Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Bumper</td>
<td>Heavy duty painted black</td>
<td>Heavy duty painted black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brakes</td>
<td>Power, with anti-lock brakes system</td>
<td>Power, with anti-lock brakes system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Per standards for severe duty</td>
<td>Per standards for severe duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Shaft</td>
<td>Grease fittings on all shafts, guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Grease fittings on all shafts, guards on all shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Tank</td>
<td>30 gallons (see item 16)</td>
<td>30 gallons (see item 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Cleaner</td>
<td>Per engine manufacturer specifications w/restrictor indicator</td>
<td>Per engine manufacturer specifications w/restrictor indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Filter</td>
<td>Replaceable, 1 quart</td>
<td>Replaceable, 1 quart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>600 CCA</td>
<td>600 CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Dual Electric</td>
<td>Dual Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauges</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp, and voltmeter</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp, and voltmeter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minimum Chassis Specification Chart

### Type A Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td>Frame, wheels, bumper, rails and letterings-black; balance yellow</td>
<td>Frame, wheels, bumper, rails and letterings-black; balance yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 16 Passenger Base Bus (Gasoline Engine – must have automatic fire [extinguisher suppression system](#) – V8 – Min)
2. 16 Passenger Base Bus (Diesel Engine)
3. 24 Passenger Base Bus (Gasoline Engine – must have automatic fire [extinguisher suppression system](#) – V8 – Min)
4. 24 Passenger Base Bus (Diesel Engine)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>Type C Bus 30</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVWR (lbs.)</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheels</td>
<td>8-STUD DISC 19.5” X 6.75”</td>
<td>8-STUD DISC 22.5” X 6.75”</td>
<td>8-STUD DISC 22.5” X 6.75”</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5” X 7.75”</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5” X 7.75”</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5” X 8.25”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>9R22.5 (1)</td>
<td>9R22.5 (1)</td>
<td>9R22.5 (1)</td>
<td>10R22.5(1)</td>
<td>10R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Bumper</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Axle</td>
<td>7,000 lbs</td>
<td>6,000 lbs</td>
<td>8,000 lbs</td>
<td>10,000 lbs</td>
<td>10,000 lbs</td>
<td>10,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Axle</td>
<td>10,500 lbs</td>
<td>15,000 lbs</td>
<td>17,000 lbs</td>
<td>17,500 lbs</td>
<td>19,000 lbs</td>
<td>21,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service brake:</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs(3)</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs(3)</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs(3)</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs(3)</td>
<td>Hydraulic Disc w/abs(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer(3)</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer(3)</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer(3)</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Compressor/Air dryer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Load range meeting TRA standards for required gawr.

(2) Power – Meeting Virginia specification

(3) Hydraulic (w/ Allison 2200 pts only) Full Air (5 speed direct or Allison 2100 pts only)
# Minimum Chassis Specification Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type C Bus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Type C1 Bus</strong></th>
<th><strong>35</strong></th>
<th><strong>53</strong></th>
<th><strong>65</strong></th>
<th><strong>71</strong></th>
<th><strong>77</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspension</strong></td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 7,000 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
<td>Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engine</strong></td>
<td>175 H.P.*</td>
<td>175 H.P.*</td>
<td>175 H.P.*</td>
<td>175 H.P.*</td>
<td>190 H.P.*</td>
<td>210 H.P.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transmission (Allison)</strong></td>
<td>5 Speed Direct, 1,000 PTS</td>
<td>5 Speed Direct, 2,200 or 2,100 pts**</td>
<td>5 Speed Direct, 2,100 or 2,200 pts**</td>
<td>5 Speed Direct or 2,500 pts</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive Shaft</strong></td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel tank (min size)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air cleaner</strong></td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternator</strong></td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp and ground circuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horn</strong></td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (ENGINE) Electronic speed limiter set to maximum of 60 mph.

** See Brake Item 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>Type C1 Bus</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lights</strong></td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gauges</strong></td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure as required</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure as required</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oil Filter</strong></td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battery</strong></td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minimum Chassis Specification Chart

### TYPE D Front Engine Transit Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>42 &amp; 53</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVWR (lbs.)</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheels</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 8.25&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 8.25&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Bumper</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Axle</td>
<td>10,800 lbs</td>
<td>12,000 lbs</td>
<td>12,000 lbs</td>
<td>13,000 lbs</td>
<td>13,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Axle</td>
<td>17,000 lbs</td>
<td>17,000 lbs</td>
<td>17,000 lbs</td>
<td>19,000 lbs</td>
<td>19,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service brakes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 5,400 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 8,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,000 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 8,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,500 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 9,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,500 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 9,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,500 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 9,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td>190 H.P*</td>
<td>190 H.P*</td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>210*</td>
<td>210*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission (Allison)</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>3,000 PTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Shaft</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel tank (min size)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air cleaner</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternator</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Load range meeting TRA standards for required gawr.
(2) Power – Meeting Virginia specification.

* (ENGINE) Electronic speed limiter set to maximum of 60 mph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>42 &amp; 53</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lights</strong></td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gauges</strong></td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oil Filter</strong></td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battery</strong></td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minimum Chassis Specification Chart

**TYPE D Rear Engine Transit Bus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GVWR (lbs.)</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheels</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>10-Stud Disc 22.5&quot; X 7.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
<td>11R22.5(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
<td>ONE PIECE SIDE MEMBER – FRONT TOW HOOKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
<td>Power (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Bumper</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
<td>3/16 Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Axle</td>
<td>10,800 lbs</td>
<td>10,800 lbs</td>
<td>12,000 lbs</td>
<td>12,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Axle</td>
<td>19,000 lbs</td>
<td>19,000 lbs</td>
<td>21,000 lbs</td>
<td>21,000 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service brakes:</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
<td>13.2 CMF Comp/Air dryer 16.5&quot; x 5&quot; Frt 16.5 x 7&quot; Rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 5,400 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 9,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 5,400 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 9,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,000 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
<td>Frt. Springs 6,000 lbs. Ea @ grd. Rear Springs 10,500 lbs. Ea @ grd Frt. and rear shock absorbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td>190 H.P*</td>
<td>190 H.P*</td>
<td>210 H.P*</td>
<td>210 H.P*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission (Allison)</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>2,500 PTS</td>
<td>3,000 PTS</td>
<td>3,000 PTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Shaft</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
<td>Guards on all shafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel tank (min size)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air cleaner</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
<td>Dry element type w/restriction gauge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternator</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
<td>160 amp 4 ga. charging and ground circuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
<td>Per FMVSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
<td>Per FMVSS and daytime running lights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Load range meeting TRA standards for required gawr.
(2) Power – Meeting Virginia specification.

* (ENGINE) Electronic speed limiter set to maximum of 60 mph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Design (Passenger) Capacity</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gauges</strong></td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
<td>Speedometer, tachometer, fuel, oil pressure, coolant temp &amp; voltmeter, air pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oil Filter</strong></td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
<td>1 Qt. Per manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battery</strong></td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
<td>750 cca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: B. Date: March 24, 2011

Topic: Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Cut Score and Implementation Dates for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test

Presenter: Mrs. Patty S. Pitts, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Licensure

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522 E-Mail Address: Patty.Pitts@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by

  X State or federal law or regulation
  X Board of Education regulation

___ Other: _____________

X Action requested at this meeting ___ Action requested at future meeting: _____________

Previous Review/Action:

___ No previous board review/action

X Previous review/action

date: October 22, 2009
action: First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation Regarding the Certification of Braille Instructors in Response to the Virginia General Assembly House Bill 2224

date: November 17, 2009
action: Final Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation Regarding the Certification of Braille Instructors in Response to the Virginia General Assembly House Bill 2224

date: June 24, 2010
action: First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Braille Assessment for Teachers Seeking an Initial License with an Endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments

date: July 22, 2010
action: Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve a Braille Assessment for Teachers Seeking an Initial License with an Endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments
Background Information:

The 2009 Virginia General Assembly enacted the following House Bill 2224, Chapter 202, regarding Braille certification:

§ 1. That by December 31, 2009, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, in consultation with the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, shall make recommendations to the Board of Education and the Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education and Health regarding the certification of Braille instructors.

In consultation with the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) began discussions regarding Braille instruction, certification, and licensure. On April 20, 2009, the Advisory Board approved a committee to research the policy issues and make recommendations to the full Advisory Board.

ABTEL’s committee on Braille convened July 8 and August 5, 2009. At the meeting on August 5, 2009, Dr. Edward C. Bell, director of the Professional Development and Research Institute on Blindness, Louisiana Technology University, and Mr. Michael Kasey, National Federation of the Blind, met with the committee.

The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure met on September 20-21, 2009, to review the committee’s report and make a recommendation to the Board of Education. The Advisory Board received the report of the committee including research on Braille instruction, authority regarding Braille instruction, licensure assessments, the current teacher work force with endorsements in Special Education-Visual Impairments, Virginia’s consortium to prepare teachers of visual impairments, requirements of other states, and available Braille assessments.

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

The Advisory Board unanimously recommends to the Board of Education that a reliable, valid, and legally defensible assessment available statewide (to be determined) demonstrating Braille proficiency prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education be required for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. [The Department of Education shall follow policies and procedures relative to the procurement of such an assessment.] Additionally, contingent upon available funding, opportunities for licensed teachers with the endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments will be afforded additional professional development in the teaching of Braille through the Virginia Department of Education and the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired. The Advisory Board supports the Virginia Board of Education’s efforts to include teachers of visual impairments in the Standards of Quality funding formula.
The Board of Education approved the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation on Braille certification in response to the 2009 Virginia General Assembly House Bill 2224 on November 17, 2009.

At the request of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure, a committee was convened on March 29, 2010, to recommend a Braille assessment to be considered as a requirement for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. After reviewing available assessments, the committee unanimously recommended the Braille Proficiency Test owned by the Texas Education Agency and administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The Braille-only test was developed by the Educational Testing Service for Texas. The state of Mississippi also has adopted this test.

On April 19, 2010, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure voted unanimously to recommend that the Virginia Board of Education approve the Braille Proficiency Test administered by the Educational Testing Service as the required assessment for individuals seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. The committee’s rationale included the following: (1) the Braille Proficiency Test developed by the Educational Testing Service is a reliable, valid, and legally defensible assessment; (2) the test appears to cover the appropriate knowledge and skills for Braille; (3) the test would be available after a state-specific standard setting study; and (4) the test is accessible across the state.

On July 22, 2010, the Board of Education approved ABTEL’s recommendation that the Braille Proficiency Test administered by the Educational Testing Service be the required assessment for individuals seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. The Board also authorized Department of Education staff to begin the standard-setting process for the test.

**Summary of Major Elements:**

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test (0631), research staff from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments. The standard setting study involved an expert panel comprised of teachers and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) experience with teaching students with visual impairments, either as teachers or college faculty who prepare teachers, (b) proficiency with reading and producing Braille, and (c) familiarity with the skills required of beginning teachers of students with visual impairments.

The panel was convened on October 28, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The attached technical report (Appendix) describes the content and format of the assessment, the standard setting processes and methods used, and the results of the standard setting study.

The Praxis Braille Proficiency Test at a Glance document (ETS, 2010) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. The assessment measures whether entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments have the level of Braille proficiency believed necessary for competent professional practice. The four-hour assessment contains 25 multiple-choice questions and four constructed-response questions and covers reading and producing contracted and uncontracted literary Braille and Nemeth Code. The maximum total number of raw-score points that may be earned is 36. The reporting scale for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test (0631) ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.
For the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test (0631), the panel’s cut score recommendation is 24.70. The value was rounded to the next highest whole number to determine the functional recommended cut score, 25. The value of 25 represents approximately 69 percent of the total available 36 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 25 raw points is 168.

Texas commissioned the development of this assessment. Texas based their passing score on 25 raw points out of a possible 36 points. On the Praxis scale, this would correspond to a scaled score of 168. The only other state using the assessment, Mississippi, has a scaled cut score of 158.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scaled Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 (2.49)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

On January 24, 2011, the Advisory Board for Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) recommended that the Board of Education set a passing score of 168 for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test (0631) for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments. ABTEL also recommended that the implementation date for the assessment be July 1, 2011, except for individuals completing the approved Virginia Visual Impairments Consortium program who must meet the assessment requirement beginning July 1, 2012.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendations to (1) set a passing score of 168 for the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test for individuals seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments and (2) establish the implementation date for the assessment as July 1, 2011, except for individuals completing the approved Virginia Visual Impairments Consortium program who must meet the assessment requirement effective July 1, 2012.

Impact on Resources:

Costs associated with the administration of the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test (0631) will be incurred by the Educational Testing Service. Prospective teachers seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Special Education-Visual Impairments will be required to pay the registration and test fees.
Timetable for Further Review/Action:

N/A
APPENDIX

Standard Setting Report
PRAXIS BRAILLE PROFICIENCY (0631)
Standard Setting Report

PRAXIS BRAILLE PROFICIENCY (0631)

Prepared for the Virginia Department of Education

November 2010

Conducted by
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey
Executive Summary

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on October 28, 2010. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments.

Recommended Cut Score

The standard setting study involved an expert panel, comprised of teachers and college faculty. The recommended cut score is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, the recommended cut score (rounded up) is 25 (on the raw score metric), which represents 69% of total available 36 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 25 is 168.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments

Panelists judged the extent to which the skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments. The favorable judgment of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
**Introduction**

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on October 28, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments. The standard setting study involved an expert panel comprised of teachers and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) experience with teaching students with visual impairments, either as teachers or college faculty who prepare teachers, (b) proficiency with reading and producing Braille, and (c) familiarity with the skills required of beginning teachers of students with visual impairments.

The passing score recommendation for the *Praxis Braille Proficiency* (0631) is provided to the VDOE. The VDOE is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable state regulations. The study provides a recommended passing score, which represents the combined judgments of one group of experienced educators. The full range of the VDOE’s needs and expectations could not be represented during the standard setting study. The VDOE, therefore, may want to consider both the panel’s recommended cut score and other sources to information when setting the final *Praxis Braille Proficiency* (0631) cut score (Geisinger & McCormick, 2010). Other kinds of information may provide reasons for the VDOE to adjust the recommended cut score. The recommended cut score may be accepted, adjusted upward to reflect more stringent expectations, or adjusted downward to reflect more lenient expectations. There is no *correct* decision; the appropriateness of any adjustment may only be evaluated in terms of its meeting the VDOE’s needs.

Two critical sources of information to consider when setting the cut score are the standard error of measurement (SEM) and the standard error of judgment (SEJ). The former addresses the reliability of *Praxis Braille Proficiency* (0631) scores and the latter the reliability of panelists’ cut score recommendations. The SEM allows VDOE to recognize that a *Praxis Braille Proficiency* (0631) score—any test score on any test—is less than perfectly reliable. A test score only approximates what a candidate *truly* knows or *truly* can do on the test. The SEM, therefore, addresses the question: “How close of an approximation is the test score to the *true* score?” The SEJ allows the VDOE to consider the
likelihood that the recommended cut score from the current panel would be similar to cut scores recommended by other panels of experts similar in composition and experience. The smaller the SEJ, the more likely that another panel would recommend a cut score consistent with the recommended cut score. The larger the SEJ, the less likely the recommended cut score would be reproduced by another panel.

In addition to measurement error metrics (e.g., SEM, SEJ), the VDOE should consider the likelihood of classification error. That is, when adjusting a cut score, policymakers should consider whether it is more important to minimize a false positive decision or to minimize a false negative decision. A false positive decision occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests he should receive a license/certificate, but his actual knowledge/skill level is lower (i.e., the candidate does not possess the required knowledge/skills). A false negative occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests that she should not receive a license/certificate, but she actually does possess the required knowledge/skills. The VDOE needs to consider which decision error to minimize; it is not possible to eliminate both types of decision errors simultaneously.

**Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment**

The Praxis Braille Proficiency *Test at a Glance* document (ETS, 2010) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments have the level of braille proficiency believed necessary for competent professional practice.

The four hour assessment contains 25 multiple-choice questions\(^1\) and four constructed-response questions and covers reading and producing contracted and uncontracted literary braille and Nemeth Code. The maximum total number of raw-score points that may be earned is 36. The reporting scale for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

---

\(^1\) Five multiple-choice questions are pretest questions and do not contribute to a candidate’s score.
Expert Panels

The standard setting study for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0621) assessment included an expert panel recruited by the VDOE. The VDOE recruited panelists to represent a range of professional perspectives. A description of the panel is presented below. (See the Appendix for a listing of panelists.)

The panel included 14 teachers of students with visual impairments. Thirteen panelists were White and one was African American. Thirteen panelists were female. All the panelists reported being certified teachers of students with visual impairments in Virginia. Nearly 80% of the panelists had 16 or more years of experience teaching Braille.

A fuller demographic description for the members of the panel is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Committee Member Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group you are representing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you currently have a Special Education – Visual Impairments endorsement in Virginia?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently teaching braille?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently supervising or mentoring teachers of visually impaired students?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)
Committee Member Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Including this year, how many years of experience do you have teaching braille?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 7 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 11 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-5 or K-6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6-8 or 7-9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12 or 10-12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Setting</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process and Method

The design of the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment standard setting study for the VDOE included an expert panel. The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the content specifications for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment (included in the Praxis Braille Proficiency Test at a Glance, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the assessment.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction. Dr. James Lanham, Director of Licensure, welcomed the panelists and provided an overview of the certification process in Virginia. Dr. Clyde Reese, the ETS facilitator, then provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study. (The agenda for the meeting is in the Appendix.)
Reviewing the Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately an hour and a half to respond to the multiple-choice questions and to take notes on the constructed-response (transcription) questions. The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists were given the answer key (correct answers for the multiple-choice questions) to self-score and the rubrics for the constructed-response questions; how well a panelist did on the test was not shared.

The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the assessment; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering teachers of students with visual impairments, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering teachers.

Describing the Just Qualified Candidate

Following the review of the assessment, panelists described the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and/or skills believed necessary to be a qualified teacher of students with visual impairments. The JQC description is the operational definition of the cut score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this description of the JQC.

For each of the competency areas measured by the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, the panel was asked to provide performance indicators, or “can do” statements that answered the following two questions:

- What can our JQC do to demonstrate the necessary level of competency that a not-quite qualified candidate could not?
- What would be something that might represent a slightly higher level of competency than we would expect from our JQC?

The six competency areas are listed in the Appendix.
Panelists’ Judgments

The standard-setting process for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment is described next, followed by the results from the standard-setting study. The recommended cut score for the panel is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score.

**Standard Setting for Multiple-Choice Questions.** For the multiple-choice questions included on the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, a probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used. In this approach, for each multiple-choice question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

The panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:

- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range; and
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments for multiple-choice questions.

**Standard Setting for Constructed-Response Questions.** For the constructed-response questions included on the Praxis Braille Proficiency assessment, an Extended Angoff method (Cizek & Bunch, 2007; Hambleton & Plake, 1995) was used. In this approach, for each question, a panelist decides on the assigned score value that would most likely be earned by a JQC. The basic process that each panelist
followed was to consider the expected proficiency level of the JQC and then to review the question and the rubric for that question. The rubric for a question is based on the number of transcription errors in a candidate’s response; the possible scores for each question are 1, 2, 3 and 4. A test taker’s response to a constructed-response question is scored by a trained scorer and verified by the chief reader. Each panelist decided on the score most likely to be earned by a JQC. For each of the four constructed-response questions, panelists recorded the score (0 through 4) that a JQC would most likely earn. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments for constructed-response questions.

**Judgment of Praxis Braille Proficiency Content Specifications**

In addition to the standard setting process, the panel judged the importance of the skills stated or implied in the assessment content specifications for the job of an entry-level teacher of students with visual impairments. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the assessment. Judgments were made using a four-point Likert scale — Very Important, Important, Slightly Important, and Not Important. Each panelist independently judged the six competency areas.

**Results**

**Initial Evaluation Forms**

The panelists completed initial evaluations following training for multiple-choice questions and again following training for constructed-response questions. The primary information collected from these forms was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. All panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

**Summary of Standard Setting Judgments**

A summary of the standard-setting judgments is presented in Table 2. The numbers in the table reflect the recommended cut scores — the number of raw-score points needed to “pass” the assessment — of each panelist. For the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, results for the multiple-choice questions, constructed-response questions and the overall assessment are presented. Note that the Praxis
Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment reports a single overall score and that the panel is recommending a single cut score for the combination of the multiple-choice and constructed response questions. The separate “cut scores” for the two parts are intermediate steps in calculating the overall cut score.

The panel’s average recommended cut score and highest and lowest cut scores are reported, as are the standard deviation (SD) of panelists’ cut scores and the standard error of judgment (SEJ). The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability of the judgments. It indicates how likely it would be for other panels of educators similar in make-up, experience, and standard-setting training to the current panel to recommend the same cut score on the same form of the assessment. A comparable panel’s cut score would be within 1 SEJ of the current average cut score 68 percent of the time and within 2 SEJs 95 percent of the time.

For the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, the panel’s cut score recommendation is 24.70. The value was rounded to the next highest whole number to determine the functional recommended cut score, 25. The value of 25 represents approximately 69% of the total available 36 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 25 raw points is 168.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Multiple-Choice Judgments</th>
<th>Constructed-Response Judgments</th>
<th>Overall Cutscore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowest</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEJ</strong></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents the estimated standard errors of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut score. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled scores associated with 1 and 2 SEMs above and below the recommended cut score are provided.

Table 3
Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scaled Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments
Panelists judged the extent to which the skills reflected by the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments. Panelists rated the six competency areas on a four-point scale ranging from Very Important to Not Important. The panelists’ ratings are summarized in Table 4.

Reading Contracted and Uncontracted Literary Braille and Nemeth Code was judged Very Important by 12 of the 14 panelists (or 86%) with the remaining two panelists indicating that it is Important. Producing Braille Using a Manual Braillewriter and a Traditional Slate and Stylus was judge Very Important by 9 of the 14 panelists (or 64%) with five panelists indicating that it is Important. All six competency areas were judged to be Very Important or Important by more than 90% of the panelists.

2 The raw score SEM values included in this report are updated throughout the year as data become available. The SEM values listed in each edition of Understanding Your Praxis Scores (http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/pdf/uyps_web.pdf) are scaled score SEM values based on candidate scores on one or more test forms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification Rating</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Reading Contracted and Uncontracted Literary Braille and Nemeth Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading contracted and uncontracted literary braille</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reading basic Nemeth Code (e.g., +, -, x, ÷, =, &lt;, &gt;, %, $, decimals, punctuation indicators, horizontal and vertical formats of presentation)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using resources for reading advanced Nemeth Code</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Producing Braille Using a Manual Braillewriter and a Traditional (non-direct) Slate and Stylist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Producing contracted and uncontracted literary braille</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Producing basic Nemeth Code (e.g., +, -, x, ÷, =, &lt;, &gt;, %, $, decimals, punctuation indicators, horizontal and vertical formats of presentation)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Referring to Nemeth Code rules to produce advanced Nemeth Code</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Final Evaluations

The panelists completed an evaluation form at the conclusion of their standard setting study. The evaluation form asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation. Table 5 present the results of the final evaluation.

All panelists *Strongly Agreed* that they understood the purpose of the study and that the facilitator’s instructions and explanations were clear. All of the panelists *Agreed* or *Strongly Agreed* that they were prepared to make their standard setting judgments and that the standard-setting process was easy to follow.

**Table 5**
**Final Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of the study</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations were clear</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to “take the test” and to discuss the test content was useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to practice making standard setting judgments was useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training was adequate to complete my assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on October 28, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level teachers of students with visual impairments. The standard setting study involved an expert panel, comprised of teachers and college faculty.

Standard setting was conducted using a probability-based Angoff approach for the multiple-choice questions and an Extended Angoff method for the constructed-response questions. For the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment, the recommended cut score (rounded up) is 25 (on the raw score metric), which represents 69% of total available 36 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 25 is 168.

The panel confirmed that the knowledge and/or skills stated or implied in the Praxis Braille Proficiency (0631) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level teachers. The results of the evaluation surveys (initial and final) support the quality of the standard-setting implementation.
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AGENDA  
Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment  
Standard Setting Study  
October 28, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast &amp; Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Overview of the Licensure Process in Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Overview of Standard Setting &amp; Workshop Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Overview of the Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>“Take” the Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Discuss the Praxis Braille Proficiency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Standard Setting Training for M-C Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Standard Setting Judgments for Multiple-Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Standard Setting Training for CR Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Standard Setting Judgments for Constructed-Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Specification Judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Complete Final Evaluation, Collect Materials &amp; Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Reading Contracted and Uncontracted Literary Braille and Nemeth Code

- Reading contracted and uncontracted literary braille.
- Reading basic Nemeth Code (e.g., +, -, ×, ÷, =, <, >, %, $, decimals, punctuation indicators, horizontal and vertical formats of presentation).
- Using resources for reading advanced Nemeth Code.

II. Producing Braille using a manual braillewriter and a traditional (non-direct) slate and stylus

- Producing contracted and uncontracted literary braille.
- Producing basic Nemeth Code (e.g., +, -, ×, ÷, =, <, >, %, $, decimals, punctuation indicators, horizontal and vertical formats of presentation).
- Referring to Nemeth Code rules to produce advanced Nemeth Code.
The responsibility for teacher licensure is set forth in section 22.1-298.1 of the Code of Virginia, which states that the Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation the requirements for licensure of teachers. The Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (September 21, 2007) 8VAC20-22-40 (A) state, in part, that “…all candidates who hold at least a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university and who seek an initial Virginia teaching license must obtain passing scores on professional teacher’s assessments prescribed by the Board of Education.”

The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) examinations as the professional teacher’s assessment requirements for initial licensure in Virginia. The Board originally approved cut scores on 16 subject content tests that became effective July 1, 1999. Subsequently, the Board adopted additional content knowledge tests as they were developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Virginia teachers and teacher educators participated in validation and standard setting studies guided by ETS personnel to ensure an appropriate match between Praxis II tests and the competencies set forth in Virginia’s regulations, as well as the K-12 Standards of Learning.
ETS continues to update the Praxis II assessments through the test regeneration process. When this process results in substantial changes to the assessment, another standard setting study is required.

Summary of Major Elements

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051), research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on November 16, 2010. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

The study involved an expert panel comprised of teachers, administrators and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) technology education experience, either as technology education teachers or college faculty who prepare technology education teachers, and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning technology education teachers.

The panel was convened on November 16, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The technical report (Appendix A) is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting study.

In addition, research staff from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies in October 2010. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers. The attached technical report (Appendix B) details the work of the multi-state committees.

The Praxis Technology Education Test at a Glance document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level technology education teachers have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two-hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering Technology and Society (approximately 18 questions); Technological Design and Problem Solving (approximately 24 questions); Energy, Power, and Transportation (approximately 18 questions); Information and Communication Technologies (approximately 18 questions); Manufacturing and Construction Technologies (approximately 18 questions); and Pedagogical and Professional Studies (approximately 24 questions). Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; six category scores – one for each content area listed above – also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a candidate’s score. (Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to a candidate’s score.) The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051) ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

The process used in the Virginia standard setting study is detailed in Appendix A. The panel’s cut score recommendation for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051) is 74.96 (see Table 1). The value was rounded to 75, the next highest whole number, to determine the functional recommended cut. The value of 75 represents approximately 68 percent of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 75 raw points is 162.
A similar process was used in the multi-state standard setting studies as described in Appendix B. The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score (see Table 2). For the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051), the average recommended cut score (rounded up) is 73 (on the raw score metric), which represents 66 percent of the total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 72 and 74, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 73 is 159.

When reviewing the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) for the cut scores recommended by the Virginia Standard Setting Study as well as the Multi-State Studies, there is an overlap in the scaled scores. The SEM 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 score that precisely reflects the test-taker’s actual level of knowledge and 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 Standard Error of Measurement for the recommended cut scores for the Virginia Standard Setting Study and the Multi-State Studies are shown on the next page. Note that consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

**Standard Error of Measure Summaries – Technology Education (0051)**

**Table 1**

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score**

**Technology Education – Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 (4.91)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score**

**Technology Education – Multi-State Studies**

**Panel 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72 (5.01)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 (4.94)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Across Panels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 (4.98)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

On January 24, 2011, the Advisory Board for Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) recommended that the Board of Education set a cut score of 162 for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051) for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Technology Education. The revised assessment will be offered after September 1, 2011.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation and adopt a cut score of 162 for the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051) for individuals seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Technology Education.

Impact on Resources:

Costs associated with the administration of the Praxis Technology Education Assessment (0051) will be incurred by the Educational Testing Service. Prospective teachers seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Technology Education will be required to pay the registration and test fees.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

N/A
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Executive Summary

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on November 16, 2010. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

Recommended Cut Scores

The recommended cut score is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, the average recommended cut score is 75 (on the raw score metric), which represents 68% of total available 110 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 75 is 162.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

The study involved an expert panel, comprised of teachers, administrators and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) technology education experience, either as technology education teachers or college faculty who prepare technology education teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning technology education teachers.

The panel was convened on November 16, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The following technical report is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting study.

The passing score recommendation for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment is provided to the VDOE. The VDOE is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable state regulations. The study provides a recommended passing score, which represents the combined judgments of one group of experienced educators. The full range of the VDOE’s needs and expectations could not be represented during the standard setting study. The VDOE, therefore, may want to consider both the panel’s recommended cut score and other sources to information when setting the final Praxis Technology Education (0051) cut score (Geisinger & McCormick, 2010). Other kinds of information may provide reasons for the VDOE to adjust the recommended cut score. The recommended cut score may be accepted, adjusted upward to reflect more stringent expectations, or adjusted downward to reflect more lenient expectations. There is no correct decision; the appropriateness of any adjustment may only be evaluated in terms of its meeting the VDOE’s needs.

Two critical sources of information to consider when setting the cut score are the standard error of measurement (SEM) and the standard error of judgment (SEJ). The former addresses the reliability of Praxis Technology Education (0051) scores and the latter the reliability of panelists’ cut score recommendations. The SEM allows the VDOE to recognize that a Praxis Technology Education (0051) score—any test score on any test—is less than perfectly reliable. A test score only approximates what a
candidate truly knows or truly can do on the test. The SEM, therefore, addresses the question: How close of an approximation is the test score to the true score? The SEJ allows the VDOE to consider the likelihood that the recommended cut score from the current panel would be similar to cut scores recommended by other panels of experts similar in composition and experience. The smaller the SEJ, the more likely that another panel would recommend a cut score consistent with the recommended cut score. The larger the SEJ, the less likely the recommended cut score would be reproduced by another panel.

In addition to measurement error metrics (e.g., SEM, SEJ), the VDOE should consider the likelihood of classification error. That is, when adjusting a cut score, policymakers should consider whether it is more important to minimize a false positive decision or to minimize a false negative decision. A false positive decision occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests he should receive a license/certificate, but his actual knowledge/skill level is lower (i.e., the candidate does not possess the required knowledge/skills). A false negative occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests that she should not receive a license/certificate, but she actually does possess the required knowledge/skills. The VDOE needs to consider which decision error to minimize; it is not possible to eliminate both types of decision errors simultaneously.

Overview of the Praxis Assessment

The Praxis Technology Education Test at a Glance document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level technology education teachers have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering Technology and Society (approximately 18 questions); Technological Design and Problem Solving (approximately 24 questions); Energy, Power, and Transportation (approximately 18 questions); Information and Communication Technologies (approximately 18 questions); Manufacturing and Construction
Technologies (approximately 18 questions); and Pedagogical and Professional Studies (approximately 24 questions).  

Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; six category scores—one for each content area listed above—also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a candidate’s score. The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

Processes and Methods

The following section describes the processes and methods used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate recommended passing scores, or cut scores. (The agenda for the panel meeting is presented in the Appendix.)

The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the test content specifications for the assessment (included in the Test at a Glance document, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the assessment.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction by James Lanham, from the VDOE. The ETS facilitator then explained how the assessment was developed, provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study.

Reviewing the Assessment

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately an hour and a half to respond to the multiple-choice questions. The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists were given the answer key for the assessment and checked their responses. How well the panelists did on the assessment was not shared with the panel.

---

1 The number of questions for each content area may vary slightly from form to form of the assessment.
2 Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to a candidate’s score.
The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the assessment; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering technology education teachers, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering teachers.

Defining the Just Qualified Candidate

Following the review of the assessment, panelists internalized the definition of the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and/or skills believed necessary to be a qualified technology education teacher. The JQC definition is the operational definition of the cut score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this definition of the JQC.

The panelists were split into smaller groups, and each group was asked to write down their definition of a JQC. Each group referred to Praxis Technology Education Test at a Glance to guide their definition. Each group posted its definition on chart paper, and a full-panel discussion occurred to reach consensus on a final definition (see the consensus JQC definition in the Appendix).

Panelists’ Judgments

The standard-setting process for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment was conducted for the overall test. A probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used. In this approach, for each multiple-choice question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

The panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:
- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range; and
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1.0. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on the first five questions.

**Judgment of Content Specifications**

In addition to the standard setting process, the panel judged the importance of the knowledge and/or skills stated or implied in the assessment content specifications for the job of an entry-level technology education teacher. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the assessment. Judgments were made using a four-point Likert scale — *Very Important*, *Important*, *Slightly Important*, and *Not Important*. Each panelist independently judged the six knowledge categories and 73 knowledge/skills statements.

**Results**

**Expert Panels**

The standard setting study included an expert panel. The VDOE recruited panelists to represent a range of professional perspectives. A description of the panel is presented below. (See Appendix for a listing of panelists.)

The panel included 15 teachers, administrators, and college faculty who prepare technology education teachers. In brief, 12 panelists were teachers, one was an administrator, and two were college faculty. Both of the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of technology education teachers. Twelve panelists were White, two were African American, and one was Hispanic. Ten panelists were male. Thirteen panelists reported being certified technology education teachers in Virginia. The majority of panelists (11 of the 15 panelists or 73%) had
11 or fewer years of experience as a technology education teacher, and approximately a fifth had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

A fuller demographic description for the members of the panel is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Member Demographics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Department Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently certified as a technology education teacher in Virginia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently teaching technology education in Virginia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently supervising or mentoring other technology education teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Panel Member Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years of experience do you have teaching technology education?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching technology education?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of technology education teachers?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Evaluation Forms.

The panelists completed an initial evaluation after receiving training on how to make question-level judgments. The primary information collected from this form was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. All panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

Summary of Standard Setting Judgments

A summary of the standard-setting judgments is presented in Table 2. The numbers in the table reflect the recommended cut scores — the number of raw points needed to “pass” the assessment — of each panelist. The panel’s average recommended cut score and highest and lowest cut scores are
reported, as are the standard deviations (SD) of panelists’ cut scores and the standard errors of judgment (SEJ). The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability of the judgments. It indicates how likely it would be for other panels of educators similar in make-up, experience, and standard-setting training to the current panel to recommend the same cut score on the same form of the assessment. A comparable panel’s cut score would be within 1 SEJ of the current average cut score 68 percent of the time and within 2 SEJs 95 percent of the time.

The panel’s cut score recommendation for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment is 74.96 (see Table 2). The value was rounded to 75, the next highest whole number, to determine the functional recommended cut. The value of 75 represents approximately 68% of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 75 raw points is 162.
Table 2
Summary of Standard Setting Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Cut Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>80.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 74.96
SD 9.77
SEJ 2.52
Highest 98.85
Lowest 55.20

Table 3 presents the estimated standard errors of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut score. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled scores associated with 1 and 2 SEMs above and below the recommended cut scores are provided. The standard errors provided are an estimate, given that the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment has not yet been administered.
Table 3
Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 (4.91)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. Panelists rated the six knowledge categories and 73 knowledge/skills statements on a four-point scale ranging from Very Important to Not Important. The panelists’ ratings are summarized in Table 4 (in Appendix).

The six knowledge categories were judged to be Very Important or Important by 87% or more of the panelists. The knowledge categories of Pedagogical and Professional Studies (73% of the panelists judged as Very Important) and Technological Design and Problem Solving (87% of the panelists judged as Very Important) were seen as the most important for beginning technology education teachers. The knowledge categories of Information and Communication Technologies (27% of the panelists judged as Very Important and 13% of the panelists judged as Slightly Important) and Manufacturing and Construction Technologies (27% of the panelists judged as Very Important and 7% of the panelists judged as Slightly Important) were seen as less important for beginning technology education teachers. All but 5 of the 73 knowledge statements were judged to be Very Important or Important by at least two-thirds of the panelists.

Summary of Final Evaluations.

The panelists completed an evaluation form at the conclusion of their standard setting study. The evaluation form asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation. Table 5 (in Appendix) present the results of the final evaluations.
All panelists *strongly agreed* that they understood the purpose of the study and that the facilitator’s instructions and explanations were clear. All panelists *agreed or strongly agreed* that they were prepared to make their standard-setting judgments. Approximately 73% of the panelists *strongly agreed* that the standard-setting process was easy to follow.

**Summary**

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing passing score, or cut score, for Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard-setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

The recommended cut score is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For Praxis Technology Education (0051), the average recommended cut score is 75 (on the raw score metric), which represents 68% of total available 110 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 75 is 162.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
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Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Balthis</td>
<td>Wise County Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Cooper</td>
<td>Bath County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanette M. Dean</td>
<td>Norfolk City Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James T. DeMarino</td>
<td>Arlington County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd D. Fantz</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gerrol</td>
<td>Roanoke County Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hawley</td>
<td>Campbell County Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia B. Hess</td>
<td>Virginia Beach City Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deidra D. Murray</td>
<td>Norfolk County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin L. O'Rear</td>
<td>New Kent County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Piccione</td>
<td>Prince William County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip A. Reed</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruf</td>
<td>Spotsylvania County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott C. Settar</td>
<td>Fairfax County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew B. Weatherford</td>
<td>Pittsylvania County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda: TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION (6-12) PANEL

Tuesday, November 16, 2010

8:00 am    Registration and Breakfast
8:30 am    Welcome and Introduction
8:50 am    Overview of Study
9:20 am    Take the Test and Self-Score
10:50 am   BREAK
11:00 am   Discuss the Test Content
11:30 am   Discuss the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC)
           Noon     LUNCH
12:45 pm   Define the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC) - Continued
1:30 pm    Training for Standard Setting Judgments
2:00 pm    Complete Standard Setting Judgments
           BREAK
3:00 pm    Specification Judgment Training
3:30 pm    Complete Specification Judgments
3:45 pm    Complete Final Evaluation
4:00 pm    Collect Materials and Adjourn

Thank You for Participating
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Description of a Just Qualified Candidate
Praxis Technology Education (0051)
(Developed for the Virginia Department of Education)

- Understands the importance of collaboration and interdisciplinary teaching and demonstrates the relationships in context between technology and other curricular areas
- Can identify and model key safety concerns and practices
- Can describe and apply technological design and problem solving processes
- Can identify and implement objectives that address specific state competencies and national standards
- Uses major concepts, terminology and appropriate tools related to the teaching of technological core topics, i.e., power, energy, transportation, manufacturing, communication, information technology, construction
- Understands and applies the systems model
- Understands and utilizes a variety of professional development opportunities, i.e., professional associations and student organizations
- Can evaluate a technology’s impact and identify its interrelationships with society
- Utilizes multiple instructional strategies and assessments that facilitate student achievement and technological literacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Technology and Society</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

**Specification Judgments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Technological Design and Problem Solving</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how to implement and document the steps of a design process.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to select and use tools—especially software—in a design process, including the creation, testing, evaluation, and communication of solutions.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how to identify a problem and define design requirements (criteria and constraints).</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to generate possible solutions to design problems and how to select, develop, and refine design proposals, using analysis and creativity.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to evaluate, test, and optimize designs, using specifications, design principles, modeling, experimentation, and prototyping.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how to organize and communicate the solution to a design problem.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands systems thinking and knows how to model it for students.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands there is no such thing as a perfect design and that making design decisions involves balancing trade-offs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to operate, maintain, and troubleshoot technological systems.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply the design process to systems and problems in energy, power, and transportation.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Judgments</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply the design process to problems in information technology and</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications technology.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply the design process to problems in manufacturing and construction.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Energy, Power, and Transportation</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands and knows how to utilize various types of control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply mathematical and scientific principles to solve problems involving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the harness, transfer, loss, transmission, and conversion of power and energy.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands energy utilization systems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the inputs used in transportation systems.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the components of vehicles and support systems, including infrastructures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and subsystems for propulsion, suspension, control, and guidance.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the different processes involved in transportation operations, along with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the part each process plays in the efficiency of the overall system.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the different forms of energy and the differences between them.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands and can model the relationship between energy, power, and work.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specified Judgment</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how energy is measured and controlled.</td>
<td>3 20%</td>
<td>9 60%</td>
<td>3 20%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to apply concepts of energy and power to solve problems related to them.</td>
<td>4 27%</td>
<td>9 60%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the different ways power is generated and used, including their differences in efficiency and impact on the environment.</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>9 60%</td>
<td>4 27%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows and applies safety practices related to working with energy and power.</td>
<td>8 53%</td>
<td>5 33%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Information and Communication Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specified Judgment</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understands major concepts and terminology related to information systems.</td>
<td>8 53%</td>
<td>5 33%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Given a communications problem or task, can identify and knows how to use appropriate tools and materials, especially software and hardware, to address it.</td>
<td>4 27%</td>
<td>9 60%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to use operating systems, software applications, communication devices, and networking components in the classroom/laboratory.</td>
<td>5 33%</td>
<td>8 53%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes the various types of network structures.</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>5 33%</td>
<td>10 67%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the concepts that make up a communications system.</td>
<td>7 47%</td>
<td>6 40%</td>
<td>2 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands concepts and terminology related to audio, video, electronic, data, technical, and graphic communications.</td>
<td>4 27%</td>
<td>10 67%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to arrange the elements of a communication message so</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the message is effective and aesthetically pleasing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the impacts of communication technology and media on</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society and culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands legal and ethical issues regarding the use of</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications and information technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows issues and trends in information and communications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Manufacturing and Construction Technologies</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the management functions used in construction and</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply a systems model to manufacturing and</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the key concepts associated with the efficiency of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the differences between manufacturing systems.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the variety and properties of materials used in the</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture of products and can evaluate the suitability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material to different manufacturing purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Specification Judgments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the primary processing methods of converting raw materials into industrial materials or standard stock and the secondary processing methods of converting industrial materials into finished products.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the key concepts and terminology related to construction.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the variety and properties of materials used in the construction of structures and can evaluate the suitability of material to different construction purposes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the numerous constraints on structural designs, such as building codes, cost, and function.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the systems and subsystems of buildings and structures and the functions they perform.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands static and dynamic loads and how they produce forces that affect stability and failure in a structure.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the variety of processes used in construction, including on-site and prefabricated techniques.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Pedagogical and Professional Studies</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a technology education program, knows how to create and implement a curriculum based on state and national standards.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Judgments</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to select appropriate instructional content and develop learning activities.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to choose, adapt, and implement instructional strategies appropriate to both</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the content and the level at which the content is being taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the importance of designing and implementing instructional activities that</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasize problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to apply appropriate instructional technology equipment, materials, processes,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and tools to enhance teaching and to actively engage students in learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to select and use a variety of assessment methods to monitor and evaluate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both student learning and instructional effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to create and maintain a safe and healthy learning environment.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is aware of the relationship between classroom learning and student organizations.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the relationship between technology education programs and advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows how to modify instructional activities and methods to address students’ diverse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the importance of promoting technology education internally and externally.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Understands the importance of becoming involved in professional associations and organizations related to technology education.
- Understands the importance of the professional growth of the technology education teacher via formal instruction, in-service activities, and professional association meetings.
- Is familiar with current educational policy, legislation, and funding opportunities.
- Is familiar with opportunities for further education and careers.
- Is aware of the history, issues, and trends related to technology education.
- Is familiar with the management of resources, records, and budgets.
- Recognizes the importance of collaborating with other school faculty to design instruction that integrates knowledge and skills from other core academic subject areas into instruction in technology.
Table 5
Final Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree N</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Percent</th>
<th>Agree N</th>
<th>Agree Percent</th>
<th>Disagree N</th>
<th>Disagree Percent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree N</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to “take the test” and to discuss the test content was useful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to practice making standard setting judgments was useful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training for the standard setting judgments was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Technology Education (0051) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

Participating States

Panelists from 18 states were recommended by state departments of education to participate on expert panels. The state departments of education recommended panelists with (a) technology education experience, either as technology education teachers or college faculty who prepare technology education teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning technology education teachers.

Recommended Cut Scores

The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, the average recommended cut score (rounded up) is 73 (on the raw score metric), which represents 66% of total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 72 and 74, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 73 is 159.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Technology Education (0051) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers. Panelists were recommended by state departments of education¹ to participate on the two expert panels. The state departments of education recommended panelists with (a) technology education experience, either as technology education teachers or college faculty who prepare technology education teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning technology education teachers.

The two, non-overlapping panels (a) allow each participating state to be represented and (b) provide a replication of the judgment process to strengthen the technical quality of the recommended passing score. For the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, 18 states were represented by 34 panelists across the two panels, (See Appendix A for the names and affiliations of the panelists.)

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating States (and number of panelists) for Multi-State Panels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (1 panelist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut (1 panelist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho (2 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (2 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas (2 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky (3 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (3 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (3 panelists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine (1 panelist)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Arkansas, Connecticut, Maine, Nevada, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah and Wyoming were represented on only one of the two panels.*

¹ State departments of education that currently use one or more Praxis tests were invited to participate in the multi-state standard setting study.
The panels were convened in September 2010 in Princeton, New Jersey. For both panels, the same processes and methods were used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate the recommended passing score, or cut score. The following technical report is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting studies.

The passing score recommendation for the assessment is provided to each of the represented state departments of education. In each state, the department of education, the state board of education, or a designated educator licensure board is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable state regulations.

The first national administration of the new Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment will occur in fall 2011.

**Overview of the Praxis Assessment**

The Praxis Technology Education *Test at a Glance* document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level technology education teachers have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering *Technology and Society* (approximately 18 questions); *Technological Design and Problem Solving* (approximately 24 questions); *Energy, Power, and Transportation* (approximately 18 questions); *Information and Communication Technologies* (approximately 18 questions); *Manufacturing and Construction Technologies* (approximately 18 questions); and *Pedagogical and Professional Studies* (approximately 24 questions).

Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; six category scores – one for each content area listed above – also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a

---

2 The number of questions for each content area may vary slightly from form to form of the assessment.
The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

**Processes and Methods**

For both expert panels, the same processes and methods were used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate the recommended passing score, or cut score. The following section describes the processes and methods used. (The agenda for the panel meetings is presented in Appendix A.)

The design of the standard setting study included two non-overlapping expert panels. The training provided to panelists as well as the study materials were consistent across panels with the exception of defining the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). To assure that both panels were using the same frame of reference when making question-level standard setting judgments, the JQC definition developed through a consensus process by the first panel was used as the definition for the second panel. The second panel did complete a thorough review of the definition to allow panelists to internalize the definition. The processes for developing the definition (with Panel 1) and reviewing/internalizing the definition (with Panel 2) are described later, and the Just Qualified Candidate definition is presented in Appendix C.

The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the test content specifications for the assessment (included in the *Test at a Glance* document, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the assessment.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction by the meeting facilitator, Dr. Wanda Swiggett from the Center for Validity Research. She explained how the assessment was developed, provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study.

---

3 Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to a candidate’s score.
Reviewing the Assessment

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately an hour and a half to respond to the 120 multiple-choice questions. (Panelists were instructed not to refer to the answer key while taking the test.) The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists checked their responses against the answer key.

The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the assessment; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering technology education teachers, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering teachers.

Defining the Just Qualified Candidate

Following the review of the assessment, panelists internalized the definition of the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and/or skills believed necessary to be a qualified technology education teacher. The JQC definition is the operational definition of the cut score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this definition of the JQC.

In Panel 1, the panelists were split into smaller groups, and each group was asked to write down their definition of a JQC. Each group referred to the Praxis Technology Education Test at a Glance to guide their definition. Each group posted its definition on chart paper, and a full-panel discussion occurred to reach consensus on a definition (see Appendix C).

In Panel 2, the panelists began with the definition of the JQC developed by the first panel. Given that the multi-state standard setting study was designed to replicate processes and procedures across the two panels, it was important that both panels use consistent JQC definitions to frame their judgments. For Panel 2, the panelists reviewed the JQC definition, and any ambiguities were discussed and clarified. The panelists then were split into smaller groups, and each group developed performance indicators or “can do” statements based on the definition. The purpose of the indicators was to provide clear examples of what might be observed to indicate that the teacher had the defined knowledge. The performance indicators were shared across the group, and discussed and added to the definition. The panel also had
an opportunity to suggest minor changes to the initial definition, if doing so added clarity. No significant changes to the initial definition were suggested by Panel 2.

**Panelists’ Judgments**

A probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used for the multiple-choice questions. In this approach, for each question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

For each panel, the panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:

- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range; and
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1.0. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on the first five questions.

The panelists engaged in two rounds of judgments. Following Round 1, feedback was provided to the panel, including each panelist’s (listed by ID number) recommended cut scores and the panel’s average recommended cut score, highest and lowest cut scores, and standard deviation. Following discussion, the panelists’ judgments were displayed for each question. The panelists’ judgments were summarized by the three general difficulty levels (0 to .30, .40 to .60, and .70 to 1), and the panel’s average question judgment was provided. Questions were highlighted to show when panelists converged.
in their judgments (at least two-thirds of the panelists located a question in the same difficulty range) or diverged in their judgments. Panelists were asked to share their rationales for the judgments they made. Following this discussion, panelists were provided an opportunity to change their question-level standard-setting judgments (Round 2).

Other than the definition of the JQC, results from Panel 1 were not shared with the second panel. The question-level judgments and resulting discussions for Panel 2 were independent of judgments and discussions that occurred with Panel 1.

Judgment of Content Specifications

In addition to the two-round standard setting process, each panel judged the importance of the knowledge and/or skills stated or implied in the assessment content specifications for the job of an entry-level technology education teacher. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the assessment. Judgments were made using a four-point Likert scale — Very Important, Important, Slightly Important, and Not Important. Each panelist independently judged the six knowledge categories and 73 knowledge/skills statements.

Results

Results are presented separately for the two panels. The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score.

Expert Panels

The standard setting study included two expert panels. The various state departments of education recruited panelists to represent a range of professional perspectives. A description of the panels is presented below. (See Appendix A for a listing of panelists for each panel.)

Panel 1 included 18 teachers, administrators, and college faculty who prepare technology education teachers, representing 14 states. In brief, 12 panelists were teachers, two were administrators or department heads, and four were college faculty. All four of the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of technology education teachers. Fifteen panelists were White, one was African American, and one was Asian American. Six panelists were female.
Sixteen panelists reported being certified technology education teachers in their states. Two-thirds of panelists (12 of the 18 panelists or 67%) had seven or fewer years of experience as a technology education teacher, and two had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

Panel 2 included 16 teachers, administrators, and college faculty, representing 14 states. In brief, six panelists were teachers, four were administrators or department heads, five were college faculty, and one was a technology integration specialist. Four of the five panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of technology education teachers. Thirteen panelists were White, two were African American, and one was Asian American. Six panelists were female. Eleven panelists reported being certified technology education teachers in their states. Over half of panelists (9 of the 16 panelists or 56%) had seven or fewer years of experience as a technology education teacher, and three had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

A fuller demographic description for the members of the two panels is presented in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D.

Initial Evaluation Forms.

The panelists completed an initial evaluation after receiving training on how to make question-level judgments. The primary information collected from this form was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. Across both panels, all panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

Summary of Standard Setting Judgments by Round.

A summary of each round of standard-setting judgments is presented in Appendix D. The numbers in each table reflect the recommended cut scores — the number of raw points needed to “pass” the assessment — of each panelist for the two rounds. The panel’s average recommended cut score and highest and lowest cut scores are reported, as are the standard deviations (SD) of panelists’ cut scores and the standard errors of judgment (SEJ). The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability of the judgments. It indicates how likely it would be for other panels of educators similar in make-up, experience, and standard-setting training to the current panels to recommend the same cut score on the same form of the assessment. A comparable panel’s cut score would be within 1 SEJ of the current average cut score 68 percent of the time and within 2 SEJs 95 percent of the time.
Round 1 judgments are made without discussion among the panelists. The most variability in judgments, therefore, is typically present in the first round. Round 2 judgments, however, are informed by panel discussion; thus, it is common to see a decrease both in the standard deviation and SEJ. This decrease — indicating convergence among the panelists’ judgments — was observed for both panels. The Round 2 average total score is the panel’s recommended cut score (passing score).

The panels’ cut score recommendations for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment are 71.86 for Panel 1 and 73.92 for Panel 2 (see Tables D3 and D4 in Appendix D). The values were rounded to the next highest whole number to determine the functional recommended cut scores — 72 for Panel 1 and 74 for Panel 2. The values of 72 and 74 represent approximately 65% and 67%, respectively, of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled scores associated with 72 and 74 raw points are 158 and 160, respectively.4

Table D5 (in Appendix D) presents the estimated standard errors of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut scores for each panel. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled scores associated with 1 and 2 SEMs above and below the recommended cut scores are provided. The standard errors provided are an estimate, given that the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment has not yet been administered.

In addition to the recommended cut scores for each panel, the average cut across the two panels is provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment. The panels’ average cut score recommendation for the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment is 72.89. The value was rounded to 73 (next highest raw score) to determine the functional recommended cut score. The value of 73 represents approximately 66% of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 73 raw points is 159. Table D5 (in Appendix D) presents the standard error of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut score combining the information from the two panels.

4 For reference purposes, if the recommended raw cut score was 71 or 73 points, the scaled score would be 156 or 159, respectively.
Summary of Content Specification Judgments.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. Panelists rated the six knowledge categories and 73 knowledge/skills statements on a four-point scale ranging from *Very Important* to *Not Important*. The panelists’ ratings are summarized in Table D6 (in Appendix D).

The six knowledge categories were judged to be *Very Important* or *Important* by 85% or more of the panelists. The knowledge categories of *Pedagogical and Professional Studies* (85% of the panelists judged as *Very Important*) and *Technological Design and Problem Solving* (79% of the panelists judged as *Very Important*) were seen as the most important for beginning technology education teachers. The knowledge categories of *Information and Communication Technologies* (15% of the panelists judged as *Slightly Important*) and *Manufacturing and Construction Technologies* (12% of the panelists judged as *Slightly Important*) were seen as less important for beginning technology education teachers. All but nine of the 73 knowledge statements were judged to be *Very Important* or *Important* by at least two-thirds of the panelists.

Summary of Final Evaluations.

The panelists completed an evaluation form at the conclusion of their standard setting study. The evaluation form asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation and the factors that influenced their decisions. Tables D7 and D8 (in Appendix D) present the results of the final evaluations.

All panelists *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that they understood the purpose of the study and that the facilitator’s instructions and explanations were clear. All panelists *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that they were prepared to make their standard setting judgments. Across the two panels, all but one of the panelists *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the standard-setting process was easy to follow. All but one of the panelists reported that the definition of the JQC was at least *somewhat influential* in guiding their standard-setting judgments. All but one of the panelists reported that between-round discussions were at least *somewhat influential* in guiding their judgments. Across the two panels, 10 of the 34 panelist indicated that the cut scores of other panelists did not influence their judgments.
There were similar ratings between the two panels when asked to respond to their level of comfort with their panel’s recommended passing score. All but three of the 34 panelists indicated they were very or somewhat comfortable with their recommendation. Two panelists (one from each panel) reported being somewhat uncomfortable with their recommended passing score; one panelist from Panel 1 reported being very uncomfortable with the panel’s recommended passing score. For both panels, the majority of the panelists indicated that the recommend cut score was about right (100% for Panel 1 and 88% for Panel 2) and the remaining panelists from Panel 2 indicated the cut score was too low.
Summary

To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Technology Education (0051) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level technology education teachers.

The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Technology Education (0051) assessment, the average recommended cut score (rounded up) is 73 (on the raw score metric), which represents 66% of total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 72 and 74, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 73 is 159.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level technology education teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
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Appendix A

Panelists’ Names & Affiliations
## Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akers, Ruth</td>
<td>Baltimore County Public Schools (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp, Doug</td>
<td>Tripp Middle School (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Brad</td>
<td>Berea College (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doring, Susan A.</td>
<td>Paul Laurence Dunbar (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam, Deborah</td>
<td>Grambling State University (LA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman, Tanner</td>
<td>Richland School District (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Jason</td>
<td>Mukwonago Area School District (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley, Todd</td>
<td>Purdue (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, Janel</td>
<td>University of Idaho (ID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy, Donna</td>
<td>Clark County School District (NV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoy, Benjamin Mabe</td>
<td>London High School (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neden, Michael</td>
<td>Pittsburg State University (KS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sansuchat, Dan</td>
<td>Granville Middle School (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semko, Thomas</td>
<td>New Jersey Technology Education Association (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoot, Michael</td>
<td>Jordan Applied Technology Center (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnier, Wendy</td>
<td>Welsh High School (LA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wykoff, Matthew V.</td>
<td>Vance High School (NC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One panelist on Panel 1 declined to have his/her name listed in the technical report.

## Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brusic, Sharon</td>
<td>Millersville University (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, John M.</td>
<td>Dalton L. McMichael High School (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattanach, Bruce</td>
<td>The Lakeview School (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Gerald</td>
<td>University of Maryland Eastern Shore (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dischino, Michele</td>
<td>Central Connecticut State University (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gensemer, Amy</td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung, Jui-Long</td>
<td>Boise State University (ID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalk, Rick</td>
<td>Spartanburg School District Five (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaluf, Kevin</td>
<td>Kankakee Valley High School (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raper, Johanna Shantele</td>
<td>Osceola School District and Arkansas Northeastern College (AR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigler, Kenny</td>
<td>Fort Hays State University (KS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roubion, Eric M.</td>
<td>Orleans Parish School Board (LA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Kwamina</td>
<td>Kernersville Middle (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotts, Alan</td>
<td>Cody High School (WY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubersox, Ryan J.</td>
<td>Waunakee Community High School (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggoner, Erin</td>
<td>Jessamine County Schools (KY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 One panelist on Panel 1 declined to have his/her name listed in the technical report.
Appendix B

Workshop Agenda
Praxis Technology Education Assessment
Standard Setting Study

Day 1

9:00 – 9:15 Welcome and Introductions
9:15 – 9:45 Overview of Standard Setting & Workshop Events
9:45 – 9:55 Overview of the Praxis Technology Education Assessment
9:55 – 10:00 Break
10:00 – 11:30 “Take” the Praxis Technology Education Assessment
11:30 – 12:00 Discuss the Praxis Technology Education Assessment
12:00 – 12:45 Lunch
12:45 – 3:00 Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC
3:00 – 3:05 Break
3:05 – 3:30 Standard Setting Training
3:30 – 5:00 Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments for Questions 1-80
5:00 – 5:15 Collect Materials; End of Day 1
Praxis Technology Education Assessment
Standard Setting Study

Day 2

9:00 – 9:15  Overview of Day 2
9:15 – 9:30  Review of the Standard Setting Process
9:30 – 10:30 Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments for Questions 81-120
10:30 – 10:45 Break
10:45 – 12:00 Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments
12:00 – 1:00 Lunch
1:00 – 2:30  Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments (continued)
2:30 – 2:45  Break
2:45 – 3:15  Specification Judgments
3:15 – 3:30  Feedback on Round 2 Recommended Cut Score
3:30 – 3:45  Complete Final Evaluation
3:45 – 4:00  Collect Materials; End of Study
Appendix C

Just Qualified Candidate (JQC) Definitions
Description of a Just Qualified Candidate
Praxis Technology Education

A JQC …

- Understands the importance of collaboration and interdisciplinary teaching and demonstrates the relationships in context between technology and other curricular areas

- Understands major concepts, terminology, and uses appropriate tools related to information/communication systems

- Can identify and model key safety concerns and practices

- Can describe and apply the steps of an engineering design process

- Can identify objectives that best address specific national standards

- Understands the basic technology core topics, i.e., power, energy, transportation, manufacturing, communication, information technology, construction

- Understands and applies the systems model

- Understands and utilizes a variety of professional development opportunities and professional and student organization

- Can evaluate a technology and identify its interrelationships with society

- Utilizes multiple instructional strategies and assessments that facilitate student achievement in technology literacy
Appendix D

Results for Praxis Technology Education
Table D1
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you currently certified as a Technology Education teacher in your state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you currently teaching Technology Education in your state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you currently supervising or mentoring other Technology Education teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years of experience do you have teaching Technology Education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Panel Member Demographics — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching Technology Education?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K - 5 or K - 6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working in a K-12 school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of Technology Education teachers?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D2
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Department Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Integration Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you currently certified as a Technology Education teacher in your state?

| Yes                                        | 11 | 69%     |
| No                                         | 5  | 31%     |

Are you currently teaching Technology Education in your state?

| Yes                                        | 10 | 63%     |
| No                                         | 6  | 38%     |

Are you currently supervising or mentoring other Technology Education teachers?

| Yes                                        | 10 | 63%     |
| No                                         | 6  | 38%     |

How many years of experience do you have teaching Technology Education?

| 3 years or less                            | 2  | 13%     |
| 4 - 7 years                                | 7  | 44%     |
| 8 - 11 years                               | 3  | 19%     |
| 12 - 15 years                              | 1  | 6%      |
| 16 years or more                           | 3  | 19%     |
Table D2 (continued)
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching Technology Education?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K - 5 or K - 6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working in a K-12 school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of Technology Education teachers?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D3
Cut score Summary by Round of Judgments — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.85</td>
<td>79.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.40</td>
<td>69.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>72.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71.55</td>
<td>72.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>84.90</td>
<td>84.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>76.05</td>
<td>76.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.85</td>
<td>77.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>56.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>71.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.30</td>
<td>60.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>74.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>69.90</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.85</td>
<td>64.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>75.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>77.35</td>
<td>76.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>71.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>58.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>80.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEJ</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>84.90</td>
<td>84.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>56.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D4
Cut score Summary by Round of Judgments — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>70.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>74.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>62.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>77.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>77.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td>82.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>60.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>83.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.65</td>
<td>73.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77.45</td>
<td>78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>84.85</td>
<td>84.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>64.85</td>
<td>69.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.05</td>
<td>62.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58.15</td>
<td>58.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>72.44</td>
<td>73.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEJ</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>58.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D5

Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score

(a) Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72 (5.01)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 (4.94)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 (4.98)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.
### Table D6
**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Technology and Society</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the nature of technology, technology education, and technological literacy.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how invention and innovation occur, how they are influenced by cultural and economic factors, and how they are built on existing technologies.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how technological development is influenced by knowledge from other fields of study, especially mathematics and the sciences.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the influence that significant technological innovations have had on human history and on today’s world.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands critical changes in technology through the different periods of human history.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how various factors affect technology development.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the impacts of technology on society and on social institutions such as the family and the political system.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands ways to decrease the negative environmental impact of technological systems and processes and knows how to evaluate trade-offs with respect to different approaches.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the relationships between engineering, mathematics, science, and technology.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels</td>
<td>Very Important N</td>
<td>Very Important %</td>
<td>Important N</td>
<td>Important %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Technological Design and Problem Solving</td>
<td>27 79%</td>
<td>7 21%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how to implement and document the steps of a design process.</td>
<td>29 85%</td>
<td>5 15%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to select and use tools—especially software—in a design process, including the creation, testing, evaluation, and communication of solutions.</td>
<td>17 50%</td>
<td>16 47%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how to identify a problem and define design requirements (criteria and constraints).</td>
<td>23 68%</td>
<td>9 26%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to generate possible solutions to design problems and how to select, develop, and refine design proposals, using analysis and creativity.</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to evaluate, test, and optimize designs, using specifications, design principles, modeling, experimentation, and prototyping.</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands how to organize and communicate the solution to a design problem.</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands systems thinking and knows how to model it for students.</td>
<td>19 56%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands there is no such thing as a perfect design and that making design decisions involves balancing trade-offs.</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D6 (continued)

Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>18 53%</td>
<td>4 12%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 44%</td>
<td>16 47%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 47%</td>
<td>15 44%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 24%</td>
<td>23 68%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 26%</td>
<td>21 62%</td>
<td>4 12%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 32%</td>
<td>22 65%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 18%</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>8 24%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 12%</td>
<td>18 53%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 12%</td>
<td>18 53%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6%</td>
<td>19 56%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Knows how to operate, maintain, and troubleshoot technological systems.
- Knows how to apply the design process to systems and problems in energy, power, and transportation.
- Knows how to apply the design process to problems in information technology and communications technology.
- Knows how to apply the design process to problems in manufacturing and construction.
- Understands and knows how to utilize various types of control.
- Knows how to apply mathematical and scientific principles to solve problems involving the harness, transfer, loss, transmission, and conversion of power and energy.
- Understands energy utilization systems.
- Knows the inputs used in transportation systems.
- Understands the components of vehicles and support systems, including infrastructures and subsystems for propulsion, suspension, control, and guidance.
- Understands the different processes involved in transportation operations, along with the part each process plays in the efficiency of the overall system.
Table D6 (continued)

Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the different forms of energy and the differences between them.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands and can model the relationship between energy, power, and work.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how energy is measured and controlled.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to apply concepts of energy and power to solve problems related to them.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the different ways power is generated and used, including their differences in efficiency and impact on the environment.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows and applies safety practices related to working with energy and power.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Information and Communication Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands major concepts and terminology related to information systems.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Given a communications problem or task, can identify and knows how to use appropriate tools and materials, especially software and hardware, to address it.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to use operating systems, software applications, communication devices, and networking components in the classroom/laboratory.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes the various types of network structures.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the concepts that make up a communications system.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D6 (continued)

**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands concepts and terminology related to audio, video, electronic, data, technical, and graphic communications.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to arrange the elements of a communication message so that the message is effective and aesthetically pleasing.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the impacts of communication technology and media on society and culture.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands legal and ethical issues regarding the use of communications and information technologies.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows issues and trends in information and communications technologies.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **Manufacturing and Construction Technologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the management functions used in construction and manufacturing.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to apply a systems model to manufacturing and construction processes.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the key concepts associated with the efficiency of production.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the differences between manufacturing systems.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows the variety and properties of materials used in the manufacture of products and can evaluate the suitability of material to different manufacturing purposes.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D6 (continued)

Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the primary processing methods of converting raw materials into industrial materials or standard stock and the secondary processing methods of converting industrial materials into finished products.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the key concepts and terminology related to construction.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the variety and properties of materials used in the construction of structures and can evaluate the suitability of material to different construction purposes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the numerous constraints on structural designs, such as building codes, cost, and function.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the systems and subsystems of buildings and structures and the functions they perform.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands static and dynamic loads and how they produce forces that affect stability and failure in a structure.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the variety of processes used in construction, including on-site and prefabricated techniques.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Pedagogical and Professional Studies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a technology education program, knows how to create and implement a curriculum based on state and national standards.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to select appropriate instructional content and develop learning activities.</td>
<td>29 85%</td>
<td>5 15%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to choose, adapt, and implement instructional strategies appropriate to both the content and the level at which the content is being taught.</td>
<td>27 79%</td>
<td>7 21%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the importance of designing and implementing instructional activities that emphasize problem solving.</td>
<td>25 74%</td>
<td>9 26%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to apply appropriate instructional technology equipment, materials, processes, and tools to enhance teaching and to actively engage students in learning.</td>
<td>19 56%</td>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to select and use a variety of assessment methods to monitor and evaluate both student learning and instructional effectiveness.</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>14 41%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to create and maintain a safe and healthy learning environment.</td>
<td>31 91%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is aware of the relationship between classroom learning and student organizations.</td>
<td>5 15%</td>
<td>18 53%</td>
<td>11 32%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the relationship between technology education programs and advisory committees.</td>
<td>6 18%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>4 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows how to modify instructional activities and methods to address students’ diverse needs.</td>
<td>23 68%</td>
<td>10 29%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the importance of promoting technology education internally and externally.</td>
<td>11 32%</td>
<td>16 47%</td>
<td>6 18%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification判断</td>
<td>Very Important N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Important N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the importance of becoming involved in professional associations and organizations related to technology education.</td>
<td>5 15%</td>
<td>21 62%</td>
<td>7 21%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the importance of the professional growth of the technology education teacher via formal instruction, in-service activities, and professional association meetings.</td>
<td>10 29%</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar with current educational policy, legislation, and funding opportunities.</td>
<td>7 21%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar with opportunities for further education and careers.</td>
<td>8 24%</td>
<td>11 32%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>2 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is aware of the history, issues, and trends related to technology education.</td>
<td>6 18%</td>
<td>16 47%</td>
<td>12 35%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar with the management of resources, records, and budgets.</td>
<td>10 29%</td>
<td>15 44%</td>
<td>8 24%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the importance of collaborating with other school faculty to design instruction that integrates knowledge and skills from other core academic subject areas into instruction in technology.</td>
<td>20 59%</td>
<td>13 38%</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D7

**Final Evaluation — Panel 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>15 83%</td>
<td>3 17%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>14 78%</td>
<td>4 22%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training in the standard setting method was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment.</td>
<td>13 72%</td>
<td>5 28%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The explanation of how the recommended cut score is computed was clear.</td>
<td>10 56%</td>
<td>8 44%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity for feedback and discussion between rounds was helpful.</td>
<td>15 83%</td>
<td>2 11%</td>
<td>1 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>10 56%</td>
<td>7 39%</td>
<td>1 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D7 (continued)

**Final Evaluation — Panel 1**

How influential was each of the following factors in guiding your standard setting judgments? | Very Influential | Somewhat Influential | Not Influential |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
- The definition of the JQC | 15 | 83% | 2 | 11% | 1 | 6% |
- The between-round discussions | 8 | 47% | 8 | 47% | 1 | 6% |
- The knowledge/skills required to answer each test question | 10 | 56% | 8 | 44% | 0 | 0% |
- The cut scores of other panel members | 3 | 18% | 10 | 59% | 4 | 24% |
- My own professional experience | 16 | 89% | 2 | 11% | 0 | 0% |

Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores? | Very Comfortable | Somewhat Comfortable | Somewhat Uncomfortable | Very Uncomfortable |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
- Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores? | 11 | 61% | 5 | 28% | 1 | 6% | 1 | 6% |

Overall, the recommended cut score is: | Too Low | About Right | Too High |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
- Overall, the recommended cut score is: | 0 | 0% | 18 | 100% | 0 | 0% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree N</th>
<th>Strongly Agree Percent</th>
<th>Agree N</th>
<th>Agree Percent</th>
<th>Disagree N</th>
<th>Disagree Percent</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree N</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training in the standard setting method was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The explanation of how the recommended cut score is computed was clear.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity for feedback and discussion between rounds was helpful.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D8 (continued)
Final Evaluation — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How influential was each of the following factors in guiding your standard setting judgments?</th>
<th>Very Influential N</th>
<th>Very Influential Percent</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential N</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential Percent</th>
<th>Not Influential N</th>
<th>Not Influential Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The definition of the JQC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The between-round discussions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge/skills required to answer each test question</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cut scores of other panel members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My own professional experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores?</th>
<th>Very Comfortable N</th>
<th>Very Comfortable Percent</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable N</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable Percent</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable N</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable Percent</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable N</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the recommended cut score is:</th>
<th>Too Low N</th>
<th>Too Low Percent</th>
<th>About Right N</th>
<th>About Right Percent</th>
<th>Too High N</th>
<th>Too High Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topic: Final Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Approve a Cut Score on the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment

Presenter: Mrs. Patty S. Pitts, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Licensure

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522 E-Mail Address: Patty.Pitts@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:
___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by
    X State or federal law or regulation
    X Board of Education regulation
    ___ Other: __________

X Action requested at this meeting ___ Action requested at future meeting: __________

Previous Review/Action:
___ No previous board review/action

X Previous review/action
date February 17, 2011
action First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure to Approve a Cut Score on the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment

Background Information:

The responsibility for teacher licensure is set forth in section 22.1-298.1 of the Code of Virginia, which states that the Board of Education shall prescribe by regulation the requirements for licensure of teachers. The Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (September 21, 2007) 8VAC20-22-40 (A) state, in part, that “…all candidates who hold at least a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university and who seek an initial Virginia teaching license must obtain passing scores on professional teacher’s assessments prescribed by the Board of Education.”

The Board of Education prescribes the Praxis II (subject area content) examinations as the professional teacher’s assessment requirements for initial licensure in Virginia. The Board originally approved cut scores on 16 subject content tests that became effective July 1, 1999. Subsequently, the Board adopted additional content knowledge tests as they were developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Virginia teachers and teacher educators participated in validation and standard setting studies guided by ETS personnel to ensure an appropriate match between Praxis II tests and the competencies set forth in Virginia’s regulations, as well as the K-12 Standards of Learning.
ETS continues to update the Praxis II assessments through the test regeneration process. When this process results in substantial changes to the assessment, another standard setting study is required.

Summary of Major Elements

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (0134), research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level art teachers.

The study involved an expert panel comprised of teachers, administrators and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) art education experience, either as art teachers or college faculty who prepare art teachers, and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning art teachers.

The panel was convened on November 17, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The attached technical report (Appendix A) is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting study.

In addition, research staff from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies in November 2010. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level Art teachers. The attached technical report (Appendix B) details the work of the multi-state committees.

The Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Test at a Glance document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level art teachers have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering Art Making – General (approximately 15 questions); Art Making – Media & Processes (approximately 61 questions); Materials & Processes in a Historical Context and Responding to Art (approximately 17 questions); and Western Tradition and Beyond the Western Tradition (approximately 27 questions).

Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; four category scores – one for each content area listed above – also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a candidate’s score. (Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to the candidate’s score.) The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (0134) ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points. The first national administration of the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment will occur in fall 2011.

The process used in the Virginia standard setting study is detailed in Appendix A. The panel recommended a cut score of 69. The value of 69 represents approximately 63 percent of the total available 110 raw points that could be earned on the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment. The scaled score associated with 69 raw points is 154.
A similar process was used in the multi-state standard setting studies as described in Appendix B. The average recommended cut score recommendations for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (rounded up) is 72 (on the raw score metric), which represents 65 percent of the total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 73 and 71, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 72 is 158.

When reviewing the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) for the cut scores recommended by the Virginia Standard Setting Study as well as the Multi-State Studies, there is an overlap in the scaled scores. The SEM 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 score that precisely reflects the test-taker’s actual level of knowledge and 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 Standard Error of Measurement for the recommended cut scores for the Virginia Standard Setting Study and the Multi-State Studies are shown on the next page. Note that consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

**Standard Error of Measure Summaries -- Art: Content Knowledge (0134)**

**Table 1**

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score**

**Art: Content Knowledge -- Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69 (5.11)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score**

**Art: Content Knowledge -- Multi-State Studies**

**Panel 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 (4.98)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scale Score Equivalent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 (5.04)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 SEMs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Combined Across Panels:** |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Recommended Cut Score (SEM)** | **Scale Score Equivalent** |
| 72 (5.01) | 158 |
| -2 SEMs | 62 |
| -1 SEM | 67 |
| +1 SEM | 78 |
| +2 SEMs | 83 |

*Note. Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.*

On January 24, 2011, the Advisory Board for Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) recommended that the Board of Education set a cut score of 158 for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (0134) for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Visual Arts PreK-12. The revised assessment will be offered after September 1, 2011.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation:**

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s recommendation and adopt a cut score of 158 for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (0134) for individuals seeking an initial license with an endorsement in Visual Arts PreK-12.

**Impact on Resources:**

Costs associated with the administration of the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Assessment (0134) will be incurred by the Educational Testing Service. Prospective teachers seeking an initial Virginia license with an endorsement in Visual Arts PreK-12 will be required to pay the registration and test fees.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

N/A
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PRAXIS ART: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (0134)

Prepared for the Virginia Department of Education

Educational and Credentialing Research
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

November 2010
Executive Summary

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study on November 17, 2010. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level art teachers.

Recommended Cut Scores

The recommended cut score is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, the average recommended cut score is 69 (on the raw score metric), which represents 63% of total available 110 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 69 is 154.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level art teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level art teachers.

The study involved an expert panel, comprised of teachers, administrators and college faculty. The VDOE recommended panelists with (a) art education experience, either as art teachers or college faculty who prepare art teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning art teachers.

The panel was convened on November 17, 2010, in Richmond, Virginia. The following technical report is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting study.

The passing score recommendation for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment is provided to the VDOE. The VDOE is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable state regulations. The study provides a recommended passing score, which represents the combined judgments of one group of experienced educators. The full range of the VDOE’s needs and expectations could not be represented during the standard setting study. The VDOE, therefore, may want to consider both the panel’s recommended cut score and other sources of information when setting the final Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) cut score (Geisinger & McCormick, 2010). Other kinds of information may provide reasons for the VDOE to adjust the recommended cut score. The recommended cut score may be accepted, adjusted upward to reflect more stringent expectations, or adjusted downward to reflect more lenient expectations. There is no correct decision; the appropriateness of any adjustment may only be evaluated in terms of its meeting the VDOE’s needs.

Two critical sources of information to consider when setting the cut score are the standard error of measurement (SEM) and the standard error of judgment (SEJ). The former addresses the reliability of Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) scores and the latter the reliability of panelists’ cut score recommendations. The SEM allows the VDOE to recognize that a Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) score—any test score on any test—is less than perfectly reliable. A test score only approximates
what a candidate truly knows or truly can do on the test. The SEM, therefore, addresses the question: How close of an approximation is the test score to the true score? The SEJ allows the VDOE to consider the likelihood that the recommended cut score from the current panel would be similar to cut scores recommended by other panels of experts similar in composition and experience. The smaller the SEJ, the more likely that another panel would recommend a cut score consistent with the recommended cut score. The larger the SEJ, the less likely the recommended cut score would be reproduced by another panel.

In addition to measurement error metrics (e.g., SEM, SEJ), the VDOE should consider the likelihood of classification error. That is, when adjusting a cut score, policymakers should consider whether it is more important to minimize a false positive decision or to minimize a false negative decision. A false positive decision occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests he should receive a license/certificate, but his actual knowledge/skill level is lower (i.e., the candidate does not possess the required knowledge/skills). A false negative occurs when a candidate’s test score suggests that she should not receive a license/certificate, but she actually does possess the required knowledge/skills. The VDOE needs to consider which decision error to minimize; it is not possible to eliminate both types of decision errors simultaneously.

Overview of the Praxis Assessment

The Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Test at a Glance document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level art teachers have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering Art Making- General (approximately 15 questions); Art Making – Media & Processes (approximately 61 questions); Materials & Processes in a Historical Context and Responding to Art (approximately 17 questions); and Western Tradition and Beyond the Western Tradition (approximately 27 questions).1

---

1 The number of questions for each content area may vary slightly from form to form of the assessment.
Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; four category scores – one for each content area listed above – also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a candidate’s score\(^2\). The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

**Processes and Methods**

The following section describes the processes and methods used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate recommended passing scores, or cut scores. (The agenda for the panel meeting is presented in the Appendix.)

The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the test content specifications for the assessment (included in the *Test at a Glance* document, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the assessment.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction by James Lanham, from the VDOE. The ETS facilitator then explained how the assessment was developed, provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study.

**Reviewing the Assessment**

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately an hour and a half to respond to the multiple-choice questions. The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists were given the answer key for the assessment and checked their responses. How well the panelists did on the assessment was not shared with the panel.

The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the assessment; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering art teachers, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering teachers.

\(^2\) Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to a candidate’s score.
Defining the Just Qualified Candidate

Following the review of the assessment, panelists internalized the definition of the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and/or skills believed necessary to be a qualified art teacher. The JQC definition is the operational definition of the cut score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this definition of the JQC.

The panelists were split into smaller groups, and each group was asked to write down their definition of a JQC. Each group referred to Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Test at a Glance to guide their definition. Each group posted its definition on chart paper, and a full-panel discussion occurred to reach consensus on a final definition (see the consensus JQC definition in the Appendix).

Panelists’ Judgments

The standard-setting process for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment was conducted for the overall test. A probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used. In this approach, for each multiple-choice question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

The panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:

- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range; and
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision
located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1.0. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on the first five questions.

Judgment of Content Specifications

In addition to the standard setting process, the panel judged the importance of the knowledge and/or skills stated or implied in the assessment content specifications for the job of an entry-level art teacher. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the assessment. Judgments were made using a four-point Likert scale — Very Important, Important, Slightly Important, and Not Important. Each panelist independently judged the knowledge categories and knowledge/skills statements.

Results

Expert Panels

The standard setting study included an expert panel. The VDOE recruited panelists to represent a range of professional perspectives. A description of the panel is presented below. (See Appendix for a listing of panelists.)

The panel included 13 teachers, administrators, and college faculty who prepare art teachers. In brief, ten panelists were teachers, two were college faculty, and one was both an administrator and college faculty. All the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of art teachers. Nine panelists were White, two were African American, and two were Asian American. Seven panelists were female. Eleven panelists reported being certified art teachers in Virginia. The majority of panelists (7 of the 13 panelists or 54%) had 11 or fewer years of experience as an art teacher, and approximately a third (5 of the 13 panelists or 38%) had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

A fuller demographic description for the members of the panel is presented in Table 1.
Table 1

**Panel Member Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/College Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently certified as an art teacher in Virginia?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently teaching art in Virginia?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently supervising or mentoring other art teachers?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many years of experience do you have teaching art?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Panel Member Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching art?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K - 5 or K - 6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of art teachers?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Evaluation Forms.

The panelists completed an initial evaluation after receiving training on how to make question-level judgments. The primary information collected from this form was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. All panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

Summary of Standard Setting Judgments

A summary of the standard-setting judgments is presented in Table 2. The numbers in the table reflect the recommended cut scores — the number of raw points needed to “pass” the assessment — of each panelist. The panel’s average recommended cut score and highest and lowest cut scores are reported, as are the standard deviations (SD) of panelists’ cut scores and the standard errors of judgment (SEJ). The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability of the judgments. It indicates how likely it would be for other panels of educators similar in make-up, experience, and standard-setting training to the
current panel to recommend the same cut score on the same form of the assessment. A comparable panel’s cut score would be within 1 SEJ of the current average cut score 68 percent of the time and within 2 SEJs 95 percent of the time.

The panel’s cut score recommendation for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment is 68.43 (see Table 2). The value was rounded to 69, the next highest whole number, to determine the functional recommended cut score. The value of 69 represents approximately 63% of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 69 raw points is 154.

Table 2
Summary of Standard Setting Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Cut Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>68.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>82.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 68.43
SD 11.47
SEJ 3.18
Highest 88.20
Lowest 46.45

Table 3 presents the estimated standard errors of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut score. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled scores associated with 1 and 2 SEMs above and below the recommended cut scores are provided. The standard
errors provided are an estimate, given that the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment has not yet been administered.

**Table 3**

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69 (5.11)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2 SEMs</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.

**Summary of Content Specification Judgments.**

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level art teachers. Panelists rated the knowledge categories and knowledge/skills statements on a four-point scale ranging from *Very Important* to *Not Important*. The panelists’ ratings are summarized in Table 4 (in Appendix).

Eleven of the 16 knowledge categories were judged to be *Very Important* or *Important* by 76% or more of the panelists. The knowledge categories of “*Understands and applies the elements of art and principles of visual organization*” and “*Knows and understands safety, environmental, and storage issues*” (77% of the panelists judged as *Very Important*) were seen as the most important for beginning art teachers. The knowledge category of “*Understand materials, tools and processes for videography, filmmaking, and installations*” (62% of the panelists judged as *Slightly Important* or *Not Important*) was seen as less important for beginning art teachers. All but 16 of the 70 knowledge statements covered by the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment were judged to be *Very Important* or *Important* by at least two-thirds of the panelists.
Summary of Final Evaluations.

The panelists completed an evaluation form at the conclusion of their standard setting study. The evaluation form asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation. Table 5 (in Appendix) present the results of the final evaluations.

All panelists agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the purpose of the study and that the facilitator’s instructions and explanations were clear. All panelists agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared to make their standard setting judgments. Approximately 85% of the panelists strongly agreed that the standard-setting process was easy to follow.

Summary

To support the decision-making process for the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) with regards to establishing passing score, or cut score, for Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted a standard setting study. The study also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level art teachers.

The recommended cut score is provided to help the VDOE determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134), the average recommended cut score is 69 (on the raw score metric), which represents 63% of total available 110 raw score points. The scaled score associated with a raw score of 69 is 154.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level art teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.
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Appendix
## Panelists’ Names & Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Choo Ashe</td>
<td>Hampton City Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Bay</td>
<td>Radford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret C. Bowen</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Gibson-McDonald</td>
<td>Lynchburg City Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Harris</td>
<td>Norfolk Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish M. Harris</td>
<td>Henrico County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia S. Herring</td>
<td>Nottoway County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. Hunter</td>
<td>Colonial Beach Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel D. Jones</td>
<td>Norfolk Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia B. Redman</td>
<td>Warren County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Rowland</td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Stratten</td>
<td>Fairfax County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Young</td>
<td>Russell County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda: VISUAL ARTS (K-12) PANEL

Wednesday, November 17, 2010

8:00 am  Registration and Breakfast
8:30 am  Welcome and Introduction
8:50 am  Overview of Study
9:20 am  Take the Test and Self-Score
10:50 am BREAK
11:00 am Discuss the Test Content
11:30 am Discuss the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC)
         Noon      LUNCH
12:45 pm Define the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC) - Continued
1:30 pm  Training for Standard Setting Judgments
2:00 pm  Complete Standard Setting Judgments
         BREAK
3:00 pm  Specification Judgment Training
3:30 pm  Complete Specification Judgments
3:45 pm  Complete Final Evaluation
4:00 pm  Collect Materials and Adjourn

Thank You for Participating
Description of a Just Qualified Candidate
Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134)
(Developed for the Virginia Department of Education)

- Knows characteristics of common 2-D and 3-D materials and processes
- Can compare characteristics of common 2-D and 3-D materials and processes.
- Knows characteristics of current technologies and equipment such as photography, videography, and computer applications
- Understands safety and health issues related to common materials and processes; applies safety procedures in the classroom
- Knows how to prepare an exhibition using appropriate presentation techniques
- Demonstrates knowledge and application of art vocabulary
- Knows major trends in Western and Nonwestern art and architecture
- Knows and understands the chronological timeline and thematic organization of art history
- Ability to analyze works of art and evaluate them critically across cultures and periods of time
- Understands the functions and purposes of works of art
- Knows the role of visual literacy and popular culture
Table 4
Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. A. ART MAKING - GENERAL</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands and applies the elements of art and principles of visual organization as applied to two-dimensional and three-dimensional media.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies elements and principles of design in visual stimuli</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains relationships of elements to principles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distinguishes uses of elements and principles in two-dimensional and three-dimensional art</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows various historical methods and contemporary approaches to creating art.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defines/identifies both historical and contemporary methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 (continued)

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. B. ART MAKING – MEDIA AND PROCESSES</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and understands safety, environmental, and storage issues related to the use of art materials and art processes.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of dangerous materials and their effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorization of dangerous materials and their effects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of proper ventilation, storage, and disposal procedures based on the medium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of MSDS sheets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of safety procedures and precautions for using artists’ materials and tools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of health issues related to the use of artists’ materials and tools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and understands how to use a variety of drawing, painting, and printmaking materials and processes.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows vocabulary related to drawing, painting, and printmaking materials and processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes drawing, painting, and printmaking processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)
Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through reproductions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knows and understands how to use digital photography and image processes.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates basic camera knowledge (camera parts, vocabulary)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of common editing and imaging software</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of uploading, downloading, storing common file types, transferring and printing images</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows and understands how to use the process of creating digital images</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understand materials, tools and processes for videography, filmmaking, and installations</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies/describes materials, tools, and processes for videography, filmmaking and installations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knows and understands how to use sculptural materials and processes.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows vocabulary related to sculptural materials and processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes sculptural processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 (continued)

**Specification Judgments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reproductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Knows and understands how to use a variety of fiber</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>art materials and processes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows vocabulary related to fiber materials and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes fiber processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reproductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the physical aspects and effective ways of presenting art work for display purposes.</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies and recognizes methods of mounting and matting work in ways appropriate to the medium</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies and describes methods of displaying three-dimensional work</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes appropriate ways of using exhibition spaces</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. A. HISTORICAL & THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – MATERIALS & PROCESSES

• Understands the following materials within an art historical context: Painting, Drawing, Printmaking, Sculpture, Architecture, Photography, Fiber Arts, Crafts.
  • Identifies characteristics of materials, processes, and techniques within an art historical context | 6 46%          | 4 31%     | 3 23%              | 0 0%          |
  • Identifies similarities and differences among materials, processes, and techniques (e.g., evolution over time) | 5 38%          | 5 38%     | 3 23%              | 0 0%          |
  • Knows vocabulary related to two-dimensional and three-dimensional media and processes within an art historical context | 4 31%          | 6 46%     | 3 23%              | 0 0%          |
  • Recognizes or identifies processes within an art historical context through reproductions | 7 54%          | 3 23%     | 3 23%              | 0 0%          |
### Table 4 (continued)

**Specification Judgments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. B. HISTORICAL & THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – THE WESTERN TRADITION IN ART HISTORY**

- Recognizes stylistic traits of art and architecture from each of the following time periods: Prehistory; Ancient Near East; Ancient Greece and Rome; Early Christian, Byzantine and Medieval periods; the Renaissance; the Baroque; 18th through 20th centuries in Europe and North America; contemporary art.
  - Identifies the styles of works of art and architecture
  - Categorizes art and architecture according to style and/or period
  - Identifies major works of art and architecture by title, style, and/or artist, as appropriate
  - Analyzes/explains the influence of art periods or schools on later work
  - Analyzes compositional elements and principles of design in works of art and architecture
  - Recognizes the impact of major artistic and technological innovations on the stylistic traits of art

| 2  | 15% | 7  | 54% | 4  | 31% | 0  | 0% |
| 2  | 15% | 7  | 54% | 3  | 23% | 1  | 8% |
| 2  | 15% | 5  | 38% | 6  | 46% | 0  | 0% |
| 3  | 23% | 8  | 62% | 2  | 15% | 0  | 0% |
| 4  | 31% | 6  | 46% | 2  | 15% | 1  | 8% |
| 2  | 15% | 9  | 69% | 2  | 15% | 0  | 0% |
Table 4 (continued)

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the content, context, and/or purpose of art and architecture from each of the following time periods: Prehistory; Ancient Near East; Ancient Greece and Rome; Early Christian, Byzantine and Medieval periods; the Renaissance; the Baroque; 18th through 20th centuries in Europe and North America; contemporary art.</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains the purposes of works of art from various time periods</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decodes/analyzes the narrative or intended content of a work of art</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyzes/explains the interrelationships between art and social factors, cultural context, and events</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains the impact of major artistic and technological innovations on the content, context, and purposes of art</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluates information about art and artists from various sources</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification Judgments</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. C.</strong> HISTORICAL &amp; THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – ART BEYOND THE WESTERN TRADITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and understands the general visual characteristics of art and architecture from Asia, Africa, the Americas, the South Pacific region.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Classifies works of art and architecture by regions/cultures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describes/analyzes works of art and architecture using compositional elements and principles of design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describes/analyzes the interrelationships between art from beyond the Western traditions and art from the Western tradition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies major works of art and architecture by title, style, and/or artist, as appropriate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the general content, context, and purposes of art from Asia, Africa, the Americas, the South Pacific region.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explains the content and/or purpose (as appropriate) of frequently referenced works of art from various locations and cultures(^1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies the general role of a work of art in its culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explains how the context in which a work of art is created conveys information about various lifestyles and belief systems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluates information about art and artists from various sources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

Specification Judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. D. HISTORICAL &amp; THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – RESPONDING TO ART</th>
<th>Very Important N</th>
<th>Very Important %</th>
<th>Important N</th>
<th>Important %</th>
<th>Slightly Important N</th>
<th>Slightly Important %</th>
<th>Not Important N</th>
<th>Not Important %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the major theories of art and aesthetics.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes the major characteristics of various theories of art and aesthetics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguishes among the major theories of art and aesthetics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compares and contrasts the differences/similarities among theories of art and aesthetics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interprets and evaluates works of art based on theories of art and aesthetics (as opposed to personal opinion)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands the relationship between art and critical response.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of critical reactions to well-known works and/or art movements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes/uses multiple viewpoints in examining a work of art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes the way personal experience affects interpretation of art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes how meaning is created in art (e.g., through symbols, iconography, formal elements and principles)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Final Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to “take the test” and to discuss the test content was useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to practice making standard setting judgments was useful</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training for the standard setting judgments was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Art: Content Knowledge (0134) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies¹. The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level Art teachers.

Participating States

Panelists from 22 states were recommended by state departments of education to participate on expert panels. The state departments of education recommended panelists with (a) art education experience, either as K-12 Art teachers or college faculty who prepare Art teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning Art teachers.

Recommended Cut Scores

The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, the average recommended cut score (rounded up) is 72 (on the raw score metric), which represents 65% of total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 73 and 71, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 72 is 158.

Summary of Content Specification Judgments

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level Art teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.

¹ The two multi-state standard setting studies collected expert judgments for questions comprising both the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) and Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135) assessments. Standard-setting procedures and results presented in the following report only pertain to the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment. A separate report contains similar information for Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135).
To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Art: Content Knowledge (0134) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies\(^2\). The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level Art teachers. Panelists were recommended by state departments of education\(^3\) to participate on the two expert panels. The state departments of education recommended panelists with (a) art education experience, either as K-12 Art teachers or college faculty who prepare Art teachers and (b) familiarity with the knowledge and skills required of beginning Art teachers.

The two, non-overlapping panels (a) allow each participating state to be represented and (b) provide a replication of the judgment process to strengthen the technical quality of the recommended passing score. For the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, 22 states were represented by 42 panelists across the two panels, (See Appendix A for the names and affiliations of the panelists.)

\(^2\) The two multi-state standard setting studies collected expert judgments for questions comprising both the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) and Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135) assessments. Standard-setting procedures and results presented in the following report only pertain to the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment. A separate report contains similar information for Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135).

\(^3\) State departments of education that currently use one or more Praxis tests were invited to participate in the multi-state standard setting studies.
Table 1
Participating States (and number of panelists) for Multi-State Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Panelists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Pennsylvania and Washington, DC were represented on only one of the two panels.

The panels were convened in November 2010 in Princeton, New Jersey. For both panels, the same processes and methods were used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate the recommended passing score, or cut score.

The following technical report is divided into three sections. The first section describes the content and format of the assessment. The second section describes the standard setting processes and methods used. The third section presents the results of the standard setting studies.

The passing score recommendation for the assessment is provided to each of the represented state departments of education. In each state, the department of education, the state board of education, or a designated educator licensure board is responsible for establishing the final passing score in accordance with applicable state regulations.

The first national administration of the new Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment will occur in fall 2011.
Overview of the Praxis Assessment

The Praxis Art: Content Knowledge Test at a Glance document (ETS, in press) describes the purpose and structure of the assessment. In brief, the assessment measures whether entry-level Art teachers have the content knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. A National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty defined the content of the assessment, and a national survey of the field confirmed the content.

The two hour assessment contains 120 multiple-choice questions covering Art Making- General (approximately 15 questions); Art Making – Media & Processes (approximately 61 questions); Materials & Processes in a Historical Context and Responding to Art (approximately 17 questions); and Western Tradition and Beyond the Western Tradition (approximately 27 questions).

Candidate scores are reported as an overall score; four category scores – one for each content area listed above – also are reported. Of the 120 multiple-choice questions, 110 questions contribute to a candidate’s score. The maximum total number of raw points that may be earned on each assessment is 110. The reporting scale for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment ranges from 100 to 200 scaled-score points.

Processes and Methods

For both expert panels, the same processes and methods were used to train panelists, gather panelists’ judgments and to calculate the recommended passing score, or cut score. The following section describes the processes and methods used. (The agenda for the panel meetings is presented in Appendix A.)

The design of the standard setting study included two non-overlapping expert panels. The training provided to panelists as well as the study materials were consistent across panels with the exception of defining the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). To assure that both panels were using the same frame of reference when making question-level standard setting judgments, the JQC definition developed through a consensus process by the first panel was used as the definition for the second panel.

\^ The number of questions for each content area may vary slightly from form to form of the assessment.
\^ Ten of the 120 multiple-choice questions are pretest questions which do not contribute to a candidate’s score.
\^ Panelists also judged the constructed-response questions that appear on the Praxis Art: Content and Analysis assessment. The process for making these judgments are not described in this report but are described in the technical report for the Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135) standard setting.
The second panel did complete a thorough review of the definition to allow panelists to internalize the definition. The processes for developing the definition (with Panel 1) and reviewing/internalizing the definition (with Panel 2) are described later, and the Just Qualified Candidate definitions are presented in Appendix C.

The panelists were sent an e-mail explaining the purpose of the standard-setting study and requesting that they review the test content specifications for the assessment (included in the Test at a Glance document, which was attached to the e-mail). The purpose of the review was to familiarize the panelists with the general structure and content of the assessment.

The standard-setting study began with a welcome and introduction by the meeting facilitator, Dr. Clyde Reese from the Center for Validity Research. He explained how the assessment was developed, provided an overview of standard setting, and presented the agenda for the study.

**Reviewing the Assessment**

The first activity was for the panelists to “take the test.” (Each panelist had signed a nondisclosure form.) The panelists were given approximately an hour and a half to respond to the 120 multiple-choice questions (as well as the three constructed-response questions that are included on the Praxis Art: Knowledge and Analysis assessment). Panelists were instructed not to refer to the answer key while taking the test. The purpose of “taking the test” was for the panelists to become familiar with the test format, content, and difficulty. After “taking the test,” the panelists checked their responses against the answer key.

The panelists then engaged in a discussion of the major content areas being addressed by the assessment; they were also asked to remark on any content areas that they thought would be particularly challenging for entering Art teachers, and areas that addressed content that would be particularly important for entering teachers.

**Defining the Just Qualified Candidate**

Following the review of the assessment, panelists internalized the definition of the Just Qualified Candidate (JQC). The JQC is the test taker who has the minimum level of knowledge and/or skills believed necessary to be a qualified Art teacher. The JQC definition is the operational definition of the
cut score. The goal of the standard-setting process is to identify the test score that aligns with this definition of the JQC.

In Panel 1, the panelists were split into smaller groups, and each group was asked to write down their definition of a JQC. Each group referred to the Praxis Art: Content and Analysis Test at a Glance\textsuperscript{7} to guide their definition. Each group posted its definition on chart paper, and a full-panel discussion occurred to reach consensus on a definition (see Appendix C).

In Panel 2, the panelists began with the definition of the JQC developed by the first panel. Given that the multi-state standard setting study was designed to replicate processes and procedures across the two panels, it was important that both panels use consistent JQC definitions to frame their judgments. For Panel 2, the panelists reviewed the JQC definition, and any ambiguities were discussed and clarified. The panelists then were split into smaller groups, and each group developed performance indicators or “can do” statements based on the definition. The purpose of the indicators was to provide clear examples of what might be observed to indicate that the teacher had the defined knowledge. The performance indicators were shared across the group, and discussed and added to the definition. The panel also had an opportunity to suggest minor changes to the initial definition, if doing so added clarity. Panel 2 made two revisions to the JQC definition developed by Panel 1: (a) splitting the first bullet into two separate bullets and (b) replacing one of the examples in the second bullet.

Panelists’ Judgments

A probability-based Angoff method (Brandon, 2004; Hambleton & Pitoniak, 2006) was used for the multiple-choice questions. In this approach, for each question, a panelist decides on the likelihood (probability or chance) that a JQC would answer it correctly. Panelists made their judgments using the following rating scale: 0, .05, .10, .20, .30, .40, .50, .60, .70, .80, .90, .95, 1. The lower the value, the less likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly, because the question is difficult for the JQC. The higher the value, the more likely it is that a JQC would answer the question correctly.

For each panel, the panelists were asked to approach the judgment process in two stages. First, they reviewed the definition of the JQC and the question and decided if, overall, the question was

\textsuperscript{7} The test specifications contained in the Praxis Art: Content and Analysis Test At A Glance subsumed the specification for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment.
difficult for the JQC, easy for the JQC, or moderately difficult/easy. The facilitator encouraged the panelists to consider the following rule of thumb to guide their decision:

- difficult questions for a JQC were in the 0 to .30 range;
- moderately difficult/easy questions for a JQC were in the .40 to .60 range; and
- easy questions for a JQC were in the .70 to 1 range.

The second decision was for panelists to decide how they wanted to refine their judgment within the range. For example, if a panelist thought that a question was easy for a JQC, the initial decision located the question in the .70 to 1 range. The second decision was for the panelist to decide if the likelihood of answering it correctly was .70, .80, .90, .95, or 1.0. The two-stage decision-process was implemented to reduce the cognitive load placed on the panelists. The panelists practiced making their standard-setting judgments on six of the multiple-choice questions.

The panelists engaged in two rounds of judgments. Following Round 1, question-level feedback was provided to the panel. The panelists’ judgments were displayed for each question. The panelists’ judgments were summarized by the three general difficulty levels (0 to .30, .40 to .60, and .70 to 1), and the panel’s average question judgment was provided. Questions were highlighted to show when panelists converged in their judgments (at least two-thirds of the panelists located a question in the same difficulty range) or diverged in their judgments. Panelists were asked to share their rationales for the judgments they made. Following this discussion, panelists were provided an opportunity to change their question-level standard-setting judgments (Round 2).

Other than the definition of the JQC, results from Panel 1 were not shared with the second panel. The question-level judgments and resulting discussions for Panel 2 were independent of judgments and discussions that occurred with Panel 1.

**Judgment of Content Specifications**

In addition to the two-round standard setting process, each panel judged the importance of the knowledge and/or skills stated or implied in the assessment content specifications for the job of an entry-level Art teacher. These judgments addressed the perceived content-based validity of the assessment. Judgments were made using a four-point Likert scale — Very Important, Important, Slightly Important,
and Not Important. Each panelist independently judged the knowledge categories and knowledge/skills statements.

**Results**

Results are presented separately for the two panels. The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score.

**Expert Panels**

The standard setting study included two expert panels. The various state departments of education recruited panelists to represent a range of professional perspectives. A description of the panels is presented below. (See Appendix A for a listing of panelists for each panel.)

Panel 1 included 21 teachers, administrators, and college faculty who prepare Art teachers, representing 21 states. In brief, 18 panelists were teachers, one was an administrators or department heads, and two were college faculty. Both of the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of Art teachers. Seventeen panelists were White, one was Hispanic or Latino, one was Asian American, one was American Indian or Alaskan Native, and one panelist indicated “other.” Fifteen panelists were female. Nineteen panelists reported being certified Art teachers in their states. Slightly less than half of panelists (9 of the 21 panelists or 43%) had seven or fewer years of experience as an Art teacher, and five had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

Panel 2 included 21 teachers and college faculty who prepare Art teachers, representing 21 states. In brief, 18 panelists were teachers and three were college faculty. All three of the panelists who were college faculty were currently involved in the training or preparation of Art teachers. Seventeen panelists were White, three were African American, and one was Asian American. Fourteen panelists were female. Eighteen panelists reported being certified Art teachers in their states. Nearly 40% of panelists (8 of the 21 panelists) had seven or fewer years of experience as an Art teacher, and three had 16 or more years of teaching experience.

A fuller demographic description for the members of the two panels is presented in Tables D1 and D2 in Appendix D.
**Initial Evaluation Forms.**

The panelists completed an initial evaluation after receiving training on how to make question-level judgments. The primary information collected from this form was the panelists indicating if they had received adequate training to make their standard-setting judgments and were ready to proceed. Across both panels, all panelists indicated that they were prepared to make their judgments.

**Summary of Standard Setting Judgments by Round.**

A summary of each round of standard-setting judgments is presented in Appendix D. The numbers in each table reflect the recommended cut scores — the number of raw points needed to “pass” the assessment — of each panelist for the two rounds. The panel’s average recommended cut score and highest and lowest cut scores are reported, as are the standard deviations (SD) of panelists’ cut scores and the standard errors of judgment (SEJ). The SEJ is one way of estimating the reliability of the judgments. It indicates how likely it would be for other panels of educators similar in make-up, experience, and standard-setting training to the current panels to recommend the same cut score on the same form of the assessment. A comparable panel’s cut score would be within 1 SEJ of the current average cut score 68 percent of the time and within 2 SEJs 95 percent of the time.

Round 1 judgments are made without discussion among the panelists. The most variability in judgments, therefore, is typically present in the first round. Round 2 judgments, however, are informed by panel discussion; thus, it is common to see a decrease both in the standard deviation and SEJ. This decrease — indicating convergence among the panelists’ judgments — was observed for both panels. The Round 2 average total score is the panel’s recommended cut score (passing score).

The panels’ cut score recommendations for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment are 72.79 for Panel 1 and 70.33 for Panel 2 (see Tables D3 and D4 in Appendix D). The values were rounded to the next highest whole number to determine the functional recommended cut scores — 73 for Panel 1 and 71 for Panel 2. The values of 73 and 71 represent approximately 66% and 65%, respectively, of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled scores associated with 73 and 71 raw points are 159 and 156, respectively.\(^8\)

\(^8\) For reference purposes, if the recommended raw cut score was 72 or 70 points, the scaled score would be 158 or 155, respectively.
Table D5 (in Appendix D) present the estimated standard errors of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut scores for each panel. A standard error represents the uncertainty associated with a test score. The scaled scores associated with 1 and 2 SEMs above and below the recommended cut scores are provided. The standard errors provided are an estimate, given that the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment has not yet been administered.

In addition to the recommended cut score for each panel, the average cut score across the two panels is provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment. The panels’ average cut score recommendation for the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment is 71.56. The value was rounded to 72 (next highest raw score) to determine the functional recommended cut score. The value of 72 represents approximately 65% of the total available 110 raw-score points that could be earned on the assessment. The scaled score associated with 72 raw points is 158. Table D5 (in Appendix D) presents the standard error of measurement (SEM) around the recommended cut score combining the information from the two panels.

**Summary of Content Specification Judgments.**

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment content specifications were important for entry-level Art teachers. Panelists rated the knowledge categories and knowledge/skills statements on a four-point scale ranging from Very Important to Not Important. The panelists’ ratings are summarized in Table D6 (in Appendix D).

Thirteen of the 16 knowledge categories were judged to be Very Important or Important by 90% or more of the panelists. The knowledge categories of “Understanding and Applying the Elements of Art and Principles of Visual Organization,” and “Knows and Understands Safety, Environment, and Storage Issue” (81% of the panelists judged as Very Important) were seen as the most important for beginning Art teachers. The knowledge category of “Understanding Materials, Tools and Processes for Videography, Filmmaking, and Installations” (65% of the panelists judged as Slightly Important or Not Important) was seen as less important for beginning Art teachers. All but four of the 70 knowledge statements covered by the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge assessment were judged to be Very Important or Important by at least two-thirds of the panelists.
Summary of Final Evaluations

The panelists completed an evaluation form at the conclusion of their standard setting study. The evaluation form asked the panelists to provide feedback about the quality of the standard-setting implementation and the factors that influenced their decisions. Tables D7 and D8 (in Appendix D) present the results of the final evaluations.

All panelists agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the purpose of the study and that the facilitator’s instructions and explanations were clear. All panelists agreed or strongly agreed that they were prepared to make their standard setting judgments. Across the two panels, all but one of the panelists strongly agreed or agreed that the standard-setting process was easy to follow.

All panelists reported that the definition of the JQC was at least somewhat influential in guiding their standard-setting judgments; 86% of panelists indicated the definition was very influential. All but two of the panelists reported that between-round discussions were at least somewhat influential in guiding their judgments. Nearly three-quarters of the panelists (32 of the 42 panelists) indicated that the knowledge/skills required to answer each question as very influential in guiding their judgments.

There were similar ratings between the two panels when asked to respond to their level of comfort with their panel’s recommended passing score. All panelists indicated they were very or somewhat comfortable with their recommendation. For both panels, the majority of the panelists indicated that the recommend cut score was about right (100% for Panel 1 and 90% for Panel 2). Of the remaining panelists from Panel 2, one indicated the cut score was too low and one indicated it was too high.

---

9 Panelists indicated their level of comfort with the cut score recommendations for both the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) and Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135) assessments.
Summary

To support the decision-making process for state departments of education with regards to establishing a passing score, or cut score, for a revised assessment in the Praxis Series™ — Art: Content Knowledge (0134) — research staff from Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed and conducted two multi-state standard setting studies\(^\text{10}\). The studies also collected content-related validity evidence to confirm the importance of the content specifications for entry-level Art teachers.

The recommended cut scores for each panel, as well as the average cut score across the two panels, are provided to help state departments of education determine an appropriate cut (or passing) score. For the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment, the average recommended cut score (rounded up) is 72 (on the raw score metric), which represents 65% of total available 110 raw score points (the recommended cut scores for Panels 1 and 2 are 73 and 71, respectively). The scaled score associated with a raw score of 72 is 158.

Panelists judged the extent to which the knowledge and/or skills reflected by the content specifications were important for entry-level Art teachers. The favorable judgments of the panelists provided evidence that the content of the assessment is important for beginning practice.

\(^\text{10}\) The two multi-state standard setting studies collected expert judgments for questions comprising both the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) and Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135) assessments. Standard-setting procedures and results presented in the following report only pertain to the Praxis Art: Content Knowledge (0134) assessment. A separate report contains similar information for Praxis Art: Content and Analysis (0135).
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Appendix A

Panelists’ Names & Affiliations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonner, Bethany</td>
<td>Oakdale Elementary School (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasser, Angela</td>
<td>Campbellsville Middle &amp; High Schools (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brouillette, Charles</td>
<td>A. E. Phillips Lab School\Louisiana Tech University (LA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon, John Mark</td>
<td>Canton High School (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowles, Mariam</td>
<td>Cedarville School District (AR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullinan, Mary Susan</td>
<td>Colliers Primary (WV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall, Marta</td>
<td>Macon R-1 School (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heid, Karen A.</td>
<td>University of South Carolina (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernández-Balcázar, Noemí Verónica</td>
<td>Kearns High School (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeCours, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Hardwick Elementary School (VT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey, Jennifer</td>
<td>Mooresville Intermediate School (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliken, Chris</td>
<td>Wells Junior High School (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock, Stephen</td>
<td>Memphis City Schools (TN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moizsis, Katherine</td>
<td>Sayreville War Memorial High School (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morin, Derek</td>
<td>Kindred Public School (ND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcutt, Adriana E.</td>
<td>Trace Crossings School (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Gorman Rhodebeck, Kathleen</td>
<td>Pembroke Hill School (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell Sacco, Kristine</td>
<td>ACLD Tillotson School (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roemer, Jordyn M.</td>
<td>North County High School (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schorsch, Jamie</td>
<td>Oak Hills High School (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrell, Robert</td>
<td>Edgewood College (WI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Panelist</strong></th>
<th><strong>Affiliation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aman, Ronald</td>
<td>West Virginia University (WV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstead, Jacqueline</td>
<td>Argyle Middle School (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csejtey, Stephen</td>
<td>Akron Public Schools (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danenhauer, Audrea</td>
<td>Farmington Public Schools (AR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieck, Jessica M.</td>
<td>Hinds County School District (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn, Holli J.</td>
<td>Kickapoo High School (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinger, Ted</td>
<td>Tulip Grove Elementary MNPS (TN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Marla</td>
<td>Barren County Middle School (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley, Lisa</td>
<td>Chittenden Central SU (VT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbulevich, Jeanette</td>
<td>Waterbury Arts Magnet School (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Bryan</td>
<td>MLKing Elementary School (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrigan, Danette</td>
<td>Sacopee Valley Middle School (ME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach, Randall</td>
<td>J.H. Rose High School (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, Juliella</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa City School System (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Kathryn</td>
<td>Spanish Fork High School (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skow, Margaret</td>
<td>Rollings Middle School of the Arts\Dorchester District Two (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers, Bridget</td>
<td>Lakewood Elementary School (LA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift, Jason</td>
<td>Plymouth State University (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, Kenneth</td>
<td>Riverside School, Princeton (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winker, Melissa</td>
<td>Memorial High School (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Crystal</td>
<td>University of North Dakota (ND)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Workshop Agenda
# Praxis Art: Content Knowledge and Praxis Art: Content and Analysis Assessments

## Standard Setting Study

### Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00 – 8:15 | Welcome and Introduction  
* Overview of Workshop Events |
| 8:15 – 8:45 | Overview of Standard Setting & the Praxis Art Assessments               |
| 8:45 – 9:00 | Break                                                                    |
| 9:00 – 10:30 | “Take” the Praxis Art Assessments                                      |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Discuss the Praxis Art Assessments                                    |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC                                    |
| 12:00 – 12:45 | Lunch                                                                   |
| 12:45 – 2:15 | Define the Knowledge/Skills of a JQC (continued)                         |
| 2:15 – 2:30 | Break                                                                    |
| 2:30 – 3:00 | Standard Setting Training for CR Questions                               |
| 3:00 – 3:30 | Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments: CR Questions                        |
| 3:30 – 4:00 | Standard Setting Training for MC Questions                               |
| 4:00 – 5:00 | Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments: MC Questions 1- 40                  |
| 5:00 – 5:15 | Collect Materials; End of Day 1                                          |
Praxis Art: Content Knowledge and
Praxis Art: Content and Analysis Assessments
Standard Setting Study

Day 2

9:00 – 9:05  Overview of Day 2
9:05 – 9:15  Review Standard Setting for MC Questions
9:15 – 10:30 Round 1 Standard Setting Judgments: MC Questions 41-120
10:30 – 10:45 Break
10:45 – 11:15 Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments: CR Questions
11:15 – 12:00 Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments: MC Questions
12:00 – 1:00  Lunch
  1:00 – 2:15  Round 1 Feedback & Round 2 Judgments: MC Questions (continued)
  2:15 – 3:00 Specification Judgments
  3:00 – 3:15  Feedback on Round 2 Recommended Cut Score
  3:15 – 3:30  Complete Final Evaluation
  3:30 – 3:45 Collect Materials; End of Study
Appendix C

Just Qualified Candidate (JQC) Definitions
Description of a Just Qualified Candidate
Panel 1

A JQC …

1. Knows characteristics of common 2-D and 3-D materials and processes and compare across materials and processes

2. Knows characteristics of common technologies and equipment such as printmaking, photography, film making, and computers

3. Understands safety and health issues related to common materials and processes; applies safety procedures in the classroom

4. Can prepare an exhibition demonstrating an understanding of aesthetic presentation

5. Demonstrates knowledge and application of art vocabulary

6. Knows major trends in Western and Nonwestern art and architecture

7. Knows and understands the chronological timeline and thematic organization of art history

8. Ability to analyze works of art and evaluate them critically across cultures and periods of time

9. Understands the roles of function and purpose of works of art (i.e., reflection)

10. Knows the role of visual literacy and popular culture
Description of a Just Qualified Candidate
Panel 2

A JQC …

1. Knows characteristics of common 2-D and 3-D materials and processes

2. Can compare characteristics of common 2-D and 3-D materials and processes.

3. Knows characteristics of common technologies and equipment such as printmaking, photography, videography, and computer applications

4. Understands safety and health issues related to common materials and processes; applies safety procedures in the classroom

5. Can prepare an exhibition demonstrating an understanding of aesthetic presentation

6. Demonstrates knowledge and application of art vocabulary

7. Knows major trends in Western and Nonwestern art and architecture

8. Knows and understands the chronological timeline and thematic organization of art history

9. Ability to analyze works of art and evaluate them critically across cultures and periods of time

10. Understands the roles of function and purpose of works of art (i.e., reflection)

11. Knows the role of visual literacy and popular culture
Appendix D

Results for Praxis Art: Content Knowledge
Table D1
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently certified as an Art teacher in your state?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently teaching Art in your state?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently supervising or mentoring other Art teachers?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years of experience do you have teaching Art?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D1 (continued)
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching Art?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K - 5 or K - 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working in a K-12 school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of Art teachers?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D2
Panel Member Demographics — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently certified as an Art teacher in your state?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently teaching Art in your state?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are you currently supervising or mentoring other Art teachers?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many years of experience do you have teaching Art?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what K-12 grade level are you currently teaching Art?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K - 5 or K - 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6 - 8 or 7 - 9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Middle School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9 - 12 or 10 - 12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently teaching at the K-12 level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes the location of your K-12 school?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working in a K-12 school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are college faculty, are you currently involved in the training/preparation of Art teachers?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not college faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D3
Cut score Summary by Round of Judgments — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>72.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.55</td>
<td>71.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>54.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>62.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>58.55</td>
<td>59.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>73.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>75.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.85</td>
<td>74.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>72.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>73.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>82.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>75.65</td>
<td>74.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81.10</td>
<td>80.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.70</td>
<td>75.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>73.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>93.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>70.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>78.65</td>
<td>78.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 72.50  72.79
SD 8.30  8.08
SEJ 1.81  1.76
Highest 93.00  93.20
Lowest 54.05  54.05
Table D4
Cut score Summary by Round of Judgments — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panelist</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>72.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>71.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>70.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>84.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>66.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>62.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75.75</td>
<td>75.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.80</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.30</td>
<td>74.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>67.85</td>
<td>71.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>56.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>66.55</td>
<td>66.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>67.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>79.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>61.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>79.10</td>
<td>77.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>69.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>66.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>79.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average  | 69.24   | 70.33   |
SD       | 8.41    | 7.48    |
SEJ      | 1.84    | 1.63    |
Highest | 84.75   | 84.20   |
Lowest  | 53.70   | 56.20   |
Table D5
Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score

(a) Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 (4.98)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 (5.04)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Cut Score (SEM)</th>
<th>Scale Score Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72 (5.01)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 SEMs</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SEM</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SEM</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 SEMs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. A.</th>
<th>ART MAKING - GENERAL</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Understands and applies the elements of art and principles of visual organization as applied to two-dimensional and three-dimensional media 11.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Identifies elements and principles of design in visual stimuli</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Explains relationships of elements to principles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Distinguishes uses of elements and principles in two-dimensional and three-dimensional art</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Knows various historical methods and contemporary approaches to creating art.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Defines/identifies both historical and contemporary methods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
### Table D6 (continued)

**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. B.</th>
<th>ART MAKING – MEDIA AND PROCESSES</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows and understands safety, environmental, and storage issues related to the use of art materials and art processes.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies dangerous materials and their effects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Categorizes dangerous materials and their effects</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describes proper ventilation, storage, and disposal procedures based on the medium</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of MSDS sheets</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates understanding of safety procedures and precautions for using artist’s materials and tools</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of health issues related to the use of artists’ materials and tools</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows and understands how to use a variety of drawing, painting, and printmaking materials and processes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knows vocabulary related to drawing, painting, and printmaking materials and processes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describes drawing, painting, and printmaking processes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
### Table D6 (continued)

**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td>11 26%</td>
<td>24 57%</td>
<td>7 17%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through reproductions</td>
<td>10 24%</td>
<td>23 55%</td>
<td>9 21%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Knows and understands how to use digital photography and image processes.</strong></td>
<td>8 19%</td>
<td>29 69%</td>
<td>5 12%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates basic camera knowledge (camera parts, vocabulary)</td>
<td>12 29%</td>
<td>25 60%</td>
<td>5 12%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of common editing and imaging software</td>
<td>5 12%</td>
<td>27 64%</td>
<td>10 24%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates knowledge of uploading, downloading, storing common file types, transferring and printing images</td>
<td>10 24%</td>
<td>28 67%</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows and understands how to use the process of creating digital images</td>
<td>7 17%</td>
<td>23 55%</td>
<td>12 29%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Understand materials, tools and processes for videography, filmmaking, and installations</strong></td>
<td>4 10%</td>
<td>11 26%</td>
<td>23 55%</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies/describes materials, tools, and processes for videography, filmmaking and installations</td>
<td>3 7%</td>
<td>11 26%</td>
<td>24 57%</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Knows and understands how to use sculptural materials and processes.</strong></td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>20 48%</td>
<td>22 52%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>14 33%</td>
<td>25 60%</td>
<td>3 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows vocabulary related to sculptural materials and processes</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes sculptural processes</td>
<td>17 40%</td>
<td>24 57%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D6 (continued)
Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through reproductions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Knows and understands how to use a variety of fiber art materials and processes</strong>¹³</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies characteristics of materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies similarities and differences among materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knows vocabulary related to fiber materials and processes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes fiber processes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solves problems and evaluates possible solutions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compares materials and techniques, and analyzes the compatibility of materials and techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes or identifies processes through reproductions¹³</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹³ One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Very Important N (%)</th>
<th>Important N (%)</th>
<th>Slightly Important N (%)</th>
<th>Not Important N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands the physical aspects and effective ways of presenting art work for display purposes.</td>
<td>20 48%</td>
<td>18 43%</td>
<td>4 10%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and recognizes methods of mounting and matting work in ways appropriate to the medium</td>
<td>17 40%</td>
<td>22 52%</td>
<td>3 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and describes methods of displaying three-dimensional work</td>
<td>19 45%</td>
<td>16 38%</td>
<td>7 17%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes appropriate ways of using exhibition spaces</td>
<td>15 36%</td>
<td>21 50%</td>
<td>6 14%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. A. HISTORICAL & THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – MATERIALS & PROCESSES

| Understanding the following materials within an art historical context: Painting, Drawing, Printmaking, Sculpture, Architecture, Photography, Fiber Arts, Crafts. | 26 62% | 16 38% | 0 0% | 0 0% |
| Identifies characteristics of materials, processes, and techniques within an art historical context | 18 43% | 24 57% | 0 0% | 0 0% |
| Identifies similarities and differences among materials, processes, and techniques (e.g., evolution over time) | 15 36% | 25 60% | 2 5% | 0 0% |
| Knows vocabulary related to two-dimensional and three-dimensional media and processes within an art historical context | 24 57% | 18 43% | 0 0% | 0 0% |
| Recognizes or identifies processes within an art historical context through reproductions | 13 31% | 27 64% | 2 5% | 0 0% |
### Table D6 (continued)

**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

<p>| II. B. HISTORICAL &amp; THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART — THE WESTERN TRADITION IN ART HISTORY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recognizes stylistic traits of art and architecture from each of the following time periods: Prehistory; Ancient Near East; Ancient Greece and Rome; Early Christian, Byzantine and Medieval periods; the Renaissance; the Baroque; 18th through 20th centuries in Europe and North America; contemporary art. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Identifies the styles of works of art and architecture
- Categorizes art and architecture according to style and/or period
- Identifies major works of art and architecture by title, style, and/or artist, as appropriate
- Analyzes/explains the influence of art periods or schools on later work
- Analyzes compositional elements and principles of design in works of art and architecture
- Recognizes the impact of major artistic and technological innovations on the stylistic traits of art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D6 (continued)

Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

|                                              | Very Important |  | Important |  | Slightly Important |  | Not Important |  |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
|                                              | N  | %   | N  | %   | N  | %   | N  | %   |
| Understands the content, context, and/or purpose of art and architecture from each of the following time periods: Prehistory; Ancient Near East; Ancient Greece and Rome; Early Christian, Byzantine and Medieval periods; the Renaissance; the Baroque; 18th through 20th centuries in Europe and North America; contemporary art\(^\text{14}\). | 20  | 48% | 21  | 50% | 0  | 0%  | 0  | 0%  |
| Explains the purposes of works of art from various time periods | 15  | 36% | 25  | 60% | 2  | 5%  | 0  | 0%  |
| Decodes/analyzes the narrative or intended content of a work of art | 14  | 33% | 25  | 60% | 3  | 7%  | 0  | 0%  |
| Analyzes/explains the interrelationships between art and social factors, cultural context, and events | 17  | 40% | 23  | 55% | 2  | 5%  | 0  | 0%  |
| Explains the impact of major artistic and technological innovations on the content, context, and purposes of art | 17  | 40% | 20  | 48% | 5  | 12% | 0  | 0%  |
| Acquires and evaluates information about art and artists from various sources | 18  | 43% | 19  | 45% | 5  | 12% | 0  | 0%  |

\(^{14}\) One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
## Table D6 (continued)

### Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. C. HISTORICAL &amp; THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART — ART BEYOND THE WESTERN TRADITION</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and understands the general visual characteristics of art and architecture from Asia, Africa, the Americas, the South Pacific region.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifies works of art and architecture by regions/cultures(^{15})</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes/analyzes works of art and architecture using compositional elements and principles of design</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes/analyzes the interrelationships between art from beyond the Western traditions and art from the Western tradition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies major works of art and architecture by title, style, and/or artist, as appropriate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
Table D6 (continued)

**Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels**

| • Understands the general content, context, and purposes of art from Asia, Africa, the Americas, the South Pacific region\(^{16}\). | Very Important N | % | Important N | % | Slightly Important N | % | Not Important N | % |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | 40% | 23 | 55% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| • Explains the content and/or purpose (as appropriate) of frequently referenced works of art from various locations and cultures\(^{16}\). | 15 | 36% | 24 | 57% | 2 | 5% | 0 | 0% |
| • Identifies the general role of a work of art in its culture | 19 | 45% | 21 | 50% | 2 | 5% | 0 | 0% |
| • Explains how the context in which a work of art is created conveys information about various lifestyles and belief systems | 18 | 43% | 21 | 50% | 2 | 5% | 1 | 2% |
| • Acquires and evaluates information about art and artists from various sources | 19 | 45% | 15 | 36% | 8 | 19% | 0 | 0% |

**II. D. HISTORICAL & THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF ART – RESPONDING TO ART**

| • Understands the major theories of art and aesthetics. | Very Important N | % | Important N | % | Slightly Important N | % | Not Important N | % |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | 40% | 24 | 57% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| • Describes the major characteristics of various theories of art and aesthetics | 14 | 33% | 23 | 55% | 5 | 12% | 0 | 0% |
| • Distinguishes among the major theories of art and aesthetics | 12 | 29% | 25 | 60% | 5 | 12% | 0 | 0% |
| • Compares and contrasts the differences/similarities among theories of art and aesthetics | 10 | 24% | 26 | 62% | 6 | 14% | 0 | 0% |
| • Interprets and evaluates works of art based on theories of art and aesthetics (as opposed to personal opinion) | 17 | 40% | 22 | 52% | 3 | 7% | 0 | 0% |

\(^{16}\) One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
Table D6 (continued)

Specification Judgments — Combined Across Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the relationship between art and critical response(^{17}).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of critical reactions to well-known works and/or art movements(^{17})</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes/uses multiple viewpoints in examining a work of art</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the way personal experience affects interpretation of art</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and discusses how meaning is created in art (e.g., through symbols, iconography, formal elements and principles)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) One or more panelists did not rate this knowledge/skill category or statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>17 81%</td>
<td>4 19%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>21 100%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training in the standard setting method was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment.</td>
<td>20 95%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The explanation of how the recommended cut score is computed was clear.</td>
<td>15 71%</td>
<td>6 29%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity for feedback and discussion between rounds was helpful.</td>
<td>16 76%</td>
<td>5 24%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>13 62%</td>
<td>7 33%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D7 (continued)

Final Evaluation — Panel 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How influential was each of the following factors in guiding your standard setting judgments?</th>
<th>Very Influential N</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential N</th>
<th>Not Influential N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The definition of the JQC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The between-round discussions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The knowledge/skills required to answer each test question</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● My own professional experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores?</th>
<th>Very Comfortable N</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable N</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable N</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the recommended cut score is:</th>
<th>Too Low N</th>
<th>About Right N</th>
<th>Too High N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Strongly Agree N</td>
<td>Strongly Agree Percent</td>
<td>Agree N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood the purpose of this study.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructions and explanations provided by the facilitators were clear.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training in the standard setting method was adequate to give me the information I needed to complete my assignment.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The explanation of how the recommended cut score is computed was clear.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity for feedback and discussion between rounds was helpful.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of making the standard setting judgments was easy to follow.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D8 (continued)

Final Evaluation — Panel 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How influential was each of the following factors in guiding your standard setting judgments?</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Not Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The definition of the JQC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The between-round discussions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The knowledge/skills required to answer each test question</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My own professional experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores?</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Comfortable</th>
<th>Somewhat Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how comfortable are you with the panel's recommended cut scores?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, the recommended cut score is:</th>
<th>Too Low</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Too High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the recommended cut score is:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presenter: Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2102 E-Mail Address: Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

- Topic presented for information only (no board action required)
- Board review required by
  - State or federal law or regulation
  - Board of Education regulation
  - Other: ______________
- Action requested at this meeting
  - Action requested at future meeting: ___________ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

- No previous board review/action
- Previous review/action
  Date: February 25, 2004
  Action: Adoption of Cut Scores for the Grade 3, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1877, U.S. History: 1877 to the Present, and Civics and Economics Standards of Learning Tests Based on the 2001 History Content Standards
  Date: February 17, 2011

Background Information:

In 2010-2011 new Standards of Learning (SOL) tests measuring the 2008 history content standards will be administered. Because of the changes in the content measured by these tests, new passing scores must be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education. Consistent with the process used in 1998 and in 2003, committees of educators were convened to recommend to the Board of Education (BOE) minimum "cut" scores for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for the new tests. Committees for the Grade 3, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1865, U.S. History: 1865 to the Present, and Civics and Economics SOL tests met in early February.
Summary of Major Elements:

Information about the range of cut scores recommended by the committees for the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for the Grade 3, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1865, U.S. History: 1865 to the Present, and Civics and Economics SOL tests will be presented to the Board. The Board is asked to review this information and to adopt "cut" scores for the Grade 3, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1865, U.S. History: 1865 to the Present, and Civics and Economics SOL tests that represent the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education adopt cut scores representing the achievement levels of pass/proficient and pass/advanced for the Grade 3, Virginia Studies, U.S. History to 1865, U.S. History: 1865 to the Present, and Civics and Economics SOL tests as follows.

- Grade 3: 23 for pass/proficient and 35 for pass/advanced as recommended by the Articulation Committee
- Virginia Studies: 21 for pass/proficient and 32 for pass/advanced as recommended by the Articulation Committee
- U.S. History to 1865: 22 for pass/proficient and 34 for pass/advanced as recommended by the Articulation Committee
- U.S. History: 1865 to the Present: 22 for pass/proficient and 34 for pass/advanced as recommended by the Articulation Committee
- Civics and Economics: 21 for pass/proficient as recommended by the Articulation Committee and 34 for pass/advanced based on the rounded results of the Round 3 results of the standard setting committee

Impact on Resources:

N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

Upon approval by the Board of Education, this information will be disseminated to the school divisions via a Superintendent’s Memorandum.
# Summary and Background Information on Proposed Cut Scores for Grade 3 and Content Specific History Tests Based on 2008 Standards of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Pass/Proficient</th>
<th>Pass/Proficient Cut Score for New Test to Maintain Previous Level of Rigor</th>
<th>Round 3 Median for Proficient</th>
<th>Articulation Committee Recommendation</th>
<th>Pass/Advanced</th>
<th>Round 3 Median for Advanced</th>
<th>Articulation Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 History</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18 (-9)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19 (-6)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26 (+1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History II</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18 (-5)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics &amp; Economics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 (0)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All tests have 40 items

** Test based on the 2001 History Standards of Learning
Topic: Final Review of Guidelines to Implement the Provisions of Section 22.1-302(A) of the Code of Virginia Pertaining to the Employment of Substitute Teachers

Presenter: Mrs. Patty S. Pitts, Assistant Superintendent for Teacher Education and Licensure

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2522 E-Mail Address: Patty.Pitts@doe.virginia.gov

Background Information:

Section 22.1-302 of the Code of Virginia was amended in the 2010 Virginia General Assembly to allow the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a case-by-case basis, during one school year to approve an extension of the 90-teaching-day restriction for substitute teachers in a teacher vacancy. The Code section, in part, states the following:

§ 22.1-302. Written contracts required; execution of contracts; qualifications of temporarily employed teachers; rules and regulations.

A. A written contract, in a form prescribed by the Board of Education, shall be made by the school board with each teacher employed by it, except those who are temporarily employed, before such teacher enters upon his duties. Such contract shall be signed in duplicate, with a copy thereof furnished to both parties. A temporarily employed teacher, as used in this section, shall mean (i) one who is employed to substitute for a contracted teacher for a temporary period of time during the contracted teacher's absence, or (ii) one who is employed to fill a teacher vacancy for a period of time, but for no longer than 90
teaching days in such vacancy, unless otherwise approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a case-by-case basis, during one school year.

B. The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations regarding temporarily employed teachers, as defined in this section, which shall provide that such teachers be at least eighteen years of age and that they hold a high school diploma or a general educational development (GED) certificate.

However, local school boards shall establish employment qualifications for temporarily employed teachers which may exceed the Board's regulations for the employment of such teachers. School boards shall also seek to ensure that temporarily employed teachers who are engaged as long-term substitutes shall exceed baseline employment qualifications.

The General Assembly further requested that the Board of Education develop guidelines to implement provisions of subsection A of Section 22.1-302 pertaining to the employment of substitutes for longer than 90 teaching days during one school year, no later than July 1, 2011.

Summary of Major Elements

A committee was established to recommend guidelines to the Board of Education to implement the provisions of Section 22.1-302 (A) of the Code of Virginia pertaining to the employment of substitute teachers. The committee was composed of Dr. Kitty Boitnott, president of the Virginia Education Association; Ms. Charla Cordle, assistant superintendent of human resources, Hanover County Schools; Mrs. Tracey Dingus, chair of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure; Dr. Howard Ben Kiser, superintendent of Gloucester County Schools and member of the Board of Directors of the Virginia Association of School Superintendents; Dr. Judi N. Swingen, personnel administrator for licensure, Chesterfield County Schools; Ms. Barbara Warren-Jones, assistant director of human resources, Hampton City Schools, and immediate past-president of the Virginia Association of School Personnel Administrators; and Department of Education staff.

The committee met in December 2010 and recommended the attached Guidelines to Implement the Provisions of Section 22.1-302(A) of the Code of Virginia Pertaining to the Employment of Substitute Teachers.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the proposed Guidelines to Implement the Provisions of Section 22.1-302(A) of the Code of Virginia Pertaining to the Employment of Substitute Teachers.

Impact on Resources:

There is a minimal impact on resources.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

The Board of Education guidelines will be distributed to school divisions through a Superintendent’s Memorandum.
GUIDELINES TO IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 22.1-302(A) OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA PERTAINING TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS

Presented to the Virginia Board of Education
February 17, 2011 and
March 24, 2011
Introduction

Section 22.1-302 of the Code of Virginia was amended in the 2010 Virginia General Assembly to allow the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a case-by-case basis, during one school year to approve an extension of the 90-teaching-day restriction for substitute teachers in a teacher vacancy. The Code section, in part, states the following:

§ 22.1-302. Written contracts required; execution of contracts; qualifications of temporarily employed teachers; rules and regulations.

A. A written contract, in a form prescribed by the Board of Education, shall be made by the school board with each teacher employed by it, except those who are temporarily employed, before such teacher enters upon his duties. Such contract shall be signed in duplicate, with a copy thereof furnished to both parties. A temporarily employed teacher, as used in this section, shall mean (i) one who is employed to substitute for a contracted teacher for a temporary period of time during the contracted teacher's absence, or (ii) one who is employed to fill a teacher vacancy for a period of time, but for no longer than 90 teaching days in such vacancy, unless otherwise approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a case-by-case basis, during one school year.

B. The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations regarding temporarily employed teachers, as defined in this section, which shall provide that such teachers be at least eighteen years of age and that they hold a high school diploma or a general educational development (GED) certificate.

However, local school boards shall establish employment qualifications for temporarily employed teachers which may exceed the Board's regulations for the employment of such teachers. School boards shall also seek to ensure that temporarily employed teachers who are engaged as long-term substitutes shall exceed baseline employment qualifications.

The General Assembly further requested that the Board of Education develop guidelines to implement provisions of subsection A of Section 22.1-302 pertaining to the employment of substitutes for longer than 90 teaching days during one school year, no later than July 1, 2011.
Guidelines

An individual (temporarily employed teacher) may be employed to fill a teacher vacancy for a period of time, but for no longer than 90 teaching days in such vacancy, unless otherwise approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a case-by-case basis, during one school year. In a rare exceptional and justifiable case due to extenuating circumstances, a school division superintendent may submit a request to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to consider an extension of the teaching days a substitute teacher may serve in a vacant teaching position.

The letter of request to the Superintendent of Public Instruction must be submitted and signed by the division superintendent. The letter for the exception must include the following information:

1. Date of the teacher vacancy;
2. Justification of efforts made to fill the position, including timelines (such as, when and where the position was advertised);
3. Candidate pool (such as, the number of qualified/acceptable candidates, whether a qualified candidate declined offer of employment, etc.);
4. Full name of the substitute teacher, license number (if applicable), name of school assigned, title of class(es)/grade level(s)/assignment(s); and
5. Qualifications of the temporarily employed teacher (substitute teacher):
   A. Documentation that the substitute teacher holds or is eligible to hold a Virginia teaching license in the assigned teaching area/content, or
   B. Documentation of the following:
      (1) Educational level [For a request to be considered, the substitute teacher must have an earned baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university except in cases where an individual is assigned to a technical professional (occupational) area that does not require a bachelor’s degree (i.e., Technical Professional License). If the individual is assigned as a substitute teacher in a technical professional area, the documentation needs to include verification of the occupational experience and, if applicable, a copy of the Virginia license (such as a nursing license or a cosmetology license) to practice in that field.];
      (2) Content knowledge and expertise in teaching area assigned; and
      (3) Teaching experience (prior substitute and/or teaching experience).

The Superintendent of Public Instruction will respond within 10 business days of receipt of the request. If the division has not received the response within this time frame, it is the responsibility of the requesting school division to contact the Department of Education to inquire about the status of the request.
Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: G Date: March 24, 2011

Topic: Final Review of Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process

Presenter: Dr. Linda Wallinger, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2034 E-Mail Address: linda.wallinger@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)
___ Board review required by
   ___ State or federal law or regulation
   ___ Board of Education regulation
   ___ Other: Board of Education request
   X Action requested at this meeting ___ Action requested at future meeting: ______

Previous Review/Action:

___ No previous board review/action
X Previous review/action
date February 17, 2011
action Board of Education accepted the Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process for first review.

Background Information:

The Board of Education’s authority for approving textbooks and other instructional materials is prescribed in the Virginia Constitution and in the Code of Virginia.

Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, § 5 (d)
It [the Board of Education] shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.

Code of Virginia, § 22.1-238
A. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public schools and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools. The Board shall publish a list of all approved textbooks on its website and shall list the publisher and the current lowest wholesale price of such textbooks.
B. Any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board.
C. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "textbooks" means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.
The Board of Education’s current textbook regulations specify the types of materials that may be adopted.

*Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption, 8 VAC 20-220-30*

Only those materials which are designed to provide basic support for the instructional program of a particular content area at an appropriate level will be adopted.

On September 23, 2010, the Board took final action to adopt revised regulations regarding textbooks that will supersede those currently in effect. The revised regulations are currently undergoing the provisions of the Administrative Process Act (APA) and will become effective at the conclusion of that process. The proposed regulations were approved by the Attorney General’s office on November 23, 2010, and by the Department of Planning and Budget on December 6, 2010. They are currently under review by the Secretary of Education’s office, and will also need to be reviewed by the Governor’s Office. When the new regulations go into effect, they will state:

*Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions, 8 VAC 20-720 et seq.*

8 VAC 20-720-179. Textbooks

A. Textbook approval

1. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks for use in the public schools of Virginia.

2. In approving basal textbooks for reading in kindergarten and first grade, the Board shall report to local school boards those textbooks with a minimum decodability standard based on words that students can correctly read by properly attaching speech sounds to each letter to formulate the word at 70 percent or above for such textbooks, in accordance with § 22.1-239 of the *Code of Virginia*.

3. Any local school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with this chapter.

4. Contracts and purchase orders with publishers of textbooks approved by the Board for use in grades 6-12 shall allow for the purchase of printed textbooks, printed textbooks with electronic files, or electronic textbooks separate and apart from printed versions of the same textbook. Each school board shall have the authority to purchase an assortment of textbooks in any of the three forms listed above.

The complete text of the proposed regulations is available in Attachment A.

As a result of significant factual inaccuracies found in two history textbooks on the list of history textbooks the Board of Education approved on January 15, 2010, the Board unanimously approved the following motion at its meeting on January 13, 2011:
MOVED that the Board of Education direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1. To initiate on the Board’s behalf a process to consider withdrawal of its approval of the textbooks “Our Virginia: Past and Present” (first edition) and “Our America to 1865” (first edition), published in each case by Five Ponds Press; and

2. To seek remedies from Five Ponds Press to help school divisions which have purchased those textbooks in replacing and/or correcting such textbooks as soon as possible, including pursuing any available assistance from and/or remedies involving the publisher; and

3. To obtain a review by qualified experts of any other textbooks published by Five Ponds Press that have been approved by the Board of Education; and

4. To present to the Board of Education for first review at its February 2011 meeting a detailed proposal to revise the Board’s process for approving textbooks for purchase by school divisions to ensure that all textbooks approved are factually accurate, incorporating in such proposal a process for prior certification by publishers that each textbook submitted for approval has been reviewed for factual accuracy by qualified experts in the subject matter, and that the publisher will promptly remedy at its expense any substantial factual errors discovered thereafter.

Summary of Major Elements

On February 17, 2011, the Virginia Board of Education accepted for first review Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process. Changes have been proposed as a result of Board and stakeholder input, including comments and suggestions from the Association of American Publishers, Inc., provided in Attachment B. Attachment C notes proposed changes using italics for inserted text and strikethroughs for deleted text.

The proposed process places primary responsibility on publishers to ensure the accuracy of their textbooks. Publishers must certify that textbooks submitted for approval have been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified content experts for factual accuracy and must list all authors/editors and their credentials. Publishers must list the professional credentials for at least three content review experts who have thoroughly examined each textbook for content accuracy. Also, the publisher must certify that each textbook has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified editors for typographical errors and errors in grammar, written expression, spelling, formatting, and other substantive elements that may affect student learning. The publishers must also sign an agreement that if factual or editing errors are identified in a publisher’s textbook, the publisher must submit a corrective action plan to the Department of Education for review and approval by the Board of Education. All corrective action plans must be approved by the Board of Education, or the Board may delegate the approval of action plans to the superintendent of public instruction. Publishers must execute corrective action plans at their own expense.

Department of Education staff will review all textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements. Any concerns will be addressed by Department staff with the appropriate publisher. A certification or agreement that is not completed correctly, is lacking in sufficient information, or is not signed by the appropriate representative, may result in the textbook(s) being removed from consideration for review.
Following final Board action to approve textbooks, the Department will post the list of approved textbooks with prices on its Web site along with information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements.

After the textbook approval takes place, the public can provide ongoing feedback to the Department regarding any inaccuracies found in an approved textbook. An electronic mailbox will be established for this purpose. Department staff will inform publishers of any errors identified. Publishers will be given the opportunity to contest the errors and/or propose a corrective action plan for approval by the Board. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, the Board may, in its sole discretion, withdraw the textbook from the approved list.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education adopt Virginia’s proposed revised textbook review process and that it be used for all future textbooks brought to the Board for approval.

**Impact on Resources:**

This responsibility can be absorbed by the agency’s existing resources at this time. If the agency is required to absorb additional responsibilities related to this process, other services will be impacted.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

Upon approval of Virginia’s Textbook Review Process, the Department of Education will post it on the Department’s Web site, and it will become effective for future textbooks approved by the Board of Education.
CHAPTER 720

PROPOSED

REGULATIONS GOVERNING
LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS AND SCHOOL DIVISIONS

8 VAC 20-720-10. Definitions

“Instructional materials” means all materials, other than textbooks, used to support instruction in the classroom, including, but not limited to, books, workbooks, and electronic media.

“Textbooks” means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.


A. Local school boards shall be responsible for the selection and utilization of instructional materials.

B. Local school boards shall adopt policies and criteria for the selection of instructional materials that shall include, at a minimum:

1. The rights of parents to inspect, upon request, any instructional materials used as part of the educational curriculum for students, and the procedure for granting a request by a parent for such access, in accordance with the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, 20 U. S. C. § 1232H, and its implementing regulation, 34 CFR 98.

2. The basis upon which a person may seek reconsideration of the local school board’s selection of instructional materials, including, but not limited to, materials that might be considered sensitive or controversial, and the procedures for doing so.

3. Pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:7 of the Code of Virginia, the policies shall include clear procedures for handling challenged controversial materials.

8 VAC 20-720-170. Textbooks

A. Textbook approval

1. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks for use in the public schools of Virginia.

2. In approving basal textbooks for reading in kindergarten and first grade, the Board shall report to local school boards those textbooks with a minimum decodability standard based on words that students can correctly read by properly attaching speech sounds to each letter to formulate the word at 70 percent or above for such textbooks, in accordance with § 22.1-239 of the Code of Virginia.
3. Any local school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with this chapter.

4. Contracts and purchase orders with publishers of textbooks approved by the Board for use in grades 6-12 shall allow for the purchase of printed textbooks, printed textbooks with electronic files, or electronic textbooks separate and apart from printed versions of the same textbook. Each school board shall have the authority to purchase an assortment of textbooks in any of the three forms listed above.

B. Selection of textbooks by local school boards

Local school boards shall adopt procedures for the selection of textbooks. These procedures shall include, at a minimum, the following:

1. Appointment of evaluation committees by the local school board to review and evaluate textbooks in each of the subject areas.

2. Notice to parents that textbooks under consideration for approval will be listed on the school division’s Web site and made available at designated locations for review by any interested citizens.

3. Opportunities for those reviewing such textbooks to present their comments and observations, if any, to the school board through locally approved procedures.

4. Procedures to ensure appropriate consideration of citizen comments and observations.

5. Selection criteria.

C. Purchasing Board of Education approved textbooks

1. Local school divisions shall purchase textbooks approved by the Board of Education directly from the publishers of the textbooks by either entering into written term contracts or issuing purchase orders on an as-needed basis in accordance with § 22.1-241 of the Code of Virginia.

2. Such written contracts or purchase orders shall be exempt from the Virginia Public Procurement Act (§§ 2.2-4300 et seq. of the Code of Virginia).

D. Purchasing non-Board of Education approved textbooks

The purchase of textbooks other than those approved by the State Board is not exempt from the Virginia Public Procurement Act.

E. Distribution of textbooks

Each school board shall provide, free of charge, such textbooks required for courses of instruction for each child attending public schools.
F. Certifications

The division superintendent and chairperson of the local school board shall annually certify to the Virginia Department of Education that:

1. All textbooks were selected and purchased in accordance with this chapter; and

2. The price paid for each textbook did not exceed the lowest wholesale price at which the textbook involved in the contract was currently bid under contract in the United States, in accordance with § 22.1-241 of the Code of Virginia.

The certification shall include a list of all textbooks adopted by the local school board.
March 8, 2011

Dr. Patricia I. Wright
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Virginia Department of Education
PO Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218

Dear Dr. Wright:

On February 17, 2011, the State Board of Education accepted for first review *Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process*. These written comments expand upon the oral comments that were made to the Board on behalf of the Association of American Publishers (AAP) at that time.

1. **Introduction**

The proposed revision of the textbook review process provides a valuable framework for ensuring the accuracy of textbooks and other instructional materials. We agree with the Board’s fundamental premise that the burden should be placed upon publishers to guarantee that their texts are free of substantial error or inaccuracy. When there is a problem, it should be the responsibility of the publisher to make things right.

The Association represents the nation's leading developers of instructional materials, technology-based curricula, and assessments. Their goal is to produce instructional materials that enhance student academic achievement. These publishers understand that textbook accuracy is a public trust involving both their integrity and the academic integrity of the school systems they serve. To that end, our textbooks are authored and reviewed by scholars and educators who are recognized experts.

Ensuring textbook accuracy is no small task. Each year, the industry publishes thousands of titles. Each text alone may contain hundreds or thousands of facts, data points, and references that will be checked. However, before a child picks up a textbook to study a lesson, its content has been read and scrutinized by highly respected and knowledgeable authorities in that discipline area. Their reviews and recommendations are incorporated into the manuscripts before publication to ensure the materials are educationally sound, accurate, and aligned with state or local standards. Our members also employ rigorous editorial review to ensure that their materials are free of grammatical, typographical and other errors. Most are then reviewed by classroom teachers before they are made available to Virginia schools.
2. Legal and Regulatory Framework

Virginia Constitution and Code

Virginia’s Constitution and statutes make clear that the authority to approve textbooks lies with the State Board of Education. The Constitution states that the Board “shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.” Article VIII, §5(d). The Code of Virginia reiterates that the “Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public school and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools.” Virginia Code § 22.1-238(A). While the Code allows localities to purchase textbooks that have not been approved by the Board, localities may do so only if they make such purchases “in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board.” Virginia Code § 22.1-238(B).

Board’s Current Approval Process

Currently, the Board employs a textbook review process that features, among other things, the following requirements:

- textbooks proposed for adoption covering Standards of Learning subjects must have a high correlation with the Standards of Learning;
- textbooks must be accurate and challenging to the learner;
- textbooks must be subject to review by review committees composed of a cross section of principals, teachers, administrators, content specialists and others with relevant expertise; and
- an opportunity must be provided for the public to review and comment upon such textbooks.


Board’s Proposed Regulation (2010)

On September 23, 2010, the Board took final action on proposed regulations governing the selection of textbooks and instructional aids and materials. The proposed regulations are pending before the Secretary of Education for review and will then go to the Governor for review and approval. These proposed regulations adopt the Code’s definition of “textbooks” as “print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course” and fill in a statutory gap by defining “instructional materials” as “all materials, other than textbooks, used to support instruction in the classroom, including, but not limited to, books, workbooks, and electronic media (emphasis added).” 8 VAC 20-720-10 (proposed).

The proposed regulations state that “[l]ocal school boards shall be responsible for the selection and utilization of instructional materials” and prescribes requirements for local policies and criteria as well as the rights of parents to review instructional materials and to request the local
school board to reconsider the use of materials that a parent finds objectionable. 8 VAC 20-720-160 (proposed).

With regard to textbooks, the proposed regulations clearly retain textbook approval authority in the Board. Local boards may select non-approved textbooks only if they comply with the procedures contained in the proposed regulations. Those procedures include the appointment of evaluation committees, notice to parents that textbooks are being considered for approval and the opportunity to review and comment on those textbooks, procedures to ensure that public comment is reviewed and considered and adoption by the local board of selection criteria. Purchase by local school boards of textbooks approved by the Board are exempt from the Virginia Public Procurement Act (Va. Code §§ 2.2-4300 et seq.). Purchases of textbooks not approved by the Board are not exempt from the Act. 8 VAC 20-720-170 (proposed).

3. **Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process**

This is the constitutional, statutory and regulatory context in which *Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process* was developed. The revised process retains many features of the current process, including use of review committees and opportunities for public review and comment on textbooks proposed for adoption. See, *Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process, First Review (February 17, 2011) Sections IV and VI.* The express purpose of the revised process is to bolster the process for assuring that textbooks are substantively accurate and free of error and to increase the responsibility of publishers:

> It is the primary responsibility of publishers to ensure the accuracy of their textbooks. Publishers must certify that textbooks submitted for approval have been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified content experts for factual accuracy and must list all authors and their credentials. Publishers must list the professional credentials for at least three content review experts who have thoroughly examined each textbook for content accuracy. Also, the publisher must certify that each textbook has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified editors for typographical errors and errors in grammar, written expression, spelling, formatting, and other substantive elements that may affect student learning. The publishers must agree to correct all factual and editing errors found in a textbook, at their expense.

*Board of Education Agenda Item J (February 17, 2011) p.3.*

In the revised process, each publisher will be required to submit one or more forms certifying the publisher’s quality control procedures and agreeing to certain remedial measures in the event that errors are identified in its textbooks. In completing the form, publishers will identify textbook authors, at least three content experts, editors and others involved in ensuring that the textbook is accurate and error free. The publisher also will provide a detailed description of its internal quality assurance and workflow to ensure the textbook was produced in a professional manner. The publisher must also describe the “process used to reach consensus on information with divergent interpretations.” Where the textbook is available in duplicate formats (e.g., print and
digital), the publisher must vouchsafe that both versions are identical or identify specifically where they differ.

The publisher also agrees to correct any mistakes at its expense. Where errors are found before the textbook is shipped, the textbook must be corrected before it is shipped. Where errors are found after the textbook has been shipped, the publisher shall provide errata sheets within 30 days of notification. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook, the Board may withdraw the textbook from the list of approved textbooks. A “significant error” is a factual or editing error that the Board of Education or Department of Education determines within the context of the intended use of the textbook will substantially interfere with student learning.” However, “a change in knowledge that occurs subsequent to publication shall not constitute a significant error.” Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process, First Review (February 17, 2011) pp. 3-4.

4. What Other States Have Done

The “adoption” of instructional programs and materials is a process that occurs at the state and/or local level. During this process, programs and materials are reviewed and approved for use in elementary and secondary public schools.

Twenty-two U.S. states have “state adoptions” administered and implemented by the state board of education and the state department of education. As part of the adoption process, instructional materials are designed and developed in accordance with very specific state criteria. Materials must be carefully aligned with state academic standards. They must also meet criteria regarding content, size, weight, durability, and many other factors.

States select instructional programs in various grades and subject levels. Most programs adopted by states are used for six years. Such programs usually include textbooks, study guides, workbooks, online homework helps, websites, teacher editions, and much more. Once a state adopts an instructional program, school districts may purchase it for use locally.

The 28 non-adoption states are known as “open territories.” In open territories, school districts (not states) adopt and then purchase instructional materials. Even so, the materials generally must reflect state standards and meet local specifications.

In most states, the substantive accuracy of textbooks is a matter of contract and/or express warranty. Textbook publishers warrant the accuracy of their textbooks subject to explicit contractual obligations to correct or replace their textbooks in the event material inaccuracies are identified. Some states also require publishers to certify the professional preparation of their textbooks to provide the public basic assurances of academic integrity.

5. Publisher Best Practices for Developing Instructional Content

Responsible publishers use best practices to design, research, write, edit and revise their instructional content. Publishing is a highly competitive industry, though, and publishers follow dramatically different approaches in the learning materials they publish. The actual amount of
research and development and refinement, as well investment, that responsible publishers devote to their textbooks is often overlooked.

Responsible publishers employ content and educational experts who start with state and local curriculum standards to determine the broad content of their instructional materials. The publishers conduct exhaustive content research to develop the most competitive instructional content. In many cases, they utilize learner verification studies and focus group studies to inform their pedagogical and editorial decisions. Publishers also rely on the expertise and extensive classroom experience of their authors, development staff, and educator-reviewers to craft content that is accessible to students. Effective content includes the important concepts that all students need to learn, addresses variable learning styles, and incorporates teaching and learning techniques that help ensure student mastery.

Development of instructional content is a team effort that is guided by state curriculum requirements for every subject. Within this framework, authors, scholars, and writers conceive the idea for a book, frame a scholarly approach, and write the manuscript. Publishers direct a team of editors, content experts, and reviewers who evaluate the manuscript for accuracy of content, appropriateness of writing style for grade level, adherence to state curriculum guidelines, and effectiveness of the pedagogy. The development process typically involves hundreds of quality assurance tasks. Below is a general outline of the process:

**Quality Assurance Process for Instructional Materials**

**Step 1 – Determine Content**
- Consult state curriculum committees, authors, independent experts/reviewers, national standards organizations, national advisory groups.
- Study established research base and new research findings.
- Establish plan for customized correlations to state and/or national standards.
- Develop preliminary plan for content.

**Step 2 – Research & Planning**
- Identify authors and content experts.
- Survey educators.
- Develop preliminary plan for chapter organization and design.
- Build out plan for customized correlations to state and/or national standards.
- Develop and produce prototype pages.
- Review prototype pages with authors and educators.
- Revise content development plan to reflect input from authors and educators.
- Develop and test new prototype.

**Step 3 – Early Development**
- Form editorial team, including authors, content experts and other specialists.
- Begin development of customized correlations to state and/or national standards.
- Develop detailed outlines and make writing assignments.
- Establish project schedule.
- Authors and content area experts write and evaluate first-draft of manuscript.
• Design plan for special features and assign writer teams.
• Create page and cover design for textbooks and all ancillary materials.
• Plan teacher editions and ancillary materials.

Step 4 – Editing and Review
• Update as necessary customized correlations to state and/or national standards.
• Document all facts from at least two independent sources.
• Edit student and teacher texts as well as ancillary materials.
• Review for accuracy (academic reviewers, independent readers, evaluators, master teachers).
• Copy edit, fact-check, prove formulas and equations, proofread.
• Incorporate changes from authors, editors and reviewers.
• Create pages, develop art, prepare charts and graphs, choose photographs.
• Check revised pages, perform cold read.
• Repeat page checks until all pages are correct.
• Check proofs.
• Produce first version or go to first printing (intended for use only as marketing samples).
• Distribute first printing or digital version.

Step 5 – Quality Reviews of First Version/Printing
• Send student and teacher editions to independent reviewers for complete content read.
• Solicit comments from teachers and state review committees.
• Research and verify accuracy of error reports through authors and independent content authorities.
• Correct errors and create proof of corrected pages.
• Proofread corrections.
• Repeat process until all corrected pages are accurate.
• Check proofs of final pages.
• Produce second digital version or print second printing (which will be sold for classroom use).

Step 6 – Continuing Quality Reviews
• Receive and review comments from students, teachers, academics and textbook review committees.
• Correct text, photographs, charts & graphs, art for errors or clarifications.
• Prepare and distribute errata if errors found.

Step 7 – Subsequent Editions
• Research clarifications, including public comments.
• Hold discussions among authors and editors.
• Complete entire preparation process—productions, documentation, verification, editing.
• Reprint (if edition is print).

In sum, far more work goes into the publication process of an educational textbook than meets the eye and the Board should feel confident about the professionalism underlying the textbooks and other instructional materials that Virginia school children read and study in public school.
classrooms. These are the best practices that the Board should demand of all textbooks and instructional materials put before students. And the Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process should incorporate these best practices into the Board’s regular approval process for all textbooks and instructional materials it adopts for use in Virginia schools.


The Association of American Publishers and its members endorse the kinds of best publishing practices outlined above and support the Board’s efforts to incorporate them into Virginia’s textbook approval process. In reviewing the proposed revised process, we have identified several issues for the Board’s consideration, which we share with the Board and the Department as constructive suggestions:

Publisher Forms

As an initial matter, we recommend that the proposed “Affidavit Agreement” be revised into two forms: (1) a publisher certification and (2) a publisher agreement. The publisher certification should certify the quality-accuracy processes employed by the publisher. The publisher agreement should set forth clear procedures to develop appropriate remedies that will apply in the event that material errors are identified.

Identifying and Correcting Errors

Where inaccuracies or errors are found in a textbook prior to shipping it is unclear whether the proposed agreement requires the publisher to reprint the entire textbook or to make corrections through errata sheets or to correct the text in some other manner. We would recommend that the proposed agreement be modified to allow both the Board and publishers jointly to craft fact-specific remedies tailored to student needs and to accommodate evolving technologies.

Regarding texts that have already been shipped, the proposed agreement requires publishers to correct any error, no matter how slight, by providing errata sheets within 30 days of notification. As a practical matter, 30 days may not provide sufficient time to print and ship errata sheets. Here again, however, the Board may want to consider developing an approach that provides both sides with flexibility to craft appropriate remedies to fact-specific situations tailored to student needs and to accommodate emerging technologies.

The proposed agreement does not assure the right of the publisher to comment or otherwise be consulted before the Board takes remedial action concerning perceived textbook inaccuracies or errors. This not only raises a question of fairness, but it may also result in the Board not receiving information essential to its decision making process and its determination of an appropriate remedy. Therefore, the Board should consider inserting an intermediate step between the Department’s identification of errors and the Department’s determination of an appropriate remedy.

In each of the instances identified above, the Board is potentially tying its hands. Where an error is found in a textbook the question is whether the error will impair student learning and what
corrective action by the publisher would serve to enhance student learning. For example, should a textbook contain the statement that “John F. Kennedy was inaugurated in 1962,” it likely would impair student learning and an appropriate remedy would be for the publisher to send errata sheets for insertion in the book. On the other hand, where a 900-page biology textbook contains 3 misplaced commas and two spacing errors, it is doubtful that student learning is impaired and the process of inserting an errata sheet to note the errors may serve to detract from, rather than enhance, student learning. A more appropriate correction may be for the publisher to post a correction on the Department of Education’s web site or simply make the corrections in the next printing of the book.

We would propose a process that, when errors are identified, the burden is on the publisher to propose a corrective action plan. That plan could contain a range of actions, such as correction when the textbook is reprinted, electronic or hardcopy errata sheets, prompt edits to an online product, textbook replacement, or textbook return and refund, depending on the extent to which the error (or errors) to be corrected impairs student learning. The plan would be agreed upon by both the publisher and the Department of Education. Where there is disagreement, the publisher would have a right to meet with the Department of Education and discuss the issue. The ultimate decision, however, would remain within the authority of the Department and the Board. Similarly, where a textbook is being considered for removal from the approval list, the publisher would have a right to be notified in writing beforehand and to respond in writing before such action is taken. We believe that the publisher’s opportunity to be heard is important, not only as a matter of fairness, but also to ensure that the Board’s action is fully informed and the record complete.

The following are suggested revisions to the proposed publishers agreement (new language is in italic, deleted language is shown as struck-through):

1. In the event that factual or editing errors that impact student learning are identified in a PUBLISHER’S textbook, the PUBLISHER shall be required to submit a corrective action plan to the Department. All corrective actions must be approved by the Board of Education or the Department of Education. Each corrective action plan shall be tailored to the materiality of the factual or editing error identified in a textbook and shall be implemented in the manner most conducive to student learning. Corrective actions include, depending upon the materiality of the error: (i) corrections upon reprinting of a textbook; (ii) corrective edits to an online textbook; (iii) electronic errata sheets posted on the PUBLISHER’S and Department's websites; (iv) print errata sheets provided to schools for insertion into textbooks; (v) replacement of textbooks; (vi) return and refunds for textbooks.

2. Prior to shipment to any of Virginia’s public schools or school divisions, the PUBLISHER shall notify the Department of Education in writing of any factual and editing errors found in the textbook and accompanying instructional materials and shall submit to the Department of Education a written plan of corrective action. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the PUBLISHER shall execute the plan at its own expense.
3. If factual or editing errors are found after textbooks or accompanying instructional materials have been shipped to any of Virginia’s public schools or school divisions, the Department of Education shall notify the PUBLISHER in writing upon discovery of such errors, or as soon thereafter as possible. The PUBLISHER shall correct them at its expense within 30 calendar days of notification by sending errata sheets to the Department of Education and to all school divisions that have purchased the textbook. The Department of Education will post errata sheets on the Department’s Textbook and Instructional Materials Web site. These factual and editing errors may have been identified by the Virginia Department of Education, by any Virginia public school division representative, or by the general public review the identified errors. If the PUBLISHER concurs that the identification of error is accurate, the PUBLISHER shall submit a written plan of corrective action to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of notice from the Department of Education. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the PUBLISHER shall execute the plan at its own expense. If the PUBLISHER disputes that its textbooks or accompanying instructional materials contain factual or editing errors, it shall submit a written statement to that effect to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of the notice of error. Upon request, the PUBLISHER shall meet with the Department of Education. The Board of Education reserves to itself the right to make a final determination of whether a textbook or accompanying material contains a factual or editing error.

4. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, it may result in the Board of Education withdrawing the textbook from the approved list. A "significant error" is a factual or editing error that the Board of Education or Department of Education determines within the context of the intended use of the textbook will substantially interfere with student learning. A change in knowledge that occurs subsequent to publication shall not constitute a significant error. The Board of Education shall notify the PUBLISHER in writing before it removes its textbook from the approved list. The PUBLISHER shall have 30 days to respond in writing and the right to meet with the Department of Education before removal.

5. If the PUBLISHER makes updates/revisions to a primary material in digital media after it has been adopted by the Board of Education, the PUBLISHER ensures that the updated/revised material has been vetted through the same quality assurance process for accuracy and editing outlined in this signed affidavit. The PUBLISHER will notify the Department and any school division that have purchased this primary material of the updates/revisions that have been made.

Managing Issues of Interpretation

The proposed agreement also requires the publisher to set forth its process for achieving consensus on information subject to different interpretations. Some subjects, such as mathematics, involve few or no questions of interpretation. Other subjects, such as literature,
may involve interpretive questions ranging from the definition of the subject matter area itself (e.g., what is “literature”) to the interpretation of specific works or events and the relative importance of certain individuals in the field (e.g. Shakespeare or lesser known authors). The language proposed by the Department requires publishers to certify that their authors and editors had a thoughtful process for addressing interpretive questions. We believe that in the vast majority of instances where corrective action is appropriate, the issue will involve objective factual errors. However, in the rare instance where an interpretive question is at issue, the process we have recommended would provide a vehicle for developing appropriate solutions.

Quality Assurance for Students Using Textbooks Chosen by Local School Boards

The quality assurance aspects of the revised process apply only to the Board’s current approval process. The Association of American Publishers endorses this revision as the first step to ensure academic integrity. Going forward, these quality assurance measures should be made applicable to local school boards too, because the purpose of the quality assurance is to ensure academic integrity for Virginia students, regardless of the process by which a textbook or instructional aid is procured. In the future, the Board should consider addition, in 8 VAC 20-720-170(B), of the following requirement of local textbook procurement of a textbook that has not been approved by the Board: “6. A requirement for the publisher to submit an Affidavit certifying that the textbook has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified content experts for factual accuracy and identifying the identities and credential of at least three such experts as well as a Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing Form that provides sufficient information regarding the quality assurance processes undertaken by the publisher, on forms prescribed by the Board.” Likewise, 8 VAC 20-720-160(B), regarding the procurement of instructional materials, should be revised by a similar addition: “4. A requirement for the publisher to submit an Affidavit certifying that the textbook has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified content experts for factual accuracy and identifying the identities and credential of at least three such experts as well as a Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing Form that provides sufficient information regarding the quality assurance processes undertaken by the publisher, on forms prescribed by the Board.” As an alternative to a formal rulemaking, the Board and Department should consider providing formal guidance to local school boards to utilize the Board’s certification and agreement forms when procuring textbooks and instructional materials that have not been approved by the Board.

Authors and Editors

On the publisher’s certification, the Board may wish to request the publisher to identify each “Program Author/Editor” instead of simply requesting “Author” identity. Some books are edited rather than authored.

Streamlined Procedures

Aspects of the revised process are duplicative of what our members already do. The Board should consider streamlining its process to take advantage of what the industry already is doing to save time, public resources and taxpayer dollars. For example, if a publisher can demonstrate to the Department of Education that it already utilizes a committee review process similar to the
committee review process that the Department intends to utilize, and that such process was objective, then there will be little gained by putting the publisher or its textbook through multiple committee reviews. The Department could conserve its resources in such cases, reducing the fiscal impact of the proposed process.

7. Conclusion

We hope that these proposed changes are helpful. We note, however, that our proposed revisions are intended to achieve policy objectives and should not be construed as a comment on the legal sufficiency of the documents (either in its current form or with our proposed revision) or otherwise to constitute provision of legal advice.

On behalf of the Association of American Publishers, thank you for your time and effort on this issue. We look forward to continued cooperation to ensure the highest quality educational materials for students in Virginia’s public schools.

Sincerely,

Jay Diskey

Jay Diskey
Executive Director, School Division
American Association of Publishers
Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Review Process

Final Review
March 24, 2011
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Section I: Introduction

The Board of Education’s authority for approving textbooks and other instructional materials is prescribed in the Virginia Constitution and in the Code of Virginia.

**Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, § 5 (d)**

It [the Board of Education] shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.

**Code of Virginia, § 22.1-238**

The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public schools and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools. The Board shall publish a list of all approved textbooks on its website and shall list the publisher and the current lowest wholesale price of such textbooks. Any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "textbooks" means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.

The Board of Education’s current textbook regulations specify the types of materials that may be approved.

**Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption, 8 VAC 20-220-30**

Only those materials which are designed to provide basic support for the instructional program of a particular content area at an appropriate level will be adopted.

On September 23, 2010, the Board took final action to adopt revised regulations regarding textbooks that will supersede those currently in effect. The revised regulations are currently undergoing the provisions of the Administrative Process Act (APA) and will become effective at the conclusion of that process. When the proposed new regulations become effective, they will state:
Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions, 8 VAC 20-720 et seq.

8 VAC 20-720-179. Textbooks

A. Textbook approval
   1. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks for use in the public schools of Virginia.
   2. In approving basal textbooks for reading in kindergarten and first grade, the Board shall report to local school boards those textbooks with a minimum decodability standard based on words that students can correctly read by properly attaching speech sounds to each letter to formulate the word at 70 percent or above for such textbooks, in accordance with § 22.1-239 of the Code of Virginia.
   3. Any local school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with this chapter.
   4. Contracts and purchase orders with publishers of textbooks approved by the Board for use in grades 6-12 shall allow for the purchase of printed textbooks, printed textbooks with electronic files, or electronic textbooks separate and apart from printed versions of the same textbook. Each school board shall have the authority to purchase an assortment of textbooks in any of the three forms listed above.

Textbooks and instructional materials play an important role in helping teachers provide instruction based on the Standards of Learning (SOL) and in helping students achieve the standards. This document provides a comprehensive overview of Virginia’s textbook review process including 1) how the review process is initiated; 2) the evaluation procedures used before textbooks are submitted to the Board of Education for first review; 3) the forms publishers must complete, including an affidavit and an agreement; 4) the selection of review committee members; 5) a description of state board action; and 6) an ongoing process for public comment on textbooks adopted approved by the Board of Education.

Section II: Initiating the Textbook Review Process

The Board of Education approves the textbook and instructional materials review process and determines the schedule for adoption approval of specific content area textbooks. The Board shall adopt will approve textbooks for, but not limited to, the four core subjects of English, mathematics, science, and history and social science.

The Virginia Department of Education administers the adoption review process on behalf of the Board of Education. A flow chart showing the order of events in Virginia’s textbook review process is provided in Appendix A. The Board of Education gives administrative authority to the Department to make necessary technical edits and changes to the process and evaluation criteria based on state or federal statutes or regulations and on the specific needs of each of the subject areas (e.g., kindergarten through grade three English/reading books may necessitate review criteria somewhat different than secondary English textbooks).
Section III: Evaluation Criteria and Publishers’ Submission Forms

Following the Board’s approval of the textbook and instructional materials adoption approval process for each subject area, the Department invites publishers to submit textbooks for review. It is the primary responsibility of publishers to ensure the accuracy of textbooks they submit for review. The Department will work to ensure that publishers have accomplished this by establishing the following evaluations for each textbook submitted: 1) an accuracy review based on publishers’ submission forms (the Textbook Publisher’s Certification and Agreement Affidavit Agreement and the Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing Form); 2) a review for correlation to the Virginia Standards of Learning, content, bias, and suitable instructional planning and support based on the evaluation criteria used by review committees; and 3) a public examination of materials during a public review and comment period.

1. Publisher’s Submission Forms (Appendix B): Publishers indicate their intent to submit textbooks and instructional materials for the adoption approval process by returning the completed Textbook Publisher’s Certification and Agreement Affidavit and the Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing Form.

The forms certification requires each publisher to certify that textbooks have been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified content experts for factual accuracy and to list all authors and their credentials. Publishers must also list the professional credentials for at least three content review experts who have thoroughly examined each textbook for content accuracy. In addition, the publisher They must certify that each textbook has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified editors for typographical errors and errors in grammar, written expression, spelling, formatting, and other substantive elements that may affect student learning.

Publishers must also certify that any duplicate version (i.e., print or digital) of the primary material that is available to Virginia school divisions contains at least the same content included in the primary material selected by the publisher for review. Any additional content, above that contained in the primary material reviewed, is accurate and free of errors. If the content of the print and digital versions of the same primary material varies, those variations are outlined in an attachment to the certification affidavit.

The publisher must agree to correct all factual and editing errors found in a textbook, at its expense. The publisher must agree to the following:

Publishers must provide a detailed description of the internal process used to ensure accuracy and lack of bias including:

- The quality assurance and workflow steps used to ensure accuracy of content;
- The quality assurance and workflow steps used to eliminate editing and typographical errors, including errors in grammar, written expression, spelling, formatting, and other substantive elements that may affect student learning;
- The fact-back-up guidelines (i.e., what is an acceptable source for a fact and what is not) used by the authors, editors, and outside content experts;
• The review by outside content experts, other than the authors, to verify accuracy and ensure freedom from bias; and
• The process used to reach consensus on information with divergent interpretations.

The Publishers must agree also sign an agreement to correct all factual and editing errors found in a textbook, at its their expense. The Publishers must agree to the following:

• If factual or editing errors are identified in a publisher’s textbook, the publisher must submit a corrective action plan to the Department of Education for review and approval by the Board of Education. Based on the materiality of the error, corrective actions may include, but are not limited to: a) corrections upon reprinting of a textbook; b) corrective edits to an online textbook; c) electronic errata sheets posted on the publisher’s and the Department of Education’s Web sites; d) print errata sheets provided to schools for insertion into textbooks; e) replacement books; f) return and refunds for textbooks.

• Prior to shipment to any of Virginia’s public schools or school divisions, the publisher shall will notify the Department of Education in writing of any correct all factual and editing errors found in the textbook and accompanying instructional materials will submit to the Department of Education a written plan of corrective action. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the publisher will execute the plan at its own expense.

• If factual or editing errors are found after textbooks or accompanying instructional materials have been shipped to any Virginia public school or school division, adopted by the Board the Department of Education, will notify the publisher in writing of such errors. The publisher will review the identified errors. If the publisher concurs that the identification of error is accurate, the publisher must submit a written plan of corrective action to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of notice from the Department. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the publisher must execute the plan at its own expense. If the publisher disputes that its textbooks contain errors, it must submit a written statement to that effect to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of the notice of error. Upon request, the publisher may meet with the Department of Education. The Board of Education reserves to itself the right to make a final determination of whether a textbook contains a factual or editing error. shall correct them at its expense within 30 calendar days of notification by sending errata sheets to the Department of Education and to all school divisions that have purchased the textbook. The Department of Education will post errata sheets on the Department’s Textbook and Instructional Materials Web site. These factual and editing errors may have been identified by the Virginia Department of Education, by any Virginia public school division representative, or by the general public.

• If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, it may result in the Board of Education may, in its sole discretion, withdrawing the textbook from the approved list. A “significant error” is a factual or editing error that the Board of Education or Department of Education determines within the context of the intended use of the textbook will substantially
interfere with student learning. A change in knowledge that occurs subsequent to
publication shall not constitute a significant error. The Board of Education must notify
the publisher in writing before it removes its textbook from the approved list. The
publisher will have 30 days to respond in writing and the right to meet with the
Department of Education before removal.
• If the publisher makes updates/revisions to a primary material in digital media after it
has been approved by the Board of Education, the publisher will ensure that
the updated/revised material has been vetted through the same quality assurance
process for accuracy and editing outlined in the signed certification affidavit.
The publisher will notify the Department and any school division that has purchased
this primary material of the updates/revisions that have been made.

Department of Education staff will review all textbook publishers’ certifications and
agreements to determine if forms have been completed correctly, sufficient information has been provided, and the forms are signed by an appropriate
representative of the publishing company. Any concerns regarding the certifications or
agreements will be addressed by Department staff with the appropriate publisher. An agreement that is not completed correctly, is lacking in sufficient information, or is not signed by the appropriate
representative, may result in the textbook(s) being removed from consideration for review.

2. **Evaluation Criteria** (Appendix C): The textbook evaluation criteria used by review
committees are composed of two sections: 1) correlation with the Standards of Learning
(SOL); and 2) instructional planning and support.

In Section I, publishers are provided with correlation forms that list all of the SOL for the
subject area being reviewed and are asked to provide specific evidence of how and where
the SOL are addressed in the textbook. Review committees use the correlation forms to
determine the degree to which content found in the textbook is correlated in thoroughness
and accuracy to the SOL. They are also given the opportunity to comment on content
accuracy, bias, or other concerns resulting from their reviews.

In Section II, a rubric with evaluation criteria is provided for review committees to offer
insight on how well the textbook is designed for instructional planning and support. The
rubric may vary based on the subject area being reviewed but typically includes criteria
relating to the organization of materials, format design, writing style and
vocabulary, graphics and illustrations, and instructional strategies. The Department of
Education may establish indicators that are specific to subject areas for each criterion. Additionally, the Department of Education will include as part of the state review,
criteria that are required in state statute.

3. **Public Examination of Materials**: After the Board of Education accepts for first review
the list of recommended textbooks, it directs the Department to seek public comment on
all textbooks on the recommended list for approval. Review copies of all
textbooks are available for public examination at various sites around the
Commonwealth. Individuals are invited to examine the proposed textbooks at the examination sites and to submit written comments via mail to the Department or via e-mail to an established electronic mailbox. Department staff review public comments and provide a summary of them to Board members as a part of the final review of the recommended textbooks for approval. adoption.

Section IV: Review Committees

As a part of the review process, the Department seeks nominations for qualified educators and content experts to serve on the textbook review committees. Nominations are solicited from division superintendents for teachers, principals, administrators, content specialists, and others who have expertise with the content areas and the standards. Department staff members will also collaborate with community colleges, institutions of higher education, and other sources of subject-matter experts with graduate degrees in the field, to assist with content review. Every attempt will be made to include the following members on each review committee: 1) teachers; 2) a division-level content specialist; and 3) a subject-matter expert who may work across committees. In selecting committee members, Department staff members will attempt to have representation from all regions of the state. Committee members must certify any potential conflict of interests they may have with serving as a member of the review committee before they will be confirmed as a member of the committee.

The Department notifies the publishers of evaluation committee members for the purpose of sending all textbooks under consideration for adoption approval to these reviewers. Committee members use the evaluation criteria, including the publisher’s SOL correlation forms, to review the textbooks independently for SOL correlations and design for instructional planning and support.

Members of the review committee submit their individual analyses of each textbook to Department staff. The full committee is then convened to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted textbooks. Following the meeting, consensus evaluations are shared with publishers, and publishers are given an opportunity to respond to committees’ reviews and recommendations. Requests by publishers for reconsideration of SOL correlations are examined carefully prior to the list of recommended textbooks being submitted to the Board of Education for first review.

Section V: State Board Action

The Superintendent of Public Instruction reviews the list of textbooks proposed by the reviewers and makes a recommendation to the Board of Education that it accept for first review the proposed list of textbooks for state approval. adoption. Copies of Information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements Affidavit Agreements and Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing Forms are is also included as part of the presentation to the Board. Upon acceptance for first review by the Board, a 30-day public examination period is announced. The public is invited to review copies of the books that have been placed at review sites around the state and to provide public comment to the Board either by mail or to an established electronic mailbox.
The Board reviews all public comment, considers the list, and adopts approves the textbooks. Following Board action, the Department posts a list of adopted approved textbooks and instructional materials with prices on the Department’s Web site under Textbooks and Instructional Materials. Information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements Affidavit Agreements will also be posted on the Web site.

Section VI: Ongoing Public Comment

After the textbook approval adoption takes place, the public can provide ongoing feedback to the Department regarding any inaccuracies found in an adopted approved textbook. An electronic mailbox will be established for this purpose. Department of Education staff will inform publishers of any errors identified. Publishers will be given the opportunity to contest the errors and/or propose a corrective action plan for approval by the Board. Department staff will forward legitimate factual or editing errors to the appropriate publisher. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, the Board of Education may, in its sole discretion, withdraw the textbook from the approved list. Further action may be taken to consider removal of the textbook from the Board of Education’s approved list.
Appendices
Virginia’s Proposed Revised Textbook Adoption Approval Process

The Board approves the textbook review process and determines the schedule for approval of specific content area textbooks.

The DOE administers the review process on behalf of the Board.

The DOE invites publishers to submit textbooks for review.

Publishers indicate their intent to submit textbooks on the completed textbook publishers’ certification and agreement forms.

DOE reviews the certifications and agreements and works with publishers to address concerns. An incomplete certification or agreement may result in the textbook being removed from consideration for review.

The DOE seeks nominations for qualified educators and content experts to serve on the textbook review committees.

Review committees of K-12 educators and content experts with advanced degrees in the field are determined.

The DOE notifies the publishers of evaluation committee members for the purpose of sending all textbooks under consideration to these reviewers.

Committee members use the evaluation criteria to review the textbooks independently for SOL correlations, content, bias, and design for instructional planning and support.

Members of the review committee submit their individual textbook analyses to DOE staff for aggregation.

The full evaluation committee convenes to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted textbooks.

The consensus evaluations are shared with publishers.

Publishers are given an opportunity to respond to the committee’s reviews and recommendations. Requests by publishers for reconsideration are reviewed.

The Board receives the proposed list of textbooks for first review, along with information from the textbook publisher’s certification and agreement forms.

During a 30-day public comment period, the public is invited to review copies of the books that have been placed at review sites around the state and to provide comment to the Board.

The Board reviews all public comment, considers the list, and approves the textbooks.

The DOE posts a list of approved textbooks with prices and information from the textbook publisher’s certifications and agreements on the DOE’s Web site.

The public may provide ongoing feedback regarding inaccuracies in an approved textbook. DOE staff will inform publishers of errors identified. Publishers will be given the opportunity to contest the errors or propose a corrective action plan for approval by the Board.
Proposed Publishers’ Submission Forms for
Virginia’s Textbook and Instructional
Materials Adoption Approval Process

Final Review

March 24, 2011
Introduction

The Virginia Board of Education’s authority for approving textbooks and other instructional materials is prescribed in the Virginia Constitution and in the *Code of Virginia*.

- **Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, § 5 (d)**
  It [the Board of Education] shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.

- **Code of Virginia, § 22.1-238**
  A. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public schools and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools. The Board shall publish a list of all approved textbooks on its website and shall list the publisher and the current lowest wholesale price of such textbooks.

  B. Any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board.

  C. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "textbooks" means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.

This document, including all attachments, provides textbook publishers with the required information and forms for submitting textbooks for review by the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) and adoption approval by the Virginia Board of Education. By submitting textbooks for evaluation, publishers agree to follow the procedures set forth in this document. Failure to comply with all procedures may result in disqualification of the textbook as a part of the review and adoption approval process.

Primary Material Submitted for Review

As noted in Section 22.1-238.C of the *Code of Virginia* above, the term textbook refers to print or electronic media for student use that serves as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.

For the remainder of this document, such instructional media will be referred to as “primary material.” Primary material contains the core curriculum that is the basis for the grade-level subject or course. VDOE review committees will review the material selected by the publisher as the “primary material.” This is typically the student edition of the textbook or the primary material that students will use to gain access to the content, although there may be exceptions according to the content area and grade level of the textbooks (e.g., teacher’s editions may
need to be included in the review at elementary grades for English/reading). Ancillary and supplemental materials will not be considered for review.

Submitting primary material in digital format is encouraged. However, publishers may submit primary material in either digital or print format, or in a format combining both media. VDOE review committees will review only the material selected as the primary material by the publisher. If a print program is submitted as the primary material to be reviewed, a digital version of this material must also be available to students. Any duplicate or similar version of the primary material submitted will not be reviewed by the VDOE review committees as a part of the textbook adoption approval process. If a publisher submits digital primary material and this material is also available in print, the review committee will review only the digital version of the primary material. In submitting their materials for review, publishers must provide an explanation of if and how the content in the primary material medium (digital or print) is different from or comparable to that offered in the other medium. Digital primary material may contain items such as embedded video clips or content that is delivered through an interactive format.

**Submission Forms**

Two submission forms follow:

- Textbook Publisher’s Affidavit Agreement
- Textbook Publisher’s Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing

Publishers must complete the Textbook Publisher’s Certification and Agreement Affidavit Agreement listing all primary materials submitted for review consideration at the time it signals intent to submit textbooks for review as part of Virginia’s textbook adoption approval process. A completed Quality Assurance for Accuracy and Editing form must be completed for each primary material submitted.
**Textbook Publisher’s Certification**

(Date)

(Publishing Company)

Name of Primary Contact: 
Phone Number, including area code: 
E-mail Address: 

The publishing company indicated above submits the following primary materials to the Virginia Department of Education for consideration in Virginia’s textbook and instructional materials adoption approval process.

| Title | ISBN | Copyright | Grade Level or Course | Is this primary material submitted as digital, print, or combination?*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only one version of the primary material will be reviewed by VDOE committees. If the primary material is available in more than one format, provide an explanation of how they differ or are comparable.

The PUBLISHER agrees to certify the following:

1. *Each* textbook and accompanying instructional materials have *has* been thoroughly examined and reviewed by at least three qualified content experts for factual accuracy in the subject matter and the textbooks and instructional materials are free from any
factual or editing errors. The credentials of the author(s) and/or editor(s) and content review experts are provided in Appendix A.

2. Each textbook and its accompanying instructional materials have has been thoroughly examined and reviewed by qualified editors to identify any typographical errors.

3. Any duplicate version (i.e., print or digital) of the primary material that is available to Virginia school divisions contains at least the same content included in the primary material selected by the publisher for review. Any additional content, above that contained in the primary material reviewed is accurate and free of errors. If the content of the print and digital versions of the same primary material varies, those variations are outlined in an attachment to the certification affidavit.

4. The Quality Assurance and Editing Process described below was followed for all primary materials submitted by the publisher for review.

Quality Assurance and Editing Process: Please describe, in three pages or less, the internal process used to ensure accuracy and lack of bias including:

• the quality assurance and workflow steps used to ensure accuracy of content;
• the quality assurance and workflow steps used to eliminate editing and typographical errors, including errors in grammar, written expression, spelling, formatting, and other substantive elements that may affect student learning;
• the fact-back-up guidelines (i.e., what is an acceptable source for a fact and what is not) used by the authors, editors, and outside content experts;
• the review by outside content experts, other than the authors, to verify accuracy and ensure freedom from bias; and
• the process used to reach consensus on information with divergent interpretations.

Enter the description here. (Additional information will not be considered or reviewed.)

(The following items have been moved to the Textbook Publisher’s Agreement.)

3. Prior to shipment to any of Virginia’s public schools or school divisions, the PUBLISHER shall correct all factual and editing errors found in the textbook and accompanying instructional materials at their expense.

4. If factual or editing errors are found after textbooks or accompanying instructional materials have been adopted by the Board of Education, the PUBLISHER shall correct them at its expense within 30 calendar days of notification by sending errata sheets to the Department of Education and to all school divisions that have purchased the textbook. The Department of Education will post errata sheets on the Department’s Textbook and Instructional Materials Web site. These factual and editing errors may have been identified by the Virginia Department of Education, by any Virginia public school division representative, or by the general public.
5. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, it may result in the Board of Education withdrawing the textbook from the approved list. A “significant error” is a factual or editing error that the Board of Education or Department of Education determines within the context of the intended use of the textbook will substantially interfere with student learning. A change in knowledge that occurs subsequent to publication shall not constitute a significant error.

7. If the PUBLISHER makes updates/revisions to a primary material in digital media after it has been adopted by the Board of Education, the PUBLISHER ensures that the updated/revised material has been vetted through the same quality assurance process for accuracy and editing outlined in this signed affidavit. The PUBLISHER will notify the Department and any school division that have purchased this primary material of the updates/revisions that have been made.

Textbook Publisher’s Agreement

The PUBLISHER agrees to the following:

1. In the event that factual or editing errors that impact student learning are identified in a PUBLISHER’s textbook, the PUBLISHER will be required to submit a corrective action plan to the Department of Education. All corrective action plans must be approved by the Board of Education, or the Board may delegate the approval of action plans to the superintendent of public instruction. Each corrective action plan must be tailored to the materiality of the factual or editing error identified in a textbook and must be implemented in the manner most conducive to and least interruptive of student learning. Based on the materiality of the error, corrective actions may include, but are not limited to: a) corrections upon reprinting of a textbook; b) corrective edits to an online textbook; c) electronic errata sheets posted on the PUBLISHER’S and the Department of Education’s Web sites; d) print errata sheets provided to schools for insertion into textbooks; e) replacement books; f) return and refunds for textbooks.

2. Prior to shipment to any of Virginia’s public schools or school divisions, the PUBLISHER shall will notify the Department of Education in writing of any correct all factual and editing errors found in the textbook and accompanying instructional materials will submit to the Department of Education a written plan of corrective action. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the PUBLISHER will execute the plan at its own expense.

3. If factual or editing errors are found after textbooks or accompanying instructional materials have been shipped to any Virginia public school or school division, adopted by the Board the Department of Education will notify the PUBLISHER in writing upon discovery of such errors, or as soon thereafter as possible. The PUBLISHER will review the identified errors. If the PUBLISHER concurs that the identification of error is
accurate, the PUBLISHER must submit a written plan of corrective action to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of notice from the Department. Upon approval of the plan of corrective action, the PUBLISHER must execute the plan at its own expense. If the PUBLISHER disputes that its textbooks contain factual or editing errors, it must submit a written statement to that effect to the Department of Education within 30 days of receipt of the notice of error. Upon request, the PUBLISHER may meet with the Department of Education. The Board of Education reserves to itself the right to make a final determination of whether a textbook contains a factual or editing error. It shall correct them at its expense within 30 calendar days of notification by sending errata sheets to the Department of Education and to all school divisions that have purchased the textbook. The Department of Education will post errata sheets on the Department’s Textbook and Instructional Materials Web site. These factual and editing errors may have been identified by the Virginia Department of Education, by any Virginia public school division representative, or by the general public.

4. If numerous and/or significant errors are identified in a textbook on the Board of Education’s approved list, it may result in the Board of Education may, in its sole discretion, withdrawing the textbook from the approved list. The Board of Education must notify the PUBLISHER in writing before it removes its textbook from the approved list. The PUBLISHER will have 30 days to respond in writing and the right to meet with the Department of Education before removal. A “significant error” is a factual or editing error that the Board of Education or Department of Education determines within the context of the intended use of the textbook will substantially interfere with student learning. A change in knowledge that occurs subsequent to publication shall not constitute a significant error.

5. If the PUBLISHER makes updates/revisions to a primary material in digital media after it has been approved by the Board of Education, the PUBLISHER will ensures that the updated/revised material has been vetted through the same quality assurance process for accuracy and editing outlined in this the signed certification affidavit. The PUBLISHER will notify the Department and any school division that has purchased this primary material of the updates/revisions that have been made.

☐ Please check here if this submission includes an attachment that outlines if and how duplicate versions (print or digital) of primary materials vary. (Item #3 in the certification)

(Signature of President of the Company or Designee)  
(Date)

(Name and Title of Person Signing)
Appendix A

Author(s)/Editor(s) and Content Review Expert Information

Section III - This attachment must be completed for each primary material submitted for review. Please insert additional copies for each primary material.

Primary Material (printed book or digital submission)
Please list name and edition of the textbook, or series, or instructional resource submitted as a primary material.

Publisher: _____
Product Name: _____
Author(s): _____

Author/Editor Information
Please complete the table below. Include each author and/or editor associated with the development of the primary material. Please insert copies of the table for additional authors/editors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Editor:</th>
<th>Role of the author/editor in writing the textbook (include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and professional background:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related published works:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the author/editor review the final copy of his/her work before publication?</td>
<td>□ Yes  □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Author/Editor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the author/editor in writing the textbook (include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Education and professional background:**

**Related published works:**

**Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:**

Did the author/editor review the final copy of his/her work before publication?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

**Author/Editor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the author/editor in writing the textbook (include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Education and professional background:**

**Related published works:**

**Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:**

Did the author/editor review the final copy of his/her work before publication?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
**Content Review Expert Information**

Please include each content review expert associated with the quality assurance process for accuracy and editing for the primary material listed in Section I. At least three content review experts must be included with at least 1) two experts with a graduate degree in the content area being reviewed; and 2) at least one teacher with recent experience teaching the content in the appropriate grade level or course. Please insert copies of the table for additional content review experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
<th>Role the reviewer had in the review process (entire book or include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and professional background:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related published works:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Role the reviewer had in the review process (entire book or include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and professional background:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related published works:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Role the reviewer had in the review process (entire book or include references to specific sections, chapters, pages, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and professional background:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related published works:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional qualifications and specific areas of expertise:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Evaluation Criteria Used by Textbook Review Committee
Section I: Correlation with the Standards of Learning

Using the information in the Standards of Learning and the Curriculum Framework for this subject, determine the degree to which content found in these textbooks instructional materials is correlated with the Standards of Learning and the Curriculum Framework for this subject, in thoroughness and accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate A</th>
<th>Limited L (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
<th>No Evidence N (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives and Lessons are aligned with the standards.</td>
<td>Limited connections between the standards and the lessons are noted.</td>
<td>No correlation between the objectives and lessons and the standards and the lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content is <em>appears</em> accurate, clear, and in sequential order.</td>
<td>Content <em>appears to contain</em> some inaccuracies or is not always clear.</td>
<td>A logical sequence of content cannot be identified and/or there appear to be significant content inaccuracies are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the essential understandings, knowledge, and skills are supported.</td>
<td>Essential understandings, knowledge, or skills are not sufficiently addressed.</td>
<td>Essential understandings, knowledge, or skills are not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many opportunities are provided for students to practice essential skills.</td>
<td>There is limited opportunity for students to practice essential skills.</td>
<td>Opportunities to practice essential skills are not included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments or concerns related to content accuracy, bias, or editing:
### Evaluation Criteria Used by Textbook Review Committee

**Section II: Rubric for Instructional Design and Support**

(Reported and may be used in correlation and adoption approval considerations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate A</th>
<th>Limited L (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
<th>No Evidence N (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 1 - Materials are</strong> Textbook is presented in an organized, logical manner and are is appropriate for the age, grade, and maturity of the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook is logically organized and grade/age appropriate for students. Objectives and materials are sequentially developed and aligned with the standards and framework.</td>
<td>Textbook lacks consistency in organization and appropriateness for the grade/age of students. Objectives and materials are inconsistent and aligned with the standards and framework.</td>
<td>Textbook is not reasonably organized and is inappropriate for the grade/age of the students. Objectives and materials are not sequentially developed and aligned with the standards and framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 2 - Materials are</strong> Textbook is organized appropriately within and among units of study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and sequence is easy to read and understand.</td>
<td>Scope and sequence is confusing and not easy to understand.</td>
<td>Scope and sequence is difficult to read and understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 3 - Format design includes titles, subheadings, and appropriate cross-referencing for ease of use.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational properties of the textbook assist in understanding and processing content.</td>
<td>Organizational properties of the textbook offer limited assistance materials assist with limited emphasis in understanding and processing content.</td>
<td>Organizational properties of the textbook do not assist in understanding and processing content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 4 - Writing style, length of sentences, and syntax, and vocabulary are appropriate.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readability is appropriate for the grade level. Writing style and syntax are varied and appropriate to enhance student understanding. Vocabulary consists of both familiar and challenging words.</td>
<td>Readability is may be appropriate but varies is inconsistent throughout the text. Writing style and syntax may be inappropriate or lack variety, offering limited support for student understanding. Vocabulary may be too challenging or too familiar.</td>
<td>Readability is not appropriate for the grade level. Writing style and syntax are often inappropriate and lack variety to enhance student understanding. Vocabulary is too challenging or unfamiliar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 5 - Graphics and illustrations are appropriate.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuals are accurate, support the student text, and enhance student understanding.</td>
<td>Visuals are somewhat unclear, have and offer limited support for the student text and student understanding.</td>
<td>Visuals are inaccurate, do not support the student text, and do not enhance student understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion 6 - Sufficient instructional strategies are provided to promote depth of understanding.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials provide students with opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.</td>
<td>Materials provide students with limited opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.</td>
<td>Materials provide students with no opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Any subject area criteria that are required in state statute will be included as part of the state review. The Department of Education may establish criteria indicators that are subject-area specific.*
Board of Education Agenda Item


Presenter: Mr. Charles B. Pyle, Director of Communications

Telephone Number: (804) 371-2420 E-Mail Address: Charles.Pyle@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by

___ State or federal law or regulation

___ Board of Education regulation

X Other: Guidance to local school boards related to § 22.1-253.13:7, Code of Virginia

X Action requested at this meeting

___ Action requested at future meeting:

Previous Review/Action:

___ No previous board review/action

X Previous review/action
date November 18, 2010

action Accepted for first review and public comment

Background Information:

Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools was accepted by the Board of Education for first review and public comment on November 18, 2010.

The proposed guidance document was revised in response to comments received between November 18, 2011, and December 18, 2011. The revised draft was posted on the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) website with other January board agenda items on January 7, 2011.

On January 10, 2011, Board of Education President Eleanor B. Saslaw delayed final review of the proposed guidelines until February 17, 2011, and extended the window for public comment on the proposed guidelines until February 12, 2011.
Given the volume of comment received during the extended public comment period, Mrs. Saslaw approved a further delay of final review of the proposed guidelines until March 24, 2011. All comments received between November 18, 2010, and February 12, 2011, are presented in Appendix A by date received.

A majority of the comments received during the official comment period were from public school teachers, administrators and representatives of stakeholder groups.

Fifty-nine, or 75 percent, of the 79 public comments received between November 18, 2010, and February 12, 2011, were critical of the original November 18, 2010, draft, or critical of the revised draft that was posted on the VDOE website as an agenda item for the January 13, 2011, board meeting. Stakeholder and education groups expressing concern about suggested model policies include the Virginia Education Association, Virginia PTA, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia Society for Technology in Education, Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and Virginia Academy of School Psychologists.

The issue of electronic communications between adult school board employees and students elicited the most comment. The majority of the critical comments raised practical objections in describing the possible impact of specific model policies and best practices included in the first two drafts on instruction and teacher-student relationships — while acknowledging concern about misconduct. A few of those critical of the first two draft documents expressed a belief that there should be no attempt whatsoever by the board or local school boards to regulate digital and online communications between teachers and students.

Several division superintendents and school board chairmen acknowledged the need for clear local policies to deter misconduct and suggested that a document from the Board of Education identifying policy objectives and offering broad guidance — rather than specific model policies and best practices — would be more useful to local school boards in responding to the 2008 legislation.

Fourteen, or 18 percent, of the comments received expressed support for the earlier draft documents and concern about the opportunities for misconduct presented by electronic communications.

Parents supporting the earlier draft documents included the mother of a victim of sexual misconduct.

Several teachers who commented in support of the earlier drafts expressed concerns about unmonitored digital and online communications between teachers and students and support for specific safeguards, such as copying parents or administrators on e-mails to individual students and not inviting students to be “friends” on personal social networking sites.

Troy R. Hutchings of Northern Arizona University, a nationally recognized researcher in the area of educator misconduct, expressed his support for the earlier drafts.
Comments were received from five persons following the official comment period, and these are presented in Appendix B.

- Charol Shakeshaft, chairperson, Department of Educational Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University, and author of *Educator Misconduct: A Synthesis of Existing Literature*, a 2004 U.S. Department of Education study on educator misconduct, submitted comments in support of the board and department’s efforts to provide guidance to school divisions on the prevention of misconduct but also expressed regret that the draft being prepared for the March meeting did not include the model policies and best practices included in the earlier drafts. Dr. Shakeshaft suggested that these be included in an appendix.
- Kitty Boitnott, president of the Virginia Education Association (VEA), in oral comments to the board on February 17, 2011, discussed guidance provided by the VEA to its members and expressed concern about the possible impact of the model policies included in the earlier drafts on instruction and teacher-student relationships.
- Pam Moran, superintendent, Albemarle County Public Schools, expressed support for the revised draft prepared for the March meeting of the Board of Education.
- Jack Dale, superintendent, Fairfax County Public Schools, expressed support for the revised draft prepared for the March meeting of the Board of Education and offered suggested edits.
- Wendell C. Roberts, staff attorney, Virginia School Boards Association, expressed support for the revised draft prepared for the March meeting of the Board of Education and offered suggested edits.

**Summary of Major Elements**

In developing *Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools*, the Division of Policy and Communications studied prevention policies adopted by school boards and legislatures in several states, including model prevention policies developed by state school board associations, and the National School Boards Association’s Council of School Attorneys.

Reports, studies, and policy briefs on the issue of sexual misconduct in school settings from the U.S. Department of Education, National School Boards Association’s Council of School Attorneys also were reviewed.

A representative selection of these policies and documents is presented in Appendix C.

The development of the guidance document also was informed by factors and circumstances contributing to actual cases of misconduct in the commonwealth’s public schools.

In response to the comments received, the focus of the proposed *Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in the Public Schools* shifted from providing detailed model policies and best practices to presenting more general guidance on relevant issues and policy objectives for consideration in the development of local policies addressing sexual misconduct and abuse.
Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools includes (i) an introduction that speaks to the shared responsibility for protecting students from misconduct and abuse, (ii) an outline of school board responsibilities related to prevention, (iii) a suggested list of policy elements for consideration by local school boards, (iv) guidance of the development of local policies governing interaction and communication between school board employees and students, and (v) guidance on creating policies on the reporting of misconduct, training and discipline.

The revised guidance document now before the board leaves the specifics of establishing boundaries for interactions between school board employees and students to local school boards where there is a greater understanding of practices and of the communications technologies and social networking systems available to educators within the division.

While no longer suggesting specific model policies and best practices, Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools does provide a framework for local policy making by identifying areas where the establishment of boundaries may protect students by providing deterrents to misconduct.

Superintendent's Recommendation:
The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in the Public Schools as a resource for school divisions.

Impact on Resources: The impact on resources is expected to be minimal.

Timetable for Further Review/Action: The document will be posted on the VDOE website in an appropriate location upon the approval of the board.
Draft Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools
Revised March 10, 2011

Introduction
Responsibility for protecting students from sexual misconduct and abuse is shared by the school board, superintendent, administrators, teachers and other school board employees, school volunteers, parents, state agencies, and law enforcement.

The Virginia Board of Education developed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools to help local school boards create and implement policies and procedures that establish clear and reasonable boundaries for interactions among students and teachers, other school board employees, and adult volunteers.

School Board Responsibilities
The local school board demonstrates its commitment to protecting students from sexual misconduct and abuse through:

1. Compliance with all state and local laws and regulations related to the screening of prospective employees for the conviction of barrier crimes and founded cases of child abuse and neglect;
2. Compliance with all state laws related to the reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect;
3. Compliance with all state laws and regulations related to reporting to the Virginia Department of Education of resignations and dismissals of licensed employees related to convictions of barrier crimes and founded cases of abuse and neglect;
4. The development, effective implementation and enforcement of clear and reasonable policies governing the interaction of students and school board employees and volunteers;
5. The establishment of channels for reporting by students and parents of suspected misconduct and abuse, and the prompt notification of law enforcement when criminal activity is alleged or suspected; and
6. Disclosure of formal reprimands and dismissals for violating school board policies on sexual misconduct and abuse prevention to school divisions seeking references.

Prevention Policy Elements
By following school board policies addressing sexual misconduct and abuse, teachers, administrators, and other educators and employees provide a safe and healthy environment for teaching and learning. Local school board policies addressing sexual misconduct and abuse should include these elements:

1. Statement of purpose addressing the shared responsibility of the school board, superintendent, administrators, teachers and other school board employees, school volunteers, parents, state agencies, and law enforcement for the prevention of sexual misconduct and abuse;
2. Clear and reasonable rules governing communication and interaction between students and school board employees;
3. Clear procedures for reporting suspected misconduct and abuse;
4. Training of school personnel and volunteers and the dissemination of sexual misconduct and abuse prevention policies to school board employees, volunteers, students, and parents; and
5. Applicability to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

In developing procedures for implementing local policies, school boards should take into consideration the strategies and tools educators use to interact with students and support instruction.

**Guidance on Communication and Interaction**

School board policies should recognize the importance of communication and interaction in learning and instruction while establishing reasonable boundaries for educator-student relationships. Educators and other employees can protect themselves from misunderstandings and false accusations by adhering to division policies.

**In-Person Communication and Interaction**

School board employees and volunteers should avoid appearances of impropriety when interacting with students. Educators, other employees and volunteers should be aware of behaviors often associated with inappropriate conduct that can create an appearance of impropriety, including:

- Conducting ongoing, private, conversations with individual students that are unrelated to school activities or the well-being of the student and that take place in locations inaccessible to others;
- Inviting a student or students for home visits without informing parents;
- Visiting the homes of students without the knowledge of parents;
- Inviting students for social contact off school grounds without the permission or knowledge of parents; and
- Transporting students in personal vehicles without the knowledge of parents or supervisors.

Personal contact between adults and students must always be nonsexual, appropriate to the circumstances and unambiguous in meaning. Employees and volunteers should respect boundaries consistent with their roles as educators, mentors and caregivers. Violations of these boundaries include:

- Physical contact with a student that could be reasonably interpreted as constituting sexual harassment;
- Showing pornography to a student;
- Unnecessarily invading a student’s personal privacy;
- Singling out a particular student or group of students for personal attention and friendship beyond the bounds of an appropriate educator/mentor-student relationship;
- Conversation of a sexual nature with students not related to the employee’s professional responsibilities; and
- A flirtatious, romantic or sexual relationship with a student.
**Electronic Communication**

Digital technology and social networking provide multiple means for educators and other school board employees to communicate with students and personalize learning. Local policies should ensure that electronic and online communications between employees, volunteers and individual students are transparent, accessible to supervisors and parents, and professional in content and tone.

As with in-person communications, educators and volunteers should avoid appearances of impropriety and refrain from inappropriate electronic communications with students. Factors that may be considered in determining whether an electronic communication is inappropriate include, but are not limited to:

- The subject, content, purpose, authorization, timing and frequency of the communication;
- Whether there was an attempt to conceal the communication from supervisors and/or parents;
- Whether the communication could be reasonably interpreted as soliciting sexual contact or a romantic relationship; and
- Whether the communication was sexually explicit.

Local policies should provide guidance to educators and other school board employees on how to maintain transparency and accessibility when communicating electronically with individual students.

Administrators, division technology staff, and division instructional staff should collaborate with parents to develop local policies and practices that deter misconduct by (i) defining parameters for electronic communications and social networking between educators and students and (ii) facilitating parental supervision of students’ social networking and digital communications with educators and other school board employees.

**Guidance on Reporting, Training, and Discipline**

School board employees and volunteers have an obligation to report violations of the division’s policies for preventing sexual misconduct to the principal or his or her designee or to the division superintendent. This obligation is in addition to the statutory responsibility to report suspected abuse and neglect. School boards should establish clear channels for reporting suspected misconduct and abuse.

School boards also should provide training for employees and volunteers on the prevention of misconduct and abuse and disseminate information about relevant division policies to employees, volunteers, students, and parents.

Inadvertent and innocuous violations of local policies provide opportunities for additional counseling and training. Appropriate formal disciplinary action should always follow violations of local policies when the substance of the conduct or communication in question is found to be inappropriate, flirtatious, romantic or sexual.
### Appendix A: Public Comment Received
November 18, 2010 – February 12, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ardaiz</td>
<td>The following are my comments regarding the referenced document: 1) The Summary and Guidance make repeated references to clear and reasonable policies, but nowhere are definitions provided for the seemingly interchangeable terms of sexual abuse and misconduct. 2) They similarly fail to address the related topic of sexual harassment, including a definition. 3) In addition, no effective date is proposed or specified. In many ways, the Guidance is similar to existing policies regarding the conduct of teachers which imply that they have responsibilities to recognize signs of abuse among their students, but not effectively &quot;deterring misconduct and providing accountability&quot; for the teachers, themselves. For example, the &quot;Model policy for electronic communications with students&quot; states that &quot;Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact privately through texting and personal social-networking sites.&quot; The obvious implication is that students may inappropriately invite teachers to interact, but not vice versa (no pun intended). The reality is that the misconduct, legal and otherwise, which we seek to prevent through the Guidance is, by definition, on the part of the adult, not the minor. Lastly, I find it disappointing that in spite of reference in the coversheet's Background Information to criminal background checks by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and also to the registry maintained by the Virginia Department of Social Services (VDSS), the Guidance document itself makes no reference to any viable regulatory authority or resources. This is most obvious upon review of the References (p12):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>a) Of 22 references, 7 are associated with religious organizations - 5 church and 2 organizations requiring religious devotion (BSA and GSA), all of which have been demonstrated to be highly ineffective in implementation. b) None addresses the regulatory authorities cited in the coversheet's Background Information (ie, FBI, VDSS), or any other regulatory authority - information necessary to establish a link between violations of board policy and criminal conduct when considering employment, retention, or termination of teachers. c) Even the Code of Virginia 22.1-253.13:7 is not referenced. I strongly urge the Board of Education to revisit this document by adding to its stated objectives and revising those which have already been drafted to remedy the above defects. In its present form, the Guidance indicates awareness of the serious concerns associated with sexual abuse and misconduct, particularly with respect to electronic communications, but clearly fails to meet the needs of public schools, students, and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Drummond</td>
<td>I am a high school choir director in Middlesex County, VA, and I am writing to you in response to reading the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools. First, I would like to thank you and your colleagues for your efforts to protect students as well as school employees from instances or allegations of sexual misconduct in the public schools. After reading the proposal set forth, I wanted to voice some of my concerns about its limitations. While I understand the concerns over electronic communication, I do not think that cutting them off in virtually all circumstances is an appropriate response to a new and changing environment. Electronic media such as Facebook, Twitter, and SMS text messaging are the main lines of communication our students use. The proposed guidelines seem heavy handed, in my opinion. Rather than cutting school faculty off from the lines of communication that our students use, why not work towards a way to engage students here? I have used text messages with my students to coordinate meeting times or places when on field trips, for example. While I am not friends with any of my students on Facebook, it is only out of deference to advice from teachers with more experience (most of whom do not use or understand social media, by the way). In regards to the one-on-one meetings with students, this is a frequent occurrence in my field. Over the last few weeks, I have been meeting one-on-one with a student after school, preparing him for All-District Chorus. Since he was the only student going to this event, it did not warrant using class time to prepare him. While his mother was aware of this, since she had to pick him up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By way of background, I am currently President of the Lafayette High School Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) in Williamsburg, VA, but I want to make it clear that I am NOT submitting these comments in that official capacity. These comments are my own but are the result of discussions with other parents and students. The examples and situations noted herein were raised in those discussions between teachers, students, parents and school administrators. They are also the result of real-world experiences. I have served on PTA Boards for about 19 years, at every grade level. I am the parent of a high-school senior, as well as the parent of a teacher in the Williamsburg James City County (WJCC) school system; our older daughter is a teacher of the hearing-impaired within WJCC -- an itinerant position in which she is required to service students from pre-K to 12th grade, at all 3 high schools, and several middle and elementary schools.

The discussions I have had with PTSA members, other parents, and within our family have raised many practical problems with DOE's proposed policy, and these are detailed below. Of course, we fully support DOE's efforts to prevent inappropriate relationships between teachers or school employees and students; however, the proposed policy, in many respects, actually may hinder the ability of the school systems to respond to allegations when they are raised.

Technology is moving rapidly and should be embraced by DOE. I view technology as something that is supposed to make our lives easier. We live in a fast-paced world where delay in obtaining information can be critical, and missed deadlines can be life-altering. We watch commercials pitting one cell-phone system against another, with one claiming better speed in providing text messaging, and the other, slower system causing embarrassing moments for its owner. New “apps” appear every day and we wonder how we lived without them before.

In such a world, texting has become essential to effective logistics among teachers, students and parents. I am NOT a regular “texter” myself, but I appreciate its value on the occasions when I do need it. As a parent of a high-school student, and a parent of a teacher, I see the superiority of texting over any other form of communication on a daily basis. For example, last year I accompanied our high-school daughter's chorus group on a field trip to Disney World for a music workshop. Groups of students and chaperones split up into small groups, but the chorus teacher needed to be able to coordinate with each of the 5 or 6 groups of students at all times. Monitoring the safety and security of the students was paramount and texting was the only effective way keeping tabs on everyone in real time under those conditions. Even trying to talk on a cell phone in that environment was usually impossible. Either the students were somewhere where there was too much noise to hear, or they were somewhere (e.g. an auditorium or stage set) where talking on a phone was not permitted or would have disturbed others. Unobtrusive texting was invaluable, and safe. Why would DOE ever want to eliminate such a safety feature?
The model policy for electronic communications with students that is currently proposed states:

Digital technology provides multiple means for teachers and other school division employees to communicate with students. The division policy should establish acceptable channels for electronic communications with students while prohibiting interactions unrelated to instruction or not specifically authorized by school board policy. In short, electronic communications with students should be transparent, accessible to supervisors, and professional in content and tone.

Model policy for electronic communications with students

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.
- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text” students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites.
- Teachers and other school board employees may not knowingly engage in online gaming with students.
- School board policy on electronic communications with students also applies to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

I will address each of the 4 bullet points above in turn.

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.
  1. Our initial reaction to this restriction was, “are you nuts?” Is the Department of Education familiar with all the systems and platforms used by the approximately 188 school divisions in the Commonwealth? Does DOE know all the capabilities and/or reliability of every school division in the state of Virginia? It is naïve, at best, to believe that every single school division, without exception, has provided a system or platform that is capable of providing the real-time communications between teachers, coaches, employees and students that is necessary in our fast-paced world. Our experience with the WJCC system, for example, is that it is slow and unreliable. Most emails go into teachers’ SPAM folders and, according to my daughter (a WJCC teacher), it can take up to 8 hours for her to even get a notification that there is a message in her SPAM folder. Can all teachers and employees in every school system access their school division’s systems and platforms from home? Does every teacher or school system employee in the state of Virginia have internet access from home? Unless DOE can demonstrate that, without exception, ALL teachers and school system employees have the ability to “use accounts, systems and platforms” provided by their respective school divisions to provide the same level of real-time communications as is provided by “texting,” then this broad restriction deprives the entire Commonwealth of the benefits of texting technology. Perhaps this policy could be rewritten to state: “When engaging in electronic communications with students, teachers and other school board employees should maximize use of accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division to the extent possible.”
  2. The restriction that electronic communications must be restricted to “accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division” also appears to discriminate against those students who do not have access to the internet at home, i.e. those who are economically disadvantaged. Although these students may have cell phones, a large number of disadvantaged students do not have computers at home. In fact, more and more households are eliminating telephone landlines, leaving cell phones as the only means of communication in a family. In those cases, the most effective method of communication is via texting. Teachers and staff should not be required to limit electronic communications to only school-system-provided platforms, e.g. Edline, provided by the school division when a significant number of students do not have access to the internet.
- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text” students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites.
  3. Why should texting be prohibited? Texting is not the “evil” that DOE is trying to protect against, the “evil” is inappropriate conduct. The “means” by which that conduct is achieved
is irrelevant. There already is a prohibition in the proposed guidelines that would cover an inappropriate text: "Conversation by school board employees and volunteers with students that could be interpreted as flirtatious, romantic or sexual is prohibited." This applies, presumably, to any conversation, whether it be telephone, texting, Skyping, etc. It could be broadened to state: "Conversations, whether oral or written (e.g. texting), by school board employees and volunteers with students that could be interpreted as flirtatious, romantic or sexual, is prohibited." That should be sufficient. Texting is no different than a phone conversation or an in-person conversation -- it just happens to be in writing; in fact, texting protects the student -- and the teacher -- because there is a record of the communication, unlike a telephone conversation where, unless the phone conversation is recorded, there is no record and accusations can amount to "he said/she said".

4. Curiously, the paragraph in the proposed guidelines that precedes these 4 bullet points states that: "In short, electronic communications with students should be transparent, accessible to supervisors, and professional in content and tone." [Emphasis added.]. What the drafters of these proposed guidelines fail to realize is that both texting and use of public social networks such as Facebook provide the very "transparency" that has been so lacking in previous "private" conversations. In the past, accusations have been made by students or parents against teachers, with little or no proof other than the testimony of the students involved. Texting and public network conversations, on the other hand, can provide the very proof necessary to prosecute the very few teachers who may be engaging in inappropriate behavior. By having a blanket prohibition against texting and public networking, DOE may actually be failing to provide students the protections that a written record provides.

5. The prohibition also is overbroad in that, as written, it would even prohibit group texts. If "transparency" is what DOE is seeking, why in heavens name would DOE prohibit even group texts? A group text is, by its very nature, transparent. As noted throughout the guidelines, conducting conversations in a public venue, i.e. discouraging one-on-one conversations behind closed doors, is to be encouraged. Group texts have proven to be an effective method of timely communication between teachers, coaches and students. In fact, during the recent snowstorms and school closings before the Christmas holidays, group texts were essential in coordinating rescheduling of arts and sporting events in a very short period of time. However, that is not to say that only group texts should be permitted. Consider the circumstance, raised at our PTSA meeting, where a teacher or coach issues a group text, but one student will have a question regarding something that is unique to the student (e.g. student will be absent) and teacher needs to be able to respond to that student without having to respond to all the other students. A "reply all" response could well inadvertently disclose medical or private information that might itself be a violation of privacy rights.

6. Texting has become essential to effective logistics among teachers, students and parents. On field trips, for example, where groups split up, teachers and employees and chaperones can keep tabs on students under conditions where talking is impractical (e.g. conditions are too quiet (museums) or too loud (theme parks, concerts)). Also, even when a teacher issues a group text, one student will have a question regarding something that is unique to the student (e.g. student will be absent) and teacher needs to be able to respond without having to respond to all the other students (which might itself be a violation because the reply might involve medical information regarding a student).

7. A blanket prohibition against texting fails to consider teachers, such as my daughter, a teacher of the hearing impaired, who may be required to use texting to communicate with her few students. She is itinerant, with students at all grade levels and multiple schools, and it is essential that she be able to use texting to communicate. In WJCC and, presumably, in other school divisions, there are a number of teachers who have to go among two or more schools. These teachers may need to communicate with students while on the go. If she (and other teachers similarly situated) are not permitted to use their personal cell phones to text, then the school system might be required to provide a Blackberry or similar device, at considerable expense to the school systems.

8. There may well be certain special needs students, such as those who are hearing-impaired, for whom texting is a godsend, and provides a means of communicating even during the school day. Perhaps there are IEPs that actually provide for the use of texting during the school day as a means of providing communication for these students who may not be able to hear school announcements over the intercom. A simple text message can
alert a deaf student to an upcoming meeting, or athletic event or other school announcement. A blanket prohibition against texting may well deprive special needs students of the communications they so desperately require.

9. The prohibition against using a "personal wireless communication device" has too many loopholes, even if were to be put into effect. For example, it fails to consider that texts also can be sent from a computer directly to a cell phone. Texting is not limited to phone-to-phone communications. For example, our family can go to www.verizon.com and send a text message from any computer to any cell phone, Blackberry, etc. The proposed model guidelines, however, would not cover such a communication. Again, the policy as proposed seems to prohibit the means of communication without addressing the content of the communication. Under the proposed policy, for example, an inappropriate communication with a system-owned wireless communication device, would arguably not be a violation.

10. The blanket prohibition against any use of social networking also is overly broad, if not completely unnecessary. If the drafters of the proposed guidelines had actually gone on Facebook and done even minimal searches, they would have seen that many teachers use social networking sites to establish activity-specific pages, e.g. Chorus, Drama, Key Club, etc., as a "public" way of disseminating information. Eliminating Facebook and similar sites as a method of communicating information is not a smart. By way of example, when schools are closed due to snow or inclement weather, teachers and coaches can post updates to group Facebook pages regarding schedule changes much more quickly than administrators can post them to School websites or school system websites. Again, if what DOE wants is transparency, then social networks – where the postings are public, at a minimum, to all members of the group and all other friends – provides the very transparency that serves to protect our students. If a teacher were to write something inappropriate, all other friends or members of the group would immediately see it, providing written evidence and witnesses. Why would DOE seek to limit such protections for students?

- Teachers and other school board employees may not knowingly engage in online gaming with students.

11. Without a clear definition of what is meant by "gaming," this blanket prohibition fails to consider legitimate uses of online gaming sites as teaching tools. Games are used in all sorts of courses, at all levels, from math and statistics, to science and literature.

- School board policy on electronic communications with students also applies to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

12. School policies should apply to everyone; however, to the extent that the policies are so broad with no consideration of circumstances that may be applicable to a given school system, a given teacher, a given student, or a given group, then the policies do not pass scrutiny.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In short, the draft DOE guidelines regarding electronic communications not only are overly broad, but actually can hinder effective communications among teachers, students and parents. Moreover, the proposed guidelines actually reduce the protections that enhanced technology has provided to students that might be the subject of inappropriate communications. Electronic communications can be saved, traced and tracked, and provide enhanced transparency. The guidelines should prohibit the inappropriate conduct only, not the means of that conduct. The prohibition against inappropriate conduct and conversations, whether oral or written, is sufficient.

I strongly urge the DOE and WJCC to reconsider these blanket prohibitions without further input from parents, teachers and students.

February 11, 2011

Jack D. Dale  
Superintendent,  
Fairfax County Public Schools

The Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) support the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) position of no tolerance for staff sexual misconduct involving students. FCPS also agrees with the need for both guidelines and training for those who deal with students. The December 2010 VBOE draft sexual misconduct guidelines, however, posed significant problems for local school boards. The January 13, 2011 revisions reflect a significant improvement, but a number of the guidelines remain overbroad and impractical.

FCPS joins the other commenters in requesting that VBOE either leave the development of sexual misconduct guidelines to local school boards entirely, or, if VBOE concludes that state level guidance is essential, convene a broad-based committee of local school experts to assist in making further revisions to the January 13, 2011 draft. A summary of our reasons for these
recommendations is provided below. Page numbers refer to the January 13, 2011 draft. 

**Elements of Sexual Abuse Policy, p. 6**

For the most part, the listed elements are reasonable and appropriate; however, we note that element 8 is unclear. What behavior is being prescribed by "applicability of virtual school programs?" In fact, what is the definition of "virtual school programs" in this context? Element 9 seems to imply that only certain types of clinicians have one-on-one dealings with students. In fact, many types of school staff, from administrators to teachers to support staff, have such dealings as part of their responsibilities. Regardless of the type of staff, such interactions cannot be entirely prescribed by "procedures" (See comments on "social interactions" below, for further detail.)

**Communication between employees and students, p. 7**

The purpose of this section is laudatory. All school boards want to deter inappropriate communications between staff and students. The goal is to prevent grooming behaviors by a predatory adult seeking the confidence of a vulnerable child. An equally important goal, however, is to allow opportunities for personal conversation with students when warranted, to provide staff guidance regarding appropriate space for private conversations without setting up artificial barriers to communication, to recognize the many types of staff who may need to communicate privately with students, and to resist the temptation to substitute logs and other paperwork for true improvements in student safety.

FCPS agrees with bullets 2 and 3 in this section, but the remaining guidelines are overbroad. For example, bullet 1 forbids staff initiation of conversations regarding the private life of an unrelated student. This prohibition unnecessarily ties the hands of school staff. Teachers and counselors often assist a child whose behavior or academic performance has changed because of a personal problem (loss of a parent, bullying, or any other out-of-school issue), by asking "what's bothering you?" or a similar non-instructional question. Similarly a teacher might interest a child in academics by drawing on a child's outside interest such as stock car racing or rock climbing. All such inquiries would be barred by bullet 1. Similarly, it is not always practical to have one-on-one conversations in a room with the door open (bullet 4). For example, school administrators need to meet privately with disruptive students, and counselors need to meet privately with troubled students. At the least this guideline should be modified to state that "School staff should have private conversations with students whenever practicable in settings where other adults can monitor without intruding, by such means as a classroom with the door open, a classroom with a closed door containing a vision panel, spaces where other adults can either see or hear, and private corners of public spaces (e.g. a quiet corner of the school library). School staff should not have one-on-one meetings in private off-campus locations that cannot be monitored by school staff, parents, or other responsible adults, without first receiving permission of an administrator."

The prohibition of ongoing one-on-one meetings without principal approval and parental permission also is impractical (bullet 5), at least insofar as the prohibition pertains to in-school meetings. Scores of one-on-one meetings occur in every school every day, and can easily become "ongoing." The permission requirement adds bureaucracy without increasing student safety. "Ongoing" one-on-one meetings off school grounds also occur, but typically require (and should require) parental and school approval—as in the case of a homebound instructor, for example.

**Electronic communication, p. 8**

FCPS concurs with the comments previously provided by the VASCD Board regarding the overly restrictive nature of the model guidelines for electronic communication. Given the increasing prevalence of electronic communication as an integral part of the lives of students and teachers, it is important to provide realistic guidelines and best practices that balance the safety risks and educational affordances of these technologies.

The proposed model guidelines represent a significantly more restrictive policy than the majority of those example policies cited (Chicago, Community High School District 128, Manatee, and Lee County). If a model policy is to be provided, it is recommended that the VASCD Board work with schools to provide examples of both reasonably restrictive and reasonably permissive model policies.

FCPS agrees that "electronic communications with students should be transparent, accessible to supervisors, and professional in content and tone" and would recommend clarifying the meaning of these terms by including the definitions as provided by District 128 (http://www.district128.org/content/electronic-communications-expectations).

FCPS agrees with the "best practices" in this section, but the remaining guidelines are overbroad. Bullet 1 should be amended to "include accounts, systems and platforms provided by, approved by, or accessible to the school division". This bullet would greatly benefit from a tangible example, such
An acceptable means of communication might be a teacher’s Facebook “Fan page” tied to their district-provided e-mail address, or a tool obtained with the awareness of parents and school or district administration.

An unacceptable means of communication would be a teacher accepting a student’s “friend” request sent to their personal Facebook account.

Bullets 2 and 4 are problematic because they use different language to define permitted communication than that of bullet 1 (“District provided” et al). The distinction is “personal” (in bullet 2) and for “purposes unrelated to instruction” (bullet 4). It seems inconsistent that student/teacher interaction via a gaming network for instructional purposes would be acceptable, but interaction via text messaging network for instructional purposes would not.

Bullet 3 is unrealistically impractical. Because school districts typically do not provide PDA’s and cell phones to teachers, teachers sometimes use their own devices to communicate with students. Examples include the teacher needing to change the time of a meeting, or coordinate groups of students on a field trip, or solve a transportation problem for a student traveling from a base school to an off-site program, or remind a student the night before of supplies needed for a school event the next day. Teachers typically text such messages from their personal device. Limiting such communications to emergencies would be over-restrictive. Requiring the teacher to file follow-up reports the next day would be extremely burdensome.

These bullets should be deleted or rewritten in consultation with school staff to create a consistent standard among bullets 1 through 4. Finally, we note that the VBOE guidelines appear to leave many of the details of electronic communications regulation to local school districts, which we believe to be appropriate. Some guidance regarding particular communications platforms is necessary and appropriate; social media are evolving so rapidly, however, that detailed rules will quickly become outdated and unworkable. Consequently, guidelines should focus on the prohibited employee conduct, not the medium of communication.

The model policy elements are unobjectionable, but incomplete. For example, the bulleted list does not include exceptions for health and safety reasons, the demonstration of technique (e.g. in gymnastics or certain career and technical education classes), self defense (personal protection), and the like. Consultation with school staff would ensure a more comprehensive final version.

The proposed guidelines regarding teachers who are alone with students, off site activities with two adults, gifts, and social gatherings (bullets 1, 2, 5, 7) are overbroad and unrealistic, notwithstanding their protective purpose. For example employees should not always avoid being alone with students (bullet 1) for the reasons described in the communications section above.

School related off-site activities will not always have two adults present (bullet 2), as in the case of an elementary teacher taking her students across the street to a park. The prohibitions in bullet 5 are sound in concept, but should not extend to clothing. As worded, this bullet would bar social workers from securing basic clothing for a needy student, or a principal from arranging for a school-wide coat drive. The bullet also would prohibit school staff from giving gifts to children of close family friends. In fact, the guidelines in general seem to assume that teachers and other school staff are not part of the community beyond their employment. The prohibition against school board employees hosting private social gatherings at which alcohol is consumed when students are present (bullet 7) remains problematic: it would prohibit weddings, religious ceremonies, and even family dinners if a school board employee is the host.

The topic of school staff socializing with students might better be addressed in training than in the guidelines. If the VBOE determines it is essential to address it in the guidelines, however, VBOE should focus not on whether the school board employee is a host or participant in a social activity, but on the nature of the activity and the relationship with the student. Any restriction must be carefully worded to avoid prohibiting legitimate support of students outside school. The underlying concept should be: “School board employees are expected to act as adults with their students, not as same-age friends. Although employees are encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities with groups of students, an employee should not make a student (other than a family member) a regular part of his or her own social life.”

The bullets prohibiting sexually explicit materials and romantic relationships (bullets 8 and 9) are useful but do not go far enough. For example, employees should be prohibited from having sexually explicit conversations with students, describing their own sexual activities, and inquiring into students’ sexual activities and preferences. The prohibition regarding illegal drug use should
be broadened, e.g. "Illegal drug use is prohibited at any time regardless of whether students are present or not."

Procedures for confidential interactions between students and clinicians, p. 10

Only the first sentence of this section should be preserved; all three of the subordinate bullets are overbroad and impractical. It is not feasible for each clinician to notify his/her supervisor in advance of each one-on-one meeting, nor is it feasible to maintain a log of all meetings. Counselors, social workers, and other school staff already carry enormous student case loads—adding such notice and logging requirements will simply increase their administrative burden without improving student safety.

Similarly the circumstances in which students will need one-on-one meetings vary with the student and situation. Certainly one-on-one meetings should not be limited to students with an IEP or health plan. Many nondisabled students may need such meetings with a clinician. In the case of students with disabilities, one-on-one meetings should not be recorded in the IEP unless needed for FAPE—but students with disabilities should still be encouraged to have such meetings when appropriate. In short, all three bullets should be eliminated.

This section also does not recognize that other school staff, in addition to clinicians, may need one-on-one meetings. At the least this section should be amended accordingly, e.g. "Administrators and other school staff may meet with students privately when confidential interactions are necessary to provide students, promote their well being, investigate incidents, impose discipline, or provide related services."

Training, p. 10

FCPS agrees that training is critical to deterrence and detection of sexual misconduct. The proposed section, however, implies that (1) one-size-fits-all training will be imposed and (2) "best practice" involves training by and through committees. FCPS submits that training content will vary with the audience. For example, administrators need training to detect sexual groomers. Young employees need training regarding appropriate social boundaries. Everyone needs training regarding baseline prohibitions, such as "romantic relationships between students and staff are never permitted."

The means by which such training should be delivered and the determination of the individual or group providing oversight will vary according to the targeted audience and the content of the training. In some cases, training may best be designed and implemented in conjunction with local police; in others, on-line training may suffice; in still others, parents and/or interdisciplinary committees should be involved. FCPS knows of no research demonstrating that "best practices" regarding sexual misconduct training always involves committees as described in the draft.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the revised sexual misconduct guidelines. As noted at the outset, we join other local school boards and professional associations in urging VBOE not to issue them in their current form. Achieving the proper balance between promoting school staff communication with students, while deterring sexual misconduct and avoiding spurious allegations, is a difficult one. It is more important to allow the time for local boards to develop their own guidelines, or for the state to collect the necessary local information for revisions to the state guidelines, than to rush to publication. Please feel free to contact my office if you have any questions, or if we can be helpful in the revision process.

Debra Abadie
VA PTA president
Debbie Kilpatrick
VA PTA Education Chair
Virginia Congress of Parents & Teachers

Revised Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

The safety, protection, and well being of all children are of paramount importance to Virginia PTA as supported by our positions and legislative policy. We are supportive of offering uniform guidelines to school divisions in order to be in compliance with state laws.

We would like to address some concerns we have with the following items:

In-Person Communication between school division employees and students

While we certainly agree with the items referring to inappropriate behavior of school board employees and volunteers with students, we have questions about the policy on conversations between teachers and students. Limiting conversations with students to only instruction and school activities would inhibit the special bonding that teachers develop with their students beginning in kindergarten. Students are encouraged to share information about their family and interests in order to make connections with other students and the educator, to better enhance the student’s learning experience. This interaction is encouraged through graduation.

The additional requirement for school board employees to request written permission of a parent or guardian and to inform the principal about more than a single one-on-one conversation with a
student may impact the teacher’s motivation to work with a student to improve behavior or provide ongoing encouragement for achievement.

Electronic communication with students

While every effort should be made by faculty and staff members to utilize school division provided communications with students and parents, in some cases – such as sports teams and faculty sponsored after-school clubs, having the capability to send electronic messages – either text, email, or voice - from personal phones to team members and parents ensures that students are informed about meeting times/dates/cancellations in a timely manner so students are not left unsupervised due to last minute changes in the schedule.

In cases of an urgent or emergency situation when it is necessary for a teacher to contact students using a personal phone, having the additional requirement of reporting in writing to a supervisor the next day puts another burden upon the teacher and the supervisor to monitor and follow up with an additional time commitment during the working day. Contacting students outside of the school day should certainly be limited, but a level of flexibility and unusual situations should be considered.

Training and dissemination of school board policy

While the impact on resources was stated as being minimal, we do have a concern that the local school board will be responsible for the cost of training for all school board employees and volunteers with a qualified vendor. How this training will be implemented and enforced is also a concern, considering the time involved during either in-school or after-school, for all participants. Virginia PTA is supportive of providing these guidelines to school divisions to better protect children, while at the same time providing a safe learning environment for our students.

February 10, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Withheld at request of commenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Public Comment on the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

I strongly agree with the above proposals. As you will recall, I had a daughter at Yorktown High School in Arlington, VA., who was caught in inappropriate sexual contact with a teacher at Yorktown High School on May 19, 2009. The Board revoked the license of Michael Brent Allen on October 28, 2010.

My experience with this very troublesome incident, exposed to me, the absolute failure of Arlington Public Schools and initially, the Virginia State Board of Education, to have measures in place to deal with those teachers and staff who are “caught” in inappropriate sexual behavior with students who are eighteen years of age or older. A student under the age of eighteen is protected by the law, but all students, regardless of their age, must be protected.

There must be mandatory notification by local jurisdictions of any sexual misconduct, to the State Board of Education, of any student in the public school systems in Virginia. This should include those students who are eighteen years of age or older; the reporting of these incidents must be the same as the reporting requirements for those students who are under eighteen years of age. All students must be protected by the sexual misconduct of teachers or other school board employees. Teachers should not text students, friend them on social networks, and use only their work emails to communicate with students. A teacher should not be alone with a student off school property. A concern is how this will be monitored, and by whom.

Additional information which should be included in these guidelines that would be helpful, is to have each local jurisdiction have in place, education for the students themselves. If they witness behavior that is uncomfortable for them, they should tell a parent, another teacher, school counselor, principal or another responsible adult. Typically, comments about a teacher that students discuss between themselves, i.e. “He’s creepy”, “If you wear a low cut shirt, you’ll get a better grade,” or “the girls in the class get better grades than the boys” should be reported at the time they occur. Both other teachers and students must feel safe; know that reporting such behavior will not carry any retribution for them.

If these Guidelines are approved by the Board of Education, what will the follow-up be with local jurisdictions to assure local policies and procedures meet the requirements of 22.1-253.13:7, Standard 7, of the Virginia Code?

I question why local jurisdictions don’t have adequate policies to address sexual misconduct of teachers or other school board employees, if this law was passed during the 2008 General Assembly. What is the procedure for dispersing the information to the appropriate parties when new laws are passed? Who is responsible for insuring local jurisdictions are meeting the requirements in their implementation of new laws?

Clearly, if approximately 120 out of 169 actions on licenses since 2000 involved sexual misconduct of teachers, more needs to be done to protect all children in the public schools in Virginia. These proposed Guidelines are a good first step and I fully support them.
Final Review of Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

This memo offers input on the Proposed Guidelines for Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in VA Schools.

I’ve coached and/or been an athletic director for much of my 32-year teaching career. I’ve also had two daughters that were involved in high school athletics. In my current position of ITRT I’ve been involved in in-service presentations for our 1700plus staff here in Rockingham County Schools. I’ve done extensive work on social media and digital ethics across Virginia and the region. I served on the committee that created the original Virginia Guidelines for Internet Safety. My comments support a common sense mindset in the use of digital communication between students and educational staff including coaches and after school activity sponsors. Any attempt to blame the technology, device or social media tool such as Facebook for inappropriate actions by professionals points to a lack of understanding of digital media. The ethical USE of the tool is the key element in this discussion.

Teachers that sponsor debate, vocational groups, yearbook, sports and other after school activities need to communicate with team members and students, frequently after hours.

Many young teachers do not have house phones. Their cell phone is their only means of communication and in some cases, even email. Given that, I feel we cannot arbitrarily tell a coach or group sponsor he/she cannot have a student’s phone number or contact on their phone. iPods, iPads and other digital devices are also conduits for communication with parents and athletes alike. Students communicate with their cell phone... it’s wired to them. We need to be able to communicate with these digital natives where they communicate!

For example, a baseball coach at my middle school told me how an athlete texted him last night alerting him that his surgery went ok. It’s obvious it was important to the athlete and the coach that this communication be sent. Coach offered words of encouragement and see you at practice when you get back!

After having my two daughters involved in athletics in high school, I’d say as a parent that I had no problem with my daughters communicating to their coaches via cell phone or text message. There were many times when my daughters had to be late or had medical issues. The only way to reach her coach was via cell or texting. There were many times that the coach (and I for that matter when I was coaching) communicated with athletes via email and cell phone.

Coaches, teachers and administrators are highly visible in their communities and must maintain a mindset that “everything they say or do” is under scrutiny. Use of social media such as Facebook, pictures posted and comments by public servants must reflect professional decorum and mindset. Friending students or (for that matter) minors is a risky endeavor and may present ethical quandaries of which the adult may not want to encounter.

I think we DO need to provide leadership and guidelines to coaches about the nature of interactions with athletes/students via cell phones and/or email. Here are some suggestions on guidelines.

They should be in school sports guideline books for students and manuals for coaching staff on school policy.

1. Coaches should keep communications with athletes/team players ONLY to professional school/team information only. No social, no cultural or personal conversations.
2. Coaches should make it clear with their team policies to parents that this communication is acceptable for team and school items only.
3. School personal should know WHO is communicating with them by adding contact information to their contact list. There should be NO communication with “unknown” text posts or calls.
4. Text posts or calls that go beyond these guidelines should be reported to the athletic director, building administrator and parent with the understanding that they are not acceptable.
5. Teachers should make notes in coaching logs, journals, or records that team communications were sent via text/email. Teachers should use their division email service for ALL email communications to athletes or team members (as opposed to their personal email accounts or social media such as Facebook).
6. Think about whom you are communicating with and what you are saying as a professional.

February 9, 2011

Jackie Keith,
NBCT

I am both a teacher and a parent. I applaud the effort to keep students safe, and I agree with the VSTE and VEA letters supporting appropriate, safe use of on- and off-line communications with students. There are many times when the school-provided electronic communications platforms can be supplemented by other web-based communications tools that are also great for education: wikis, Google Docs, twitter, etc.

My concern is how these Guidelines translate to the off-duty life of school employees and their non-
school relationships with school-age children. We live where we work and are part of the community.

**Model policy for electronic communications with students**

- **Under most circumstances**, teachers and other school board employees must restrict one-on-one electronic communications with individual students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by or accessible to the school division.

  **Comments:** Does this mean if a student (on a personal e-mail account) writes to a teacher (on a school account) the teacher cannot respond?

  If a teacher (or other school employee) is an active part of her community, he/she will belong to Facebook groups. Students may also belong to the same Facebook groups, even if they are not direct "friends." Learning today involves learning to be safe online and educators' participation in groups with students can help model that.

  **Example:** A teacher may not "friend" students, but may be part of a scout group or a religious group in which students are also members. Groups can't function if the members can't communicate. While the teacher may have the goal of avoiding direct messaging, a student may send a question that way. The role of the parent/teacher/coach in the group may be to know the answer.

  **Suggestion:** "Under most *school-related* circumstances..."

- **Teachers and other employees may not use personal communications devices to "text" students and are prohibited from interacting one-on-one with students through personal online social-networking sites.** Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact privately through texting and personal social-networking sites.

  **Comments:** Teachers text students and vice versa for all sorts of good reasons: cancellations, updates, coordination of activities. School employees are also parents in the community. A youth group leader or soccer coach would be texting students outside of school.

  **Example:** A teacher may have teenagers. If his child's phone is dead or she is driving and he needs to verify the location and safety of the teen and her friend, the parent would most safely text the friend. Calling does not work. Teenagers text. They do not answer the phone. This limits a parent/teacher's ability to monitor their own children and friends of those children.

  **Suggestion:** "Under most *circumstances* teachers and other employees may not use personal communications devices to "text" students in a *school context* and are should avoid interacting one-on-one with students through personal online social-networking sites.

**Social Interaction with Students**

- **School board employees are prohibited from hosting private social gatherings and parties with students during which alcohol and/or other drugs are consumed.**

  **Comment:** This says alcohol being consumed by adults in any amount is a problem. This seems to say a school employee cannot have a family dinner at which any adult has a glass of wine if his son has invited a friend over.

  **Suggestion:** School board employees are prohibited from providing alcohol/drugs to students. (Since this is already against the law, does it need to be included?)

**Model policy for in-person communications with students**

- **Conversations with students should focus on matters related to instruction and school activities.** School board employees and volunteers should not initiate discussions about their private lives or the intimate details of the private lives of unrelated students.

  **Comment:** A student looks upset or has not been doing well in class. The teacher initiates with "Are you all right?" and the student's home life comes spilling out. Has the teacher just initiated a discussion about the student's private life?

  **Suggestion:** School board employees and volunteers should not initiate discussions about their private lives or the intimate details of the private lives of unrelated students unless there is a concern that the student's education is involved.

**Model policy for on-site and off-site social interaction with students**

- **School employees and volunteers should avoid situations in which they are alone with an unrelated student and not observable by other adults or students.**

  **Comment:** Does this mean not driving a babysitter home? No sleepovers for children with single teacher parents?

  **Suggestion:** School employees and volunteers should avoid *school-related* situations in which they are alone with an unrelated student and not observable by other adults or students.

  The guidelines are well-intended and should be able to address student safety without also heavily impinging upon the ability of teachers to also participate in community and family life in the
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Suzan Guynn  
Director of human resources for Rockingham County Public Schools in Harrisonburg, VA  

Proposed Guidelines for Prevention of Sexual Misconduct  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools, and more specifically, the technological aspects. As a 25 year education veteran, former middle and high school principal, and a seasoned director charged with personnel and human resources, I find the language of these guidelines, even the title, substantially offensive to the majority of professionals in education across the Commonwealth. Consider the condescending message (and subsequent perception) that such guidelines communicate to the public about the need to protect students from school employees. Further, it is my experience that adults prone to this conduct already ignore existing policy that is intended to direct employees to act as professionals and role models. (Ironically, it is also the technology proposed for impact that enables us to accurately target sexual misconduct that might otherwise go untraced and undocumented.)  
There is no bad technology, and it is unreasonable to expect reasonable implementation or enforcement of any guidelines that demand regression in the use of technology for communication. Sexual misconduct is not caused by cell phones and text messaging, or it would be safe to assume that sexual misconduct did not occur before the early 70's. If prevention of sexual misconduct is the true objective of these guidelines, perhaps employees, parents, and students are better served by having their attention directed to laws addressing sexual misconduct and sexual abuse. Surely, taking a swipe at technology as well as the nature of communication between teachers and students -- as a means of preventing sexual misconduct -- is not the message we want to send about technology or about our employees. I would prefer to think we would communicate to our public the highest expectations of -- and pride in -- our people and a similarly high and progressive standard for our use technology.

Gene Kotulka  
Director of Student Services  
Orange County Public Schools  

I am writing you on behalf of the Orange County Public Schools in response to the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct that has been proposed by the Virginia Board of Education. While I applaud the intent of the Virginia Board of Education to protect our students from sexual misconduct by staff members, I am greatly concerned about the unintended consequences of the proposed legislation. I have listed my concerns below point by point:  
Procedures for one-on-one confidential interactions between students and clinicians, and private one-to-one conversations with students should take place within the potential view, but out of earshot of other adults — such as in a classroom with the hallway open door. Since each counselor must notify their supervisor in advance of one-on-one meetings with students, students would no longer be allowed to “drop in” to discuss academic and personal issues that are impacting the student immediately. Counselors must have the freedom and flexibility to meet with students when needed to build effective relationships and to provide broad services to their students.  
Communication between school division employees and students.  
As technology continues to emerge that enhances communication, it has become impossible to restrict all use of electronic communication. Currently, coaches, teachers, and administrators communicate effectively and appropriately with students through email, blackboard, and other social media sites about educational topics, homework, class projects, student activities, and other issues related to students.  
Physical contact and school board employees may not conduct an ongoing series of one-on-one meetings with a student without the knowledge of the principal and without the written permission of a parent or guardian.  
The new guidelines prohibit physical contact between students and staff members in secondary school unless it protects the student. Let me share a story about a high school teacher and student named Mark. Mark had taken the Algebra I SOL exam four times and had failed the exam all four times. When Mark was a second semester senior, he realized that he may not graduate because he had not passed the Algebra I SOL exam. Realizing that he may not graduate, Mark decided to quit school. However after a personal discussion with the teacher, he decided to remain in school. The teacher and Mark worked diligently over the next two months, meeting after school and on weekends to insure Mark’s success on the Algebra I SOL exam. The day of the exam, Mark was very nervous but the teacher was confident about him passing the exam and she expressed her confidence with Mark. Her statement helped him to relax before he took the exam. When Mark found out at the end of the day that he had passed the SOL and that he was going to graduate, he
hugged everybody he could find. He was so excited that he ran down the hallway to find his teacher and hugged her like it was the best thing that ever happened to him. On that day in school and in Mark’s home, many of tears were shed by staff members, teachers, students and family as they were excited to see Mark graduate. Do we want this type of student-teacher relationship to end? The recommended guidelines would prevent much of this from happening.

All off-site, school-related activities involving school board employees and students must be approved by an authorized administrator and must be supervised by at least two unrelated adults.

Most of our clubs, activities, band, drama, choir, and several sports programs have only one sponsor or coach. With the current budget crisis and the ever-rising tide of unfunded state mandates, school divisions will not be able to hire a second unrelated adult to supervise the students. Therefore, the proposed guidelines effectively will eliminate most of our after-school programs and deny our students the experiences that extend learning opportunities beyond the classroom.

Although the intent of the Virginia Board of Education is to ensure that every child remains safe and free from sexual misconduct, I am still greatly concerned about the unintended consequences of the proposed legislation. Before adopting these guidelines, I strongly urge you to postpone the adoption and thoroughly engage the entire school community and stakeholders to reevaluate guidelines and investigate the unintended and unforeseen consequences. Many of the unintended and unforeseen consequences have been stated in this letter and in letters written by others to the Virginia Department of Education. It is critical that the proposed guidelines recognize the ever changing field of communication. It also is important that they recognize the importance of staff members building positive relations with students. Elements of the current draft of the guidelines need further revision in order to insure that they do not result in negative unintended consequences.

February 04, 2011

Amanda Conway

Comments on new texting regulations

I am contacting you to register my opinion on the proposed changes to the Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.

I am currently a high school teacher employed by Rockbridge County Schools in western Virginia. I am very concerned that the DOE is proposing new harsh regulations on electronic communication between teachers and students. Sites like Facebook and cell phone texting are the dominant methods that students use for communication. If teachers are not allowed to use those methods, I think it will further damage our ability to connect with our students. Even college admission offices are largely abandoning other communication means (including email) because students just don’t use them.

I use a Facebook page for my classes to keep students updated about assignments and changes to the class. I have to do this outside of school, because our school blocks it, but my students always comment on how helpful it is. I also occasionally answer text messages from students who have questions about homework or projects. Any public figure, like a teacher, has to be aware of their public conduct. As a result, no matter what I am doing in public, grocery shopping or posting on Facebook, I bear that in mind. The conversations with students I have outside the school environment are just as appropriate as the ones I have inside school.

I understand that there are concerns about the hidden nature of these communication forms, and that the DOE is trying to prevent abuses of the situation. However, I see this as a classic case of punishing the many because of the behavior of the few! If we lose access to these increasingly important channels of communication, I feel that the gap between students and teachers will only widen. In an era where school attendance, graduation rates and SOL pass rates seem to be going down, one of our most important education tools is the teacher-student relationship.

February 1, 2011

Libby Garvey
Chair for the Arlington School Board

Virginia Board of Education Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

The Arlington School Board takes seriously its responsibilities for the safety and security of its students, with protection against sexual abuse by a teacher or other employee chief among them. However, the Board is very concerned about several provisions in the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.

The proposed Guidelines would interfere with the kind of healthy relationships between students and staff members that the Arlington School Board believes are essential to student success. One of the four goals of the School Board's Strategic Plan is Responsive Education. An objective of that goal, which we measure through surveys, is that students have at least one adult in their building
with whom they feel that they can talk about almost anything. In addition, Arlington Public Schools Policy 10-1 includes collaboration as a core value, stating: "We support relationships among students, staff, families and the community that ensure effective communication and promote opportunities to benefit our students."

The Arlington School Board and Arlington County Board chartered the Arlington Partnership for Children, Youth and Families, which focuses on the assets model to improve the health, wellbeing and safety of children, youth and families. The assets model encourages young people to have a trusted adult, in addition to their parents, with whom they can communicate. This trusted adult often is a teacher or other staff member, who can have a positive, life-long impact on a young person. Attached is a statement from the Partnership stating its concerns about the proposed guidelines. The Partnership has surveyed students and found that the percentage of 8th, 10th and 12th grade students who believed that their teachers really cared about them increased from 45 percent to 53 percent between 2001 and 2009. This perception of a caring school climate, a critical asset for youth, increased because Arlington teachers made efforts to build relationships with students.

The draft Guidelines are overly prescriptive and fail to recognize that we have measures in place regarding sexual misconduct and abuse. They also fail to recognize that local school boards represent community values and understand the need to implement programs in a manner that benefit students.

The following are specific issues regarding the proposed Guidelines that cause us the most concern.

**Procedures for one-on-one confidential interactions between students and clinicians**

Developing effective relationships with students is critical to the delivery of comprehensive counseling services for students. It is imperative that counselors have the freedom and flexibility to meet with students who require academic, career or personal-social counseling in a variety of settings, including one-to-one meetings. We believe that all students need to be able to share their concerns with counselors in a safe and supportive environment.

The proposal that clinicians, including counselors, must notify their supervisors in advance of one-on-one meetings and that clinicians keep a log of every such meeting, including the place, purpose and duration of each meeting, would undermine the important, healthy relationship that we want students and counselors to have. For example, this would prohibit a student from dropping in to see a counselor about an academic or personal matter.

**Communication between school division employees and students**

A student may want to share important information with a trusted adult about a matter not related to instruction. This information may impact the student's social and emotional health and overall success in school. Limiting communication strictly to instructional issues impedes the student's ability to get the help he or she may need to adequately resolve an issue. Further, such limitations discourage students from seeking valuable assistance from an adult who can serve as a positive role model and advocate. It undermines a school community's efforts to build assets.

In addition, the proposed prohibition on employees and volunteers initiating discussion about their private lives undermines the healthy relationships that we in Arlington believe are essential to student success. Particularly in the beginning of the school year, we encourage our teachers to share something about themselves to help build their relationships with students. In addition, these Guidelines would essentially eliminate meaningful interactions between volunteer mentors and students because their discussions are not intended to be limited to instruction and school activities.

**Physical Contact**

The prohibition against physical contact unless necessary to protect the health and well-being of students is overbroad. While the model policy distinguishes between students in elementary school and secondary school, and recognizes that some physical contact for both ages may be appropriate, the general statement not allowing physical contact seems inconsistent with the model policy.

**Social Interaction with Students**

The model policy requiring written, parental permission for all off-site, school-related activities and that such activities must be pre-approved by an administrator and supervised by at least two adults is burdensome and unnecessary. Our students often walk as a class with their teacher to areas near their schools and sports teams often walk or run with a coach for practice at a local park. This apparently would be prohibited.

**Virtual Education**

Virtual school programs are typically associated with other public school divisions or universities that generally are bound by policies and provisions already in place in those institutions. Such
providers may be reluctant or unable to contract with schools based on ambiguous guidelines, particularly when they may already have a set of guidelines to which they must adhere; therefore, limiting learning opportunities for students.

Electronic Communications
The Model Policy for Electronic Communications with Students is problematic in many ways. The requirement that electronic communications be on platforms provided by or accessible to the school division would have a chilling effect on the very communication that we are trying to foster. The requirement that any emergency communication that takes place on unapproved platforms be reported in writing on the next school day adds additional burden to the employee and serves no useful purpose.

Training Requirement and the Effect on Volunteers
Arlington has a robust volunteer program. "Lunch buddies" who may read to students in the cafeteria or weekly readers who meet with students after school to read to them or assist them with their homework are just a few of the many volunteers who work in Arlington schools. The training requirement in the draft Guidelines, even if permitted by "workshop or online with a means of confirming participation and completion," will deter some of the volunteers who are devoted to helping our student succeed.

Impact of Requirements on Students
As we have indicated, the draft Guidelines could have a negative effect on the instructional program and goals of the Arlington Public Schools. We also believe that they could cause confusion. By limiting communication between students and adults, students may hesitate to reach out for help, or to report sexual misconduct if it occurs. The effect on adults in the schools could also be negative. A teacher who suspects that a student is being abused at home may hesitate to inquire because the teacher would be violating the tenet that non-school activities should not be the subject of conversations.

Current Policies in the Arlington Public Schools
Arlington Public Schools complies with laws that require background checks for employees and requires certification from contractors. In addition, we have several School Board Policies (SBP's) that pertain to this topic (all of which are available on our website at www.apsva.us/policies). Examples include:

- **SBP 25-1.11 Safety of Students and Child Abuse and Neglect - Child Protective Services:** The Arlington Public School Division (APS) shall maintain safe conditions on school property and provide appropriate safeguards for the protection of students. All students should have the right to learn in a safe and protective learning environment. Children who are abused and neglected cannot learn well or attain their full potential.
  - Policy Implementation Procedure 25-1.11: At least one adult will be designated by the principal to be in visual and voice contact with all students under supervision. During activities when visual and voice contact by an adult is not possible, additional adults will be assigned, or students will be restricted to areas and activities in which it is reasonable to expect that threats to safety will not occur. The number of students under a single adult's supervision will be no larger than that deemed by the principal to be reasonable in terms of the age group and type of activity.

- **SBP 25-1.15 Student Sexual Harassment:** The Arlington Public Schools shall provide learning environments that are free of sexual harassment. No student shall suffer reprisals for reporting any incident, making a good faith complaint, or participating in the investigation of an incident or complaint of sexual harassment. Confidentiality shall be maintained to the maximum extent possible. Substantiated complaints shall result in appropriate disciplinary action.

- **SBP 25-1.17 Student Safety - Bullying/Harassment Prevention:** Arlington Public Schools is committed to creating a safe, caring, respectful learning environment for all students. Bullying or harassment of students, including bullying based on an actual or perceived characteristic, such as race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, mental, physical, or sensory disability, is strictly prohibited and will not be tolerated. Students who engage in bullying or harassing behaviors will be subject to disciplinary action. This policy applies to school buildings; school grounds; school-sponsored social events, trips, and sporting events; and to buses and bus stops. Bullying which occurs off of school premises, including misuse or inappropriate use of technology, is also prohibited and subject to school discipline when the order, safety or welfare of the school or its students is affected as a result of such out-of-school actions.
  - Policy Implementation Procedure 25-1.17: Arlington Public Schools strives to develop and maintain a climate of respect within each school. This includes adult modeling of respectful
behavior and caring responses to student concerns. APS will implement comprehensive procedures to reduce the incidence of bullying and harassment within the school division. Arlington Public Schools will establish student behavioral expectations that address bullying/harassment; provide ongoing staff and student training; establish procedures for reporting bullying/harassment; and provide consistent consequences when incidents of bullying occur.

- **SBP 35-3 Employment:** Because the people who staff the school system are discharging a public trust of great value to the community and because the employees of the school system are the key to a successful educational system, the selection and assignment of persons determined by selecting officials to be the best qualified for vacant positions are essential to the delivery of educational services to the citizens of Arlington.
  - **Policy Implementation Procedure 35-3.1:** As a condition of employment all applicants who are offered and accept positions with the Arlington Public Schools must submit to fingerprinting and provide descriptive information to be submitted along with the finger prints through the Central Criminal Records Exchange to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purpose of obtaining criminal record information.
  - **PIP 40-4.18 Certification about Child Abuse and Criminal Convictions:** All APS services contracts will include language certifying that the contractor (i) has not been convicted of a felony or any offense involving the sexual molestation or physical or sexual abuse or rape of a child; and (ii) whether he has been convicted of a crime of moral turpitude. The certification language will be included even if the contract does not on its face involve services with or to students.

- **SBP 45-2 Acceptable Use of Electronic Networked Resources & Internet Safety:** APS considers the safe and appropriate use of the Internet and networked resources to be essential to the safety and welfare of the school division. Arlington Public Schools (APS) also supports the use and integration of technology to reach educational goals, including those defined by the Virginia Standards of Learning for Computer/Technology, the APS curricula, and the Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel (TSIPs). In support of these goals, the Arlington School Board provides access for students, faculty, and staff to a variety of technology-supported resources including the Internet. ***All users accessing school system electronic networked resources, including the Internet, are expected to use these resources for instructional purposes or to conduct the business of the school division. All APS students and staff members are prohibited from using the division's computer equipment and communication services for sending, receiving, viewing, or downloading illegal or inappropriate material via the Internet. Students are prohibited from accessing materials that APS deems to be harmful as defined in Code 18.2-372 dealing with obscenity.
  - **PIP 45-2:** Acceptable use includes, but is not limited to the following guidelines: ...Use school facilities and electronic resources for school-related instructional and APS business activities. This includes but is not limited to the use of the Internet, e-mail, instant messaging, chat rooms, Web pages, local school and county networks, and other electronic and online resources. ***APS is not responsible for student or staff use of electronic technology resources outside of school. However, staff or students may be disciplined for any technology use that negatively affects the APS or that negatively affects the ability or fitness of any staff person to effectively serve the school division. The use of computer equipment and communication services, technology and the Internet by school personnel shall represent the school/program favorably in the school and in the community and must model appropriate usage for the student population.

**Next Steps**
The Arlington School Board urges the Board of Education to abandon the Draft Guidelines and charge local School Boards with responsibility for meeting the intent of the legislation by developing local policies that meet local needs and take into consideration local concerns.

**January 29, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Kiara Hurt</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONCERNS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As a student, I find that communicating with my teachers outside of the classroom is very helpful. I am able to get assignments that I missed if I was absent in a timely manner so that I will not fall behind in the class. Also, my teachers use Facebook for EDUCATIONAL purposes only. They have created groups where they post homework and other handouts to better help us study. As students, we can post questions and get immediate help. My parents believe that it is THEIR business if they want me to talk to my teachers via Facebook or any other form of communication. This law will only hurt the students and parents!!!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jennifer A. Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACS Teacher at Bedford County Public Schools-SRHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools**

I am a member of the VEA and also a teacher at Staunton River High School in Moneta, VA. I have been teaching for the past three years at the high school level but prior to that, I was an adjunctive therapist at Carillion where I taught life skills to adolescents and adults in an inpatient psychiatric rehab. During this time I was bound by strict rules concerning patient and clinician contact and those rules were clear and specific to the extent they could be. I was able to maintain a healthy relationship with the patients I served as well as adhere to the guidelines of the appropriate code of conduct. When I changed careers I was in a different environment but still maintained, and currently do, the professionalism of having healthy relationships with students while at the same time developing a therapeutic relationship with them as well. This was extremely important when several students of mine chose me to confide in because they felt like they had no one else. I was able to let them know I had to discuss the content of the discussion with my superiors and also let them know I would help with whatever I was legally and ethically able to do. It was because of the boundaries set forth by the school and by my own ethics I was able to do so. That’s why with the proposed legislation, I have some concerns about the wording and the limitations that may be placed on healthy therapeutic relationships between teachers and students.

The first issue relates to the 1:1 conversations about only school related material or instruction. Students feel like you care when they initiate and you respond to their personal lives. If this were not the case my one student would not have trusted me to initiate an investigation into abuse by her stepfather, and that could have resulted in tragedy. The wording needs to reflect the appropriate and ethical exchange of information on a personal level, not the absence of it. I also have concerns about clinicians need to notify staff about a 1:1 student conversation as this is not always possible or therapeutic. The log would be appropriate and a discussion after, however not immediately prior to because there are times you will lose a student or their courage to confide in you. The conversations I have are always prefaced with the premise I will need to share some information and depending on the nature it can’t always be kept confidential by law. If your wording reflects the interaction between student and professional to include the possibly of it being that of a public nature, it may address those issues.

Lastly, the issue of spontaneous hugs being inappropriate with older children may need to be addressed because there are children with special needs that are chronologically teens or adults however cognitively they are at the level of an elementary school child and that would make that an appropriate interaction depending on the student. I have one I work with now who needs to have a hug, initiated by her, so much she goes out of her way to come by and get one. I remind her of appropriateness in school but cognitively that hurts her feelings so we work on it daily.

I am urging you to look at some wording and provisions to consider making some changes. If the words stay the same in some areas it could have a negative impact on the same people it is trying to protect. The student.

Please consider some of the concerns introduced and please let me know if I can elaborate on anything I addressed in this letter. Protect our children however do it in a way that doesn’t damage the therapeutic relation they can have with school professionals like me. That may be the only one they have.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Porter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy and physiology/environmental science teacher at Middlesex High School in Saluda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools**

I would like to express my concerns about the proposed guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools and in particular the following bullets of the Model Policies.

**Model policy for in-person communications with students.**

**Bullet 1** - Educators are challenged to peak the interests of students in learning. Many times that can only be accomplished by asking about interests and other details that may not be related to school. The language in the bullet vague and could cause issues if a biology teacher was to say if they enjoyed watching the Superbowl last Sunday. It continues to be vague as to the term “their”. Are the educators to not talk about the educator’s private life or the student’s private life or both?

My teachers served as role models and not because they knew their subject matter but because they cared enough to share their lives with me. Educators must be able to make subjects relevant to students’ lives and that requires knowing more about students than what is related to educational subject matters.

**Bullet 4** - As educators, we are required to report Child Abuse and Neglect. Often that information is gathered by students initiating a conversation that the student does not want any other person besides the trusted educator to hear. The proposed guideline does not address situations where
this is not feasible such as psychological testing by counselors that require absolute confidentiality.

**Bullet 5:** What is a one-on-one meeting? Are educators prohibited from allowing students to seek help during planning blocks because it may be considered a "series of one-on-one meetings" that they did not inform the parents or principal?

**Model policy for electronic communications**

**Bullet 2** - Educators and students do not always have access to computers in cases where a student may need information but may be able to give that information via “text” messaging. Many of my students will not access email on a daily basis but will respond to text messages and will send messages to me regarding assignments. Providing for a consent form that allows administration to view records of both texting and/or social networking may make more sense. As a forensic science instructor, I know an investigator would much rather know you sent a text message than made a phone call. The text message leaves information on the sender and receiver's account and is much easier to investigate than verbal communications.

**Bullet 3** - This information is already available for investigation should the need arise.

**Model policy for on-site and off-site social interaction with students**

**Bullet 2 & 3** - The language in these would require two adults in every bus and would put an undo burden on smaller school systems.

**Bullet 5** - This bullet would prevent a teacher from giving a coat to a child that did not have a coat but then again teachers are not allowed to ask if the student has a coat.

**Bullet 7** - The language would prevent an educator that was a parent of a student from inviting other educators that were parents over for dinner in which alcohol was consumed because it may be construed as a party.

I understand the intention of the law but as written, it does nothing to prohibit someone intent on committing a crime from doing so and places a needless burden on educators that are trying to engage students.

**Alexandra Dore**

**Teacher-Student Texting/Calling**

My name is Alexandra Dore and I am a sophomore at New Kent High School. Not only do I attend New Kent, but I am also a sophomore at Chesapeake Bay Governor's School which specializes in science and math. I take classes with my governor's school from 8 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and then continue my English and history studies at my home high school. To get to the college that the governor's school is based out of, I am bussed there and following a 45 minute drive away from my house, I arrive. None of my teachers or classmates live in that area, for we come from many different counties.

I am involved in many aspects of both my high school and governor's school extra-curricular activities and due to the fact that I attend two schools at the age of 16, I am often overwhelmingly busy. I play varsity field hockey in the fall, I manage the varsity wrestling team in the winter, and I play varsity soccer in the spring. In the spring, I compete in Odyssey of the Mind and this is the first year that I am also competing in the Beta club talent convention.

My coaches and teachers are not only teachers and coaches, but mentors, friends, and role models. They are men and women, young and old, and all part of my personal support group that ease my specific stressors and struggles through my high school journey. To contact my governor's school instructors I either call them or text them. Texting is preferred due to the fact that it is less time consuming and does not interrupt what the other is doing. If school is canceled due to inclement weather, it is rarely listed on the radio or television due to the fact that the governor's school is fairly small, constructed of approximately 75 students per campus. We are alerted personally by our teachers through a phone tree, and without it everyone is left in the dark. During my sports seasons, my coaches use texting and calling to alert their players in schedule changes or just to check in on our grades and stress level (due to the fact that varsity sport participation is a lot to manage along with a successful high school career). They also become close friends in which to confide in. The relationship which blossoms is neither unhealthy nor wrong and does not violate my boundaries or theirs. Often times I text or call my old teachers to set up tutoring sessions or ask for help with current assignments or lessons. The contact I have with them allows me to be successful.

The relationship which is allowed to develop due to teacher and student contact through texting and/or calling is not unnatural, invasive or harmful in any way. One mistake made with this situation should not cause other students all over Virginia to have their time with their teachers limited to the 6 hours we spend in school daily. In most situations, teacher-student contact out of school is imperative to success in high school. I have the right to use my phone privileges to contact whomever when necessary and my rights school not be limited due to someone else’s
mistake, theirs should. Thank you for your time and I hope you consider what I say, for I need the relationships I have been able to develop with my role models at school. With much appreciation,

**Kaylyn Kelly**  
**Student-Teacher Texting**  
This is Kaylyn Kelly and I'm 15 years old. I am a student at Chesapeake Bay Governors School and am active in many different school sports. Everyone I've talked to has agreed with me saying that teacher-student texting is an absolute need for students and teachers to have. In Governor's School we go on many field trips and are usually given the numbers of our teachers to text them or call them to inform them of where we are, if we're lost, where to meet them, and many other important things. Also, it's an extreme convenience that most of our teachers are quickly accessible through the phone when we need to get information or ask questions about particular assignments. Without it, there's no way to contact our teachers if we need assistance on an assignment or if we were to get lost on a field trip. I used to be a member of the crew team and if texting with my coaches were banned then I would have missed countless AM practices, sudden places to meet during a regatta, changes in event times, and times to schedule my one-on-one training with our coach or athletic trainer. I think students should be able to be alone with coaches or teachers because sometimes that is how certain people can concentrate on one's class work such as tutoring. And I know that athletic one-on-one training with my coach was a good thing because she could ask me questions about what I eat or do to workout, etc. that I wouldn't have felt uncomfortable answering around my peers and the same concept applies when I got one-on-one tutoring with my math teacher. I wouldn't want to ask him some of the questions unless I wasn't around my classmates so I didn't seem 'stupid.' Do not ban student-teacher texting because many students use it to their advantage and if this isn't enough proof for you then I don't know what would be because something that involves teachers teaching students also requires the students to ask questions to their teachers during or OUT of school. If you take away our right to be in contact with our teachers then you're making a grave mistake on the students' part.

**Jerrica Rawls**  
**Student teacher texting**  
Hello, I am a student of the Chesapeake Bay Governors School for math and environmental sciences; because of the hard, challenging classes I take, I absolutely NEED to get in touch with my teachers. I have texted and called my chemistry teacher quite often with questions on how to do my homework or what I need to know for a quiz. It's comforting knowing that my teachers are available when I need their assistance. I'd I couldn't text my teacher then my grades would simply go down the drain. Why should everyone receive the repercussions of only a few mistakes? Please protect our education and our futures....

**Elizabeth G. Lambert**  
Guidance counselor at Brunswick High School in Lawrenceville, VA  
**Concerns about prohibiting use of social media**  
I am writing to voice my deep concerns about the Board’s proposal to prohibit all use of social media between students and teachers. I am not in favor of this measure which I feel would take away a very important means of communicating outside of the school setting. I am a guidance counselor in a rural Southside high school. I could give you numerous examples of how I use social media to communicate professionally and effectively with my students. As a matter of fact, I would feel like I lost my right arm if I could not communicate with them on Facebook. I have talked drop outs into coming back to school, I have given advice to scared teens who thought they might be pregnant and didn't know what to do, and I have sent thousands of messages of encouragement to students who needed it to get through a tough time. I know of a lot of teachers here at my school who use it to remind students to study, to answer questions about homework, and again, to give encouragement. This type of media is not going away; we should embrace its use and make it a positive experience. I am so tired of a few bad apples ruining the good things that we as professionals on the front lines of education try to do for our students. I hope this is not another example of that happening. The few who are going to use it for negative reasons are going to use it anyway, regardless of your policy. Let us who will use it to sincerely help our students continue to do so.

**Jonathon M**  
**Comments on the ban**  
I am both a student at Chesapeake Bay Governors School and Lancaster High School, and the ban is not going to work. I find on field trips that being able to contact my teacher if I am in trouble or one of my friends is, I have the ability to immediately contact my teacher. This ban is senseless and will only cause safety and other issues.
Furthermore, it will not prevent sexual interactions between teachers, because like Prohibition it will be worked around and it happens to like .001% of students, so justify the ban for me then.

### Concerns Regarding Proposed Virginia DOE Sexual Misconduct Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roxanne Rodes, M.S.Ed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher at Linkhorn Middle School in Lynchburg, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns Regarding Proposed Virginia DOE Sexual Misconduct Guidelines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respectfully wish to express that I am very concerned about the new Sexual Misconduct Guidelines being proposed by DOE. I deeply appreciate your consideration of these matters. Thank you in advance for your assistance, and willingness to work with teachers, students, parents to improve education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. I appreciate your sharing my concerns with the Virginia DOE. Please refer to my e-mail excerpt below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Do the new guidelines prohibit teachers entirely from being a member of a social networking site, or does it just prohibit a teacher from communicating with a student (minor under 18 years of age that one personally teaches) via a social networking site? Would college and alumni websites like classmates.com be prohibited if the teacher never interacts with a student on these sites (For example, he or she just has classmates from his/her own college days as &quot;friends&quot; (individuals who are in their 20's, 30's, 40's, etc. only)? What about university discussions (Harvard Crimson online comments, M.I.T. open courseware discussion groups regarding classes, etc. Even classes with online Blackboard discussion groups that we may be forced to create and participate in for recertification with ODU, UVA, etc. for our teacher's license renewal? What about wiki's that the school system requires teachers to set up, or remnants from past school requirements, etc. including homework blogs that the school system makes us periodically update still? Please clarify. If any of these sites and networks are now prohibited, what steps should we take to notify the sites that we need to cancel accounts, etc. in order to be in compliance with new laws and guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.S. Is this even constitutional under the 1st. Amendment to the United States Constitution regarding freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of assembly? What about the 14th. Amendment as well under the concept of &quot;equal protection&quot;? Are teachers being deprived of rights as citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States that other citizens take for granted?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public comment on proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in VA Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linda S. Robinson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Department at James Monroe High School in Fredericksburg, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public comment on proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in VA Public Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a teacher of high school English, as sponsor of my school's National Honor Society chapter, and as a former seven year veteran of the Fredericksburg City School Board, I am writing in strong opposition to the far-reaching terms of the currently proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in VA Public Schools on the grounds that they will greatly impair my ability to perform the duties of my positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a 59 year old teacher and parent. I am on a ten month contract, and during the school year my work day at school begins at 6:00 a.m. and ends at 4:00 if I am lucky, after which I go home to grade papers, prepare for the next day, and send out emails: I contact students who were absent and need copies of class documents; I remind students of make-up opportunities and schedules; I request volunteers from among my NHS members to help with upcoming projects, since we meet only once a month and many needs crop up in between; I respond to student and parent email requests for letters of recommendation, advice on assignments, and so on. This list goes on and on, taking up a good portion of each evening. Having a home and family obligations, I cannot spend any more hours per day at school than the ten or more I already put in, yet I try to be always accessible to both students and parents who have questions or needs--- and these contacts are always of a professional, not a personal, nature. There is simply no free time at school to attend to all these responsibilities, and to legally bar me or any of the countless other dedicated teachers from reasonably meeting our obligations is to severely impair our ability to do our jobs of helping students succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I am on only a ten month contract, I teach AP English, which entails student work over the summer months--- reading/analyzing novels and writing essays--- which of course I must also grade over the summer without additional compensation. To assist my students, I spend a substantial amount of uncompensated time emailing them feedback on their writing, and sending out helpful instructional materials. I do not have a classroom or school computer access over the summer months so must do all this work and contact from home. To be unable to use this means to maintain regular contact with my students would greatly hamper my ability to provide the required instruction and assistance to my students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Our National Honor Society selection process also begins in July when school is not in session. While packets of materials are mailed out to candidates in early July, it is often necessary to contact candidates via email or phone over the summer months to seek clarification of material on
their applications, or to send mass reminders of approaching deadlines. Again, I do not have classroom or school computer access over the summer. I take my "vacation" time to assure that the needs of my students, and my duties as an educator and sponsor, are met to the best of my ability.

The circumstances I have cited are my own, but most teachers/coaches/sponsors in school systems throughout our state would have similar stories to tell. Passage of the proposed Guidelines would make reasonable and professional communication by teachers ludicrously onerous. Teaching is, unfortunately, not a 9-to-5 --- or even a 6-to-4--- job. To do our jobs well and effectively, we must have the freedom to communicate with our students as necessary, when necessary, in their best interests. I greatly doubt the current guidelines would in any way impede the efforts of a determined predator, but they certainly will impair the abilities of thousands of dedicated teachers to do what must be done to work effectively with our children and parents. I hope you will strongly consider the impact of this legislation on those of us who are committed professionals simply trying to perform our jobs while drowning in a growing tide of requirements which there is never adequate time to perform; hence, we also give up our personal lives and time to get the job done--- and without the ability to continue to do this, the job won't be done.

Karl Loos
Athletic director, History dept. chair, 7th Grade Team Leader, A-Period Committee, Secondary Leadership Committee, Events Committee, Innovation Task Force at Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School for Innovation

Sexual Misconduct Guidelines
As a parent and a teacher, I appreciate the School Board trying to prevent inappropriate behavior activities between teachers and students. However, these new guidelines go too far and should not be enacted.

In trying to prevent inappropriate behavior by a very few minority, you are tying the hands of the thousands of quality teachers in the state. Teachers who understand that educating a student means team-building and working together, which contact outside of school and in the community is crucial for. Teachers who understand that the hug that the elementary student who gets excited gives them may be the only hug that child gets for the day. Teachers who are professional and passionate.

Teachers who break the rules should be punished. Don't punish all of us, though, by limiting how well we can reach our students.

Pamela R. Moran
President-elect of the Virginia Association of School Superintendents

I am writing to you on behalf of The Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS) and ask that this statement be shared with the Virginia Board of Education. The VASS Board has reviewed the proposed model guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct that the Virginia Board of Education has under consideration for final action. Sexual misconduct towards a student is an egregious issue of the upmost seriousness and VASS members have no tolerance towards any such behavior exhibited by employees of the School Board. In addition to legal channels governed by state and federal law, the VASS Board believes that such inappropriate and illegal behavior also must be addressed through local School Board Policy governing the Code of Conduct for Employees of the School Board.

While the intent of the proposed guidelines is to ensure that every child under the care of Virginia’s public school employees is protected from sexual misconduct by staff, the superintendents also have concerns about unintended consequences if these guidelines were to be implemented as they currently are written. For example, as superintendents we are aware of staff members who use electronic communication devices as professional communication tools with students who have their own personal electronic communication devices and accounts. We know of coaches, teachers, principals, and superintendents who communicate with students via email and through social media sites about a variety of school-related activities or issues, such as, but not limited to, homework, canceled extracurricular events, or matters of policy or school practice affecting students in our schools. Because of the potential impact on appropriate, emerging uses of electronic communication technologies, VASS believes that more thorough consideration of the implications of the recommended guidelines must occur before the Virginia Board of Education takes action.

We also know that Virginia’s educators use a variety of free online digital content and web-based work sites as spaces in which they work with students in their classes. These open source and/or free sites such as Moodle, Wikis, KidBlogs, Google, VoiceThread, Edmodo, Scribd, Facebook, Twitter and others are not necessarily “provided” or hosted by the school division. These digital content and communication-based educational applications would be prohibited under guidelines found in the recommended policy. Currently, educators across Virginia are using these social learning media sites to motivate and engage digital learners at little or no expense to school
divisions. Educators also receive guidance about the importance of using such sites for learning purposes from their national professional organizations. For example, the recent publication Writing, Learning and Leading in the Digital Age, a College Board–National Writing Project (NWP)–Phi Delta Kappa International (PDKI) report, encourages practices that would be in direct contradiction to recommendations of the proposed model policy guidelines. Conflicts between this policy and Virginia’s approved Educational Technology Plan and the USDOE’s National Education Technology Plan also exist and must be addressed.

The members of VASS universally support the spirit of recommendations to set professional boundaries and appropriate limits for face-to-face and electronic communication and interaction between Board employees and students. School Boards and superintendents in Virginia have a long standing commitment to setting professional boundaries and expectations through an explicit and clear Employee Code of Conduct. Such a Code of Conduct has been already enacted in local Board policy in most divisions and used to take action when staff members have violated the law and/or the Code of Conduct.

To ensure that thorough engagement occurs with the public and employee stakeholder groups in developing model guidelines before the policy guidelines are approved, VASS recommends the following:

1. Delay of action upon the agenda item until each of the superintendents’ regional groups can provide in-depth feedback through VASS to the Board Of Education (VaBOE).
2. Consideration by the Attorney General of these recommendations with time to publicize his opinion of the recommendations.
3. Feedback on the agenda item from a representative stakeholder group made up of members who work directly with students and who can delineate unintended consequences of specific recommendations.

Nothing is more critical to the work of Pk-12 educators than the relationships they build and nurture with the young people they serve. Again and again, research makes clear that educators must develop strong positive relationships with young people. We want to ensure that any BOE action to define “model” boundaries and limits for staff-student relationships does not limit positive interactions in ways that parents and educators would never have intended. We think these recommendations need more work before they are ready for action.

In conclusion, VASS believes that the BOE policy guideline recommendations must be consistent with the professional use of changing electronic communication systems available today and which will continue to evolve into the future. Most importantly, the superintendents want to be sure that no child is ever victimized by anyone employed by our Boards. We recommend that the BOE further engage stakeholders in determining how both of those objectives can be met.

January 19, 2011

Cecelia M. Owens-Graves
Retired Hampton teacher

Teacher-Student Texting Feedback: The Daily Press said it best in an opinion piece, dated January 7, 2011:

"The underlying goal should be obvious: to preserve the stature and status of teachers. After all, that, along with their command of their subject and their commitment to students, is what makes them successful in shaping not only young minds but also character. It is hard for teachers to hang on to the stature and status of a professional if they are Facebook friends with students."

The article continues with: "The standard of professional conduct is as old as education as a profession, or calling. The challenge for school boards is to update it to modern technology." All communication should be transparent, accessible to supervisors and professional in content and tone."

I think that article speaks volumes. Personally I am against all contact and use of all the electronic toys available. Why does the Student Press Law Center (Daily Press, Jan. 13, 2011) consider it crucial for coaches and sponsors of extracurricular activities? After-school programs and extracurricular activities have been managed successfully for decades without them. Cell phones and pagers are a distraction and if the school board votes to include them, then a very strict policy on their use is mandatory - for the protection of the student as well as the teacher/sponsor. What is really sad here is, as said in the Opinion piece, "it's appalling that its even necessary for the guidelines to state the obvious." Whatever happened to good sense, responsible judgment and parental responsibility? We have sky high dropout rates, teenage pregnancies, drug and alcohol issues, and poverty concerns. Why are we spending our precious time on electronic gadgets that have nothing to do with educating our children? Talk about computer education and I will support it. Cell phones in students' possession have no place in our schools.

H. Alan Seibert
Comments from a Division Superintendent regarding the propose Regs for Prevention of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendent of Salem Schools</th>
<th>Misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Salem Schools</td>
<td>I am sure that you are inundated with comments on this topic, so other than to say that I agree with VASCD, Bill Bosher, and others who suggest that we should target the behavior and not the medium, the purpose of this email to provide a few anecdotes about how these well-intentioned &quot;model guidelines&quot; could negatively impact me personally. Also, I previously submitted the attached copies of a recently adopted Salem City School Board regulation on the topic (as well as the policy that anchors the regulation). Not that I think we have the answers for the Commonwealth, just to share that after several months of discussion with a high degree of participation that we elected to address professionalism not a particular medium. Now for two personal examples: First, as a small division, I am fortunate to have an active Advisory Council comprised of middle and high school students. I annually give my email address and cell phone number to these students so that they may keep me apprised of concerns or ask questions when they have them. Over the past four years, emails from my advisory council members have decreased. It is clear that they prefer texting and it would be unfortunate to cut off that means of communication. On the contrary, our Division plans to leverage it and will be debuting &quot;Talk About It&quot; a texting program that will encourage students to text in concerns and ideas later this month. Second, having formerly served in the division as an elementary principal, I cannot visit our middle or high school where those students now attend without receiving many hugs from former students. Wanting to maintain appropriateness, professionalism, and being sensitive to appearances, I have become adept at turning my body so as to greet the oncoming former students sideways with a one-armed, &quot;hey, how'ya do'in&quot; hug, thereby preventing a full embrace, but a sad day it would be that I would have to begin turning my back on former students. In closing, I know first-hand how hard it can be to reconcile policy and practice, so I thank you for leading this effort and for the additional opportunity to offer comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Blosser</th>
<th>Seeking Additional Comment: Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Latin teacher at James Monroe High School in Fredericksburg | I have become aware of the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools. I have very strong opinions on several of these Guidelines, and I would like for my thoughts to be added to the public comment. My name is David Blosser, and I am the Latin Teacher at James Monroe High School in Fredericksburg, Virginia. I have reviewed the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools, and I have some comments concerning in particular the guidelines for electronic communications. Although I recognize that we teachers need to create the safest environment possible for our students, I feel that several of these guidelines are restrictive to the point of being detrimental to my effectiveness as a teacher. If we allow these guidelines to take effect, I will be losing major avenues of communication with my students. When this communication is vital to their education, then we must not allow for this communication to be denied. When I was in high school, my Latin Teacher made it a point to write her home phone number inside the cover of each of our textbooks. If any of her students had questions, concerns, or problems with assignments, they never had an excuse if they didn't contact her. She wanted to make herself as available to them as possible. When I became a Latin teacher, I followed her lead. Now, however, my students have my cell phone number so that they can reach me whenever they need my help. Some teachers have expressed concern to me that students might abuse having my phone number, but with one exception in 8 years, all phone calls from students have been of an appropriate nature. As technology has evolved, I have changed what I find acceptable. Today's students are more likely to send a short text than they are to actually call someone, and so I have now allowed students to text me if they have brief questions or concerns. Without exception, all texts from students have been appropriate and my communication has been helpful to the student. If I were to tell students that they were no longer allowed to text me, I would be losing one of my most helpful lines of communication. You may say that students would still be able to call me on the phone, but I know that some students would rather not ask a question than have to use the telephone. With texting, they are able to quickly and conveniently receive my help. We should never deny our students the opportunities to receive our help - once denied, some students may not ask again. I also have concerns about the restrictions to student and teacher interaction through social-networking sites. Two years ago, I was absent for a month to undergo surgery. I was able to obtain a qualified substitute, but my AP Latin students were concerned that they wouldn't have sufficient opportunities to prepare for their AP exam. Since I would not see them on a daily basis,
but I would have access to a computer, one student suggested that we create a Facebook group for our class. On Facebook, we would have an easily accessible site on which to post questions, comments, and plans for meeting. Students could ask each other questions and give help to each other rather than relying on me for assistance. Facebook proved to be such a helpful tool that I allowed other students to add me on Facebook. Many times, I have received messages from students asking for help with assignments, and I do not know if these questions would have been asked through other channels as easily. Could other pages be set up to accomplish similar tasks as Facebook? Certainly, but when Facebook is the tool that students are most comfortable using, why should we avoid its use? Instead of prohibiting teacher and student interactions through social media, we should create Facebook pages for our classrooms and our schools to better foster relationships between our students and their teachers and administration.

Again, I believe that it is our responsibilities as educators to ensure that students are kept safe from misconduct and harm. I do feel, however, that many of these proposed guidelines would serve hinder the vital communication I have with my students. When technologies change, why should we restrict our access to them? We should, instead, embrace these new tools of communication and use them to further our goals of educating our children. Not only can I communicate more easily with my students, but I can also be a role model for how my students ought to behave while using these tools. My personal life might appear more open to students on Facebook than it has been in the past without it, but on that site and in my interactions with students there I am no less professional. And though some oversight may be necessary, to force teachers to document each instance of electronic communication may cause some to abandon their use and, once again, to lose such a vital source of communication. I strongly urge that these restrictive guidelines be further reviewed. To completely deny teachers the use of these methods of communication will do nothing but harm the education of our children.

As representatives of the Center for Scholastic Journalism at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, we urge the Virginia Department of Education to reconsider its proposed model policy for electronic communications with students. CSJ, a national center for research and a clearinghouse on issues affecting journalism teachers and their students, has found these educators must be in the forefront of technology use, and this policy would seriously restrict that.

Today's journalism educators must prepare their students to achieve the highest professional standards and learn to use the latest tools of the trade, whether, after graduation, they plan to become tomorrow's media practitioners or simply citizens in our democracy. The proposed policy, particularly the following sections, would limit the ability to do so:

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.
- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to "text" students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites.

Although it is commendable to wish to protect students from sexual misconduct and abuse, those two provisions would not necessarily do that but would create roadblocks to good teaching and to good media advising. In particular, they would:

- Prevent demonstrating for students responsible use of new communications technology. Virginia journalism programs now attend national and regional journalism conventions where speakers routinely describe and promote such technology as means to strengthen educational programs, including the use of social networking and the presentation of news to multiple communities. Without instruction and modeling by adults, students will still be exposed to the technology, but they will only learn how to use these digital media tools from their peers.
- Limit teachers' methods for viewing or commenting on student work. This weakens the learning environment and encourages teachers to become out-of-date in their methods. In journalism classrooms across the country, students file stories and exchange information using the latest technology. Editors, staffers and advisers comment share and collaborate with each other. Preventing Virginia students from participating in such activities would put them at a serious disadvantage when they attend college with peers who have not been so restricted.
- Hamper publications advisers from keeping in touch with students who are on assignment at a news event or who might be at a journalism convention where emergency' contact is
needed for student safety. Curtailing all texting or other forms of electronic communications simply blames a modern method on problems that could arise instead of recognizing the educational value of it when educators and students are trained to use it properly. We understand the need and obligation to keep students safe, in reality and in perception, but we hope you will keep our points in mind as you consider this proposed policy. Scholastic journalism as a viable educational tool needs the use of emerging technology to carry out its educational mission. We believe it is a much sounder policy to regulate inappropriate uses of new technology (as the school does for all other forms of communication) than it is to ban all uses, the vast majority of which can be of great benefit to the student, the school and the community.

David J. Holleran, Ed.D
Division Superintendent
William T. Vrooman III
Division Technology Coordinator for Mathews County Public Schools

A component contained in the proposed regulation modification related to § 22.1-253.13:7 of the Code of Virginia contains a section on electronic communications with students that has items that do not meet our district's future plans related to technology use. To be realistic, email, phone calls, casual conversations in class, halls and school events as well as any form of communication between staff and students has risks. I agree that the "behavior" of staff that communicates with students may require regulation to clarify district policy, but banning technology should not be a target of this regulation.

Below I have included comments after the specific items that do not meet our plans in order to provide some insight into challenges small districts face and how this regulation in its current form limits our options.

Model policy for electronic communications with students:

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division. There is a need to move forward with public cloud computing in smaller districts which will enable employees and students to use free accounts, systems and platforms that may not be directly controlled or provided by the school division, if small districts are required to pay and provide support for all these types of services and systems, budget priorities in other areas will override and ultimately reduce the access and opportunity students have to these systems.

- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to "text" students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. School districts now face the reality that one to one computing will be required to meet student needs, but there will never be sufficient funding to make this happen and to maintain a realistic device and software replacement cycle as well as enabling digital text book replacement plans. The only way a small district can meet this reality is if they allow students and staff to bring in their own personal devices to help save the district money and reallocate device and software funding to needy students and staff. In the future, students and staff may be more comfortable with their personal IPhone, IPad, digital book reader or other mobile device and will be happy to use this device rather than a 7-year-old computer provided by the school.

- Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites. With so many social networking and related Web 2.0 sites available it is difficult to understand why school districts would want to ban this technology. Most middle school and high school students have cell phones with text, if you are a coach of extracurricular activities and need to let students know about a last minute change, providing them a quick text is the most effective communication method. In many cases one of the secondary phone numbers parents list on our automated school alert and closing system is their child's cell phone. This is the way the current generation of students and teachers communicate and schools need to embrace this technology. Invitation to participate in a wide range of educational discussions and topics is one of the most powerful aspects of Web 2.0 and social networking and should not be banned. Behavior and professional expectations should be the only items conveyed by this policy.

- Teachers and other school board employees may not knowingly engage in online gaming with students. There are online games that are educational and a teacher's participation with their class or individual student may be something that is highly desirable to enhance instruction and learning. This is no different than an employee that engages in chess practice and instruction after school in order to enhance the critical thinking skills of their students. In addition, there are several game design schools in the region that High School students might want to attend.
virtually for college credit and may ultimately need instructors to evaluate their design by playing the game with the student.

- School board policy on electronic communications with students also applies to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

Additional clarification and modification of the first three items above would make this item more meaningful during the program and vendor selection process as well as defining the expectations of contract instructors. In its current form it might limit the instructor's options in a virtual or distance learning setting and adversely affect the student's experience in this method of instruction.

---

**January 18, 2011**

Sarah Kinzer  
My mom's a teacher. Will I still be allowed to talk to her, or...?

**January 16, 2011**

Leif Powers  
**Fairfax, VA**

Public Comment - Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

I'm Leif Powers, acting in my private capacity as a Virginian. I wanted to briefly comment on the Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools (VA.R. Doc. No. R10-2130; Filed November 16, 2010, 10:44 a.m.).

Reading a summary in a recent Washington Post item, I was concerned that the guidelines would create a conflict with teachers' ability to develop relationships and personally connect to the students, which is really key in getting through to a number of the kids who struggle in school.

However, reviewing the guidelines in detail, I believe that the guidelines stopped just short of creating a daily obstacle to educators' lives. The guidelines are strict and somewhat nettlesome from an administrative standpoint (particularly on the IT side), and I'm not sure that they are worth the effort (this is largely out of the scope of this specific regulation). However, I do want to say that if it was indeed the intent of the guideline developers to create the strictest standards possible without creating significant problems, based on my cursory review, I think they have achieved their goal.

---

Jan Barrett  
Journalism, English, teacher, newspaper and yearbook adviser at Lafayette High School, Williamsburg, VA

**Ban on texting**

The ban on texting and teacher's personal involvement with their students will not serve the purpose it is intended. I am not sure there is a way to alleviate deviant behaviors. That has become even more evident with the shootings in Tucson. But banning what has quickly become normal and everyday forms of communication between student and teacher will only exacerbate other problems, not eliminate sexual predators. Instead of banning, educators should embrace the new technology. I do think that is what teachers have already done by relying on texting and social networks to stay connected with their students. As a journalism teacher, it is a travesty that teachers will not be able to model what they teach.

Here are other issues I see.

1. Traveling with groups of students to conventions and conferences will be next to impossible as teachers will have to rely on students to relay all the informational changes to other students via their cell phones. Teacher's authority to control and take charge will be diminished.
2. It will build a wall of inaccessibility between student and teacher. Teachers will become nearly unapproachable and shun student involvement for fear of losing their jobs.
3. Who is going to police this matter? Will teachers be required to make their cell phone and personal computer records available to administrators? That would be opening another can of worms that few organizations have time for.
4. I work with student publications in a business environment that is timely, as we must constantly meet deadlines and it highly charged. Often times my editors know more than I do about the status of a story, where to find business forms, whether or not they have submitted pages or made the deposits for the day etc. I will text them to find out the answers----fast, efficient, harmless. With the information I gather in minutes, seconds sometimes, I do whatever has to be done and move on to the next issue.

I see a multitude of other issues but these are the top four. Please rethink the ban on texting and close personal involvement with students. It will only make teaching and reaching kids on their level that much harder.

---

Emily R. Fisher  
Teacher-Student texting

I wanted to express my opinion on the proposed limitations of teacher-student texting. Texting is used when needed by coaches and teachers to coordinate after school activities (including volunteer community service activities) particularly when there are no-notice changes to schedules
because of weather and or transportation problems (not rare events). A total ban on these types of
texting would not only make it more difficult for coaches/teachers to communicate with their
students/players, but also becomes a safety factor when events are cancelled because of weather
conditions and the student unknowingly tries to get to the school or an event having received no
notification of the cancellation. Many families no longer have home phones and rely solely on their
cell phones to communicate.
Texting is the most efficient and surest way of getting out the word on cancellations, changes, etc.
Banning texting will not stop the teacher who uses this medium inappropriately. Educating the
students and teachers on what is proper would be more effective. Should a questionable text be
sent, it could be available for administrators to decide if it was in fact inappropriate whereas the
content of a telephone conversation would not be available for review.
Texting is a technology tool, nothing more and nothing less. The user is the responsible party and
if they are determined to act inappropriately they will find a way despite a ban. Go after the
abusers, not the technology.

January 15, 2011

Ms. E Widener
Science Teacher/
Forensics Coach

New technology limits
As a teacher and coach, I find the proposed ban on using technology to interact with our students
to be ridiculous. I've found that the best way to contact the students on my team about
transportation changes and meet information is through technology. I know that some people
make inappropriate use of technology but to punish everyone by banning it all together does more
harm than good. It makes the people proposing the ban seem ignorant and closed minded. If we
can't reach our kids in a way they understand we may not be able to reach them at all. It can make
the difference between a student graduating or falling through the cracks. Please don't punish
everyone for the acts of a few.

January 14, 2011

Michael Karlik
Charlottesville, VA

Comments on DOE's Proposed Guidelines
I am a graduate of Virginia's public schools and a current student at the University of Virginia. To
me, the meaningful aspects of the proposed guidelines include a mandatory report to police when
abuse is alleged or suspected (and not simply after the abuse is proven); and notification of the
state superintendent when an employee resigns or is fired because of child abuse.
But the Board also proposes to regulate the conduct of teachers in and out of the classroom in a
way that could adversely affect twenty-first century teaching techniques. Being a teacher is more
than being an instructor: sometimes, teachers have to be social workers, therapists, or advocates
for individual students.
That is why it is unfortunate that the Board wants to prohibit "interactions unrelated to instruction" and
dictate the specific types of physical contact teachers may have: a hand on the shoulder or
pat on the back is okay, but a "spontaneous hug" is "not appropriate with older children." So a
distraught high school junior who discovers she is pregnant cannot seek an extended embrace
from a trusted teacher?
Or what about the requirement that "conversations with students should focus on matters related
to instruction and school activities?" Does this forbid a teacher and student of Arab descent from
talking about their shared heritage and culture once a week after class?
The Board should consider dropping language like this, which seeks to absolutely prevent abusive
contact by a miniscule number of instructors at the expense of healthful student-teacher
interaction. Reasonable guidelines seem to warrant simply a prohibition on romantic relationships
and inappropriate verbal and physical contact.
Another worrisome area is the Board's treatment of electronic communication. Because social
media are transforming rapidly, it is true that teachers and students may not readily comprehend
the possible impropriety of online interactions. However, I am not sure that Board of Education
members understand the potential for good that these technologies may offer.
Imagine the heinous "offenses" that Virginia would outlaw if these social media restrictions were
approved. A low-income student without an at-home computer could not text her teacher
questions about homework assignments, in lieu of sending an e-mail. A teacher who posted
pictures of a class project on Flickr could not respond to comments or inquiries by her students.
And a student who wanted to quickly alert a guidance counselor to questionable content on
Facebook could not correspond with him through a Facebook message.
Kevin Ricks was able to molest so many students not because MySpace made it easier—but
because school systems' nonsensical hiring, firing, and reporting policies allowed him to walk
away without consequence. Ricks was able to transfer schools with a clean record because no
authority ever investigated him. Each new principal had no idea that Ricks was a predator.
Lowering the threshold for reporting abuse should ensure that school systems can better monitor alleged molesters. However, prohibiting teachers from using their discretion when counseling, connecting with, and reaching out to students injects the state Board of Education needlessly far into public school classrooms.

Debbie H. Johnston
Chairman of the Newport News School Board.

Thank you for extending the comment period on the proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools. As fellow education officials working to ensure that our schools are safe for all students, our School Board members appreciate the work that has gone into producing the proposed guidelines and applaud the intent.

The Newport News School Board currently has policies and procedures in place that prohibit employees from, among other things:

- failing to maintain an appropriate professional relationship with a student or employee; and
- engaging in any interaction/activity of a sexual nature or intent with a student.

We believe that these policies are broad enough to ensure that employees know that any sexual misconduct or abuse is prohibited and will not be tolerated. The proposed guidelines, however, appears to be so specific that they raise a number of practical concerns, as stated below.

- **Guideline:** Conversations with students should focus on matters related to instruction and school activities.
  
  **Concern:** Most conversation will focus on instruction and school activities, but there are many times when students and teachers will discuss other things, such as a recent vacation, a death in the family, or the latest professional football game. This is a natural course of social life, and the proposed language would be a barrier to establishing perfectly acceptable and beneficial relationships between students and teachers.

- **Guideline:** Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to "text" students and are prohibited from interacting one-on-one with students through personal online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact privately through texting and personal social-networking sites.
  
  **Concern:** Texting is a standard method of communication for young people today. To text a teacher about homework, or whether school club activity has been cancelled is commonplace. And while texting is no more dangerous than a phone call, which would not be regulated, texting is more efficient and useful in today's environment.

- **Guideline:** Physical contact between an adult and student that is expected and appropriate in preschool and in the early elementary grades — such as a spontaneous hug between a teacher and a child at the end of the day — is not appropriate with older children. Physical contact meant to encourage or reassure students, such as a hand on the shoulder or a pat on the back, should be brief and unambiguous in meaning.
  
  **Concern:** These two guidelines appear to be at odds. One says physical contact is not appropriate for "older children," and the other implies that certain types of physical contact are appropriate. If this guideline were to be approved, it would be helpful if the term "older children" was more specifically defined by age or grade level and to define what type and under what circumstances physical contact would be appropriate.

- **Guideline:** All off-site, school-related activities involving school board employees and students must be approved by an authorized administrator and be supervised by at least two unrelated adults.
  
  **Concern:** The term "supervised" implies a paid or official position. Would this prohibit a teacher from taking students on a field trip if several parents also attended, but no other employees were there to "supervise."

On behalf of the entire Newport News School Board, I respectfully request that the guidelines be reviewed and revised to ensure that the concerns above are addressed before the document is finalized.

Thank you again for extending the time to comment on this matter.

January 13, 2011

Cindy McClintock
Williamsburg, VA

Proposed rules teacher-student texting

At the suggestion of one of the band boosters, our high school band director utilizes JOTT for mass communications with students and parents. It's been absolutely wonderful to receive event cancellations (because of weather) on both our phones and e-mails, especially since e-mail delivery may be delayed or we may simply be off-line. It has also been helpful when schedules have slipped by half an hour. I will note that parents were able to opt-in for the JOTT messages, so my husband and I receive them as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs Jennifer Landis-Herman</strong></td>
<td>Accused pedophile in school: ATTN: Newport News School Board Members</td>
<td>As a parent of a current middle school aged child I do not have a problem with the cell phone issue the board is reviewing. I do however want to ask the school board to review its policy or lack of a policy in regards to accused pedophiles being allowed on school grounds. … [REDACTED INFORMATION] I would like someone to write a policy regarding individuals accused of crimes against children so no one has to go through dealing with a known child predator in an elementary school or on school grounds or school functions. … [REDACTED INFORMATION]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jennifer Neal</strong></td>
<td>Teacher - Student Texting</td>
<td>I read the article about teacher - student texting and feel that this is a very bad idea. Teachers should communicate in the open with students, the way it was before technology stepped in. We may have this technology to use at our desire but is it really the safest way to communicate between adults and minors and this is what it boils down to. Parents want to know what is going on with their children and when text messages are sent directly to a child, anything can happen. So, for the safety of our teachers and for the safety of our children communication should be made to the parents, not the child. Or communication should be put in writing on paper. Yes, this type of communication is &quot;old school&quot; but it is safest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suzanne Gill</strong></td>
<td>Proposed electronic communication ban between students and teachers</td>
<td>I am a journalism/English teacher who is opposed to the potential ban on most electronic communication between students and teachers. I use gmail to accept assignments from my reporters so I can access it at home in order to grade the first, second and final drafts on a timely basis. My students found that it allowed instant response rather than printing the article which I then had to mark and return. Our school email is not always accessible at home and assignments that are submitted online are not always available either. Gmail is much more reliable than the school platforms for communication. Journalism requires repeated and quick responses to articles to get the school newspaper done on time. My students have felt that I am accessible to them for asking questions, getting a response quickly and especially on field trips where we use our cell phones to communicate during the trip. It allows me to keep track of them and respond quickly to their needs. In a field trip I took my students on to Washington DC, one of my students had had a seizure on the street while he was going to lunch. My students were able to call me at the convention and I took a cab to the hospital where my student had been taken by ambulance. How were my students supposed to inform me of this except by cell phone? Banning communication between teachers and students is a bad idea at the high school level. FaceBook and social network sites are visible to the world. Text messaging is available even after a person has deleted the message from the phone. Several of my students have all their text messages sent to their parents so their parents can monitor what they've received and sent to their friends. Banning such messages between teachers and students is not necessary. Relationships online between teachers and students are easily reviewed and it should be up to the parents to monitor such relationships which every teacher recognizes is inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara McArthur</strong></td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>For a number of years I worked as a school social worker in PA. In my experience, the kinds of teachers/staff who would become &quot;involved&quot; with a student were not going to follow any guidelines. The reality is that their jobs are already in jeopardy once they &quot;cross the line&quot; and become inappropriately involved. Restricting all teacher/student texting, particularly after school hours will penalize the students who are involved in extra-curricular activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Karen Richardson**         | The Virginia Society for Technology in Education represents over five thousand public school teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty. With a mission to promote excellence in education through professional development, VSTE endeavors to support the integration of existing and emerging technologies. Recently, the VSTE Board reviewed the Board of Education's //Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct & Abuse in Virginia Public Schools// dated November 18, 2010 with revisions dated January 13, 2011. VSTE agrees with the overall intention of these guidelines to prevent inappropriate conduct between employees and students in Virginia's public schools. However, we join with other organizations such as the Virginia Association for Curriculum and Development (VASCED) to voice concerns about the limitations placed on social media communications; moreover, we submit these guidelines are in conflict with goals established in the
2010-15 Educational Technology Plan for Virginia. We disagree with assumptions that social media communications and one-on-one conversations between teachers and students, if allowed, will be inappropriate in nature. Research demonstrates the critical link between educator and learner relationships and their value to high levels of learning which is expected and needed in today’s schools. For this to occur in this day and time, connectivity via bricks and mortar as well as virtually is vital, cost effective, and just makes good common sense.

Technologies used in education do not create inappropriate interactions and therefore prohibiting their use would not prevent these situations. Professionalism should be at the heart of the effort to prevent inappropriate interactions. The medium is not the issue; in fact, educators should model appropriate digital citizenship when using technology to communicate in appropriate, timely, and powerful ways. VSTE strongly advocates for professional development and training materials to better prepare educators to leverage the technology for positive interactions with students.

In the last several years, VSTE has written extensively about and showcased examples of schools in Virginia using social media and mobile learning applications to create dynamic educational environments. Student use of such technology is in line with the National Educational Technology Plan as well as the 2010-15 Educational Technology Plan for Virginia and involves the development of skills that are critical to their future success in college and the workforce. Joining with the VASCD, we disagree with language that suggests model policies for electronic communications with students should be restricted to “accounts, systems, and platforms provided by the school division” and argue that setting up such in-house systems would be far from the cost neutral claim provided in the document’s conclusion. Additionally, opening the door to directives for divisions to use only in-house technology solutions, even in this narrow case, is a dangerous precedent. The Virginia Board of Education should not be in the business of codifying the source of solutions to technology-based instructional matters anymore than it should be declaring that lessons that meet the standards of learning should only be developed in-house.

The crafting of these guidelines to protect our students from inappropriate forms of contact, while well intentioned, could serve to halt innovation in classrooms all over the Commonwealth. We ask that you revisit the language of this policy so that teachers seeking to build appropriate relationships with students utilizing new forms of communication will not be hampered by the potential actions of a few with ill intent. If you would like the input of our organization in this effort, we would be more than willing to work with you.

January 12, 2011

John T. Jenkins
Social Studies
Department of
Menchville High School

Student-Teacher contact
No doubt you are receiving many comments from educators across the state, so I thank you in advance for taking the time to read this message. I will be as concise as possible. The draft guidelines for regulating student-teacher contact currently being considered have two components that may seriously interfere with the ability of a high school teacher such as myself to be an effective educator.

The first one is, “Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.” Critical here is the phrase “provided by the school division.” Literally thousands of teachers use a variety of websites, blogs, wikis, and other internet-based media to communicate with students. In this budgetary climate, the school divisions encourage but do not provide such methods of communication. In my high school using such web-based tools is essential because administrators have severely limited the number of photocopies that teachers can make. Perhaps the guideline could be reworded to say “authorized” or “permitted” by the school division and accomplish the same goal without the unintended consequence of undermining legitimate instructional usage.

The second guideline is, “Teachers and other employees…are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites.” I teach high school students and I can tell you that the majority of them are on Facebook. Using Facebook to communicate with students allows me to communicate with them in real time in situations when, for instance: they are studying for a test at night and have a question; when there is inclement weather and school closing and students have questions about the schedule; and to create threaded discussions for exam reviews. Although I understand the rationale behind prohibiting such contact, it seems to me that given the thousands of teachers who use social network to enhance their teaching and to better accommodate their students’ needs, versus the tiny number of teachers who use such media inappropriately, the negative effects of such a policy far outweigh the (potential) benefits.

Richard Lusk
English teacher at
Menchville High School

Student-Teacher Contact Policies
I am an English teacher at Menchville High School with Newport News Public Schools.
| Menchville High School with Newport News Public Schools | One of the proposed guidelines states that: “Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.” I would suggest that, although the reasons for the guidelines are obvious, the wording is too Draconian and severe. For the record, any of my ‘two-way’ communication with students is limited to school-wide email or through the school system’s online gradebook. However, I do have a number of free websites that I use to provide my students with information about assignments and lessons. For that reason, I believe that this guideline should state “Teachers and other school board employees must restrict TWO WAY electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided OR APPROVED by the school division.” Either of these two modifications would effectively deal with the issue without adversely impacting those of us who use common sense in our interactions with students. |
| Deputy David Barke | **Proposed Teacher Student Texting Ban** Just wanted to add my comments on this matter. I have 3 children in public schools in the City of Poquoson. My oldest is a Junior and also attends New Horizons Technical Center at Thomas Nelson Community College. I think we should just leave it alone. We already have laws in place to deal with any crime that may occur between the teacher and the student. I would assume school districts have policies in place to deal with inappropriate behavior. I think it’s the parents’ responsibility to monitor their children’s texting and social networking usage. Face book, MySpace and whatever comes next is the future. Students are using face book more and more and at a younger age. If a teacher has a face book page and the status said “Don’t forget about my test on Friday” it could act as a good thing. I must say until this year, no teacher has ever to my knowledge contacted my 17 year old. This year he has a teacher that will text my son (and myself) to update us a variety of things … Don’t forget about the test … No School because of Snow … Good Job on the last test … Don’t forget to bring your permission slip back today … etc. I do not see this as a bad thing. As a side note, this particular teacher has a self imposed policy of not “friending” any of his students on Face book. I respect that, and so does my son. I think as they grow older and get involved in more activities I can see where it could be used more and more. People like coaches, extracurricular actives instructors etc. In talking to others in my office, most feel as I do. I am told some other teachers have a personal face book page that students are not allowed to “friend”. They also have a "teacher" face book page that their students can be "friends" with. This way the professional and personal life's are kept separate. This at least on the surface sounds like good middle ground. I am told of a guidance counselor that has one of these professional face book pages that uses it to announce college material and related things. In closing, please understand in my opinion a blanket across the board ban would do more harm than good. We need to embrace the new technology and figure out how to make it work to help both the students and teachers. |
| Sarah Taylor | **Support for the Proposed student-teacher texting ban** I received this contact information from a teacher who opposes the ban; she was encouraging fellow teachers to make contact to try to stop the ban, but I actually support the ban. If all teachers were older, stable, and had common sense, then there wouldn't be a need for the ban, but there are a lot of young, unstable, and flighty teachers out there that blur the lines between the student and teacher, confusing some students. We have a lot of students out there who don't have good parent advocates who will contact the school if something seems strange or concerning to them about a relationship between their child and a teacher. This ban will especially protect these kinds of teachers and students. I know if my teenage daughter was regularly texting or facebooking with any of her teachers (no matter if it was same gender or opposite gender), especially socially, but really for any reason, I'd be extremely concerned and find myself in a position where I'd have to possibly get a teacher in trouble for something that might be innocent, but I just wouldn't be willing to take that risk. Another benefit to the ban would be it would protect teachers who don't want this contact but get it unwillingly. For example, I put my personal cell phone number on a field trip information sheet for a summer school trip so parents could contact us on the trip since the school would be closed. One of the students started texting me after that with school questions over the summer (when are fee days, etc.). But when the questions continued into the school year and included less school-related messages (merry Christmas, etc.), I stopped responding and had to explain to him that I didn't think it was appropriate and that sending and receiving texts costs me |
money. I could tell that he was confused and his feelings were hurt. Having this ban in place would give me an official reason to point to in that kind of situation. All teachers have school emails, and most phones that text will send a message to an email address. If a student really needs to send a teacher a message, it should be to the official school email address; that way, both the student and teacher remember what roles they play to each other.

Simmons

Teachers texting students
Allow texting, voice messages, etc., BUT require all such messages to students to include in the address(es) a "cc" to the appropriate school office, e.g. the principal's office. Of course, not all such messages will be read or listened to by that office. The potential for such, however, should strongly discourage any inappropriate messages.

Cara Zimmerman

Proposed legislation concern
I would like to express my concern about the new legislation concerning the: Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.

Many teachers work in their local community. Part of being an educator is not only interacting with students when we are at school, but also interacting with them in our community, churches, athletic clubs, local theaters, and many other venues. Social networks have become, in a way, a part of that community. Facebook is a wonderful way to advertise upcoming events and set up groups where students can communicate about what is going on in school and the community. Like anything else there are negative aspects of social networking, but these are few and I believe they are far outweighed by their positive aspects. I, personally, have a policy where I do not allow current students to friend me on Facebook, but I have allowed students who have completed my class to friend me and they have asked me for advice on many matters about school from time to time. I feel that it has been a positive experience for all of us.

Also, when students are involved in activities, texting is a way to communicate with them about changes in schedules and other information they may need to know about an event. If a student is missing from an event or is late getting there, cell phone communication or texting is a quick way to find the location of that student and check to make sure that they are okay.

While I understand the intent of this legislation I feel that it will be harmful to the schools of Virginia. We should embrace and learn to work with new technology, not try to limit its use. There are going to be those few who abuse technology, but please don't punish those of us who use it to have positive interactions with students. We trust teachers to teach our students and we need to trust that the vast majority have the wisdom to monitor their interaction with students in the community and in social media. It is my belief that those few who would abuse this means of communication would do so even if there was a policy in place, it makes no sense to implement this blanket policy and punish the rest of us.

Pete Mercier

Director of Guitar studies at Menchville High School

Regarding Teacher to Student Communications via Social Networking Websites
I am writing to express some concern about the DOE’s new policy banning teacher-student interactions through various forms of modern technology and social networking websites. I believe it is a hyper reactive response to a few instances where inappropriate conduct ensued between teachers and students after interacting through these various media, however, it is punishing the many for the actions of the few.

I realize that many members of educational authority are distinguished teachers who served many years in VA public schools and that some are from other fields, however, I believe they are missing the larger picture regarding social network forums. These websites allow teachers to create internal sites that can be informative and provide curriculum-related material(s) that allow for easier, more efficient access to the flow of information between teachers and students. While websites like TeacherWeb are great, students aren't nearly as likely to login to these, however they frequently check in to Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, and the like.

I believe the DOE is sending a message to teachers, administrators, and school employees and the message is not a positive one. The message is, "We do not trust the people that we hire to engage in ethical and appropriate interactions with students." If this were not the case, I would love to the reasoning for banning teacher to student interactions through these various technological media.

For all of the discourse about building student relationships and incorporating technology in the classroom, the proposed measure seems to exist in complete contradiction with modern educational thought and 21st Century learning. These media forms offer students and teachers another means of interaction and offers another way for teachers to build healthy, professional relationships with students. While we see students every day, we deal with 125 to 150 of them on a daily basis. There is not enough time in a school day to build solid relationships with all of our students, but social media outlets extend that time and allow teachers and students to connect.
Beyond the hours of the school day. While I am vehemently against teachers becoming “friends” with their students, I am a proponent of building quality relationships and engaging students in a number of ways to enhance their learning and productivity, as well as building their professional, social, and technological skills. The issue with social networking sites is one of ethical responsibility. To completely ban student/teacher interactions is to indite all teachers of being unethical and irresponsible, and I believe it is an unfair accusation that likewise limits student/teacher relationship building and information sharing.

**David P. Loughran**  
Harrisonburg HS  
English, Girls’ Cross Country, Boys & Girls Indoor, Outdoor Track & Field

**Proposed Communication Legislation**  
Good Morning. Just a quick note in opposition of the new proposed electronic communication legislation. As a head track coach I deal with 60-80 athletes on a daily basis. Many have needs to communicate with me where communicating by cell phone is a necessity. From questions about upcoming events, to a forgotten appointment that keeps them from practice, to emergencies, cell phone communication is a must for me and my staff. Just this past weekend (after considering the legislation and reminding myself that there was a day when we didn't have such easy communication) we had a bus leaving at 6:45 am. At 6:25 an athlete was without a ride. After communicating with me and getting picked up by a teammate, they slid on an icy roadway and hit a stop sign. After communicating with me several more times (and getting his father and police to the scene), we were able to pick them up with bus and get on our way to the meet. In many ways (this being one glaring example) the ability to communicate with my athletes is essential to their experience on our team.

**Christine Benson-Sapp**  
Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

I have read the proposed guidelines presented by the Virginia Department of Education, and I feel that many of them are quite restrictive for teachers. I have worked with children and young adults for ten years now, and I have always formed special bonds with those that I’ve worked closely with. Because of these special bonds, there are times when my students use me as more than just a teacher; they use me as a mentor, a counselor, a big sister, sometimes even a mother, and sometimes this means that my students need one-on-one alone time with me. With the restrictions the board of education has presented, my job will be just a teacher, and I feel that many of my students will feel lost if I can’t perform those other duties. While I understand that students and teachers should not be alone together or discuss personal things, there are situations that require a personal conversation that does not pertain to school or education. These conversations are often necessary to help a student’s well-being. Also, I believe that social networking between students and teachers is acceptable as long as the teachers make sure that what is posted on their websites or profiles is appropriate for the general public. I am aware that we need to keep our students safe from harm of all kinds, but we can do that without restricting ourselves to a simple pat on the back and quick referrals to administration or counselors. Teachers are hired because they are educated and determined and are passionate about their careers; they are also hired (in most cases) because they have common sense. Thank you for using these comments in your consideration of these proposed guidelines.

**Susan Traner**  
Newport News Public Schools

**High school teacher perspective on**

I would like to offer my perspective on the new DOE guidelines up for consideration that deal with how faculty can and cannot communicate with students. I am a national board certified teacher with a master’s degree and thirteen years experience teaching in VA high schools. I have been teaching AP English for the past four years, have served for many years on DOE SOL committees, and am proud to say that I teach in the same high school where I went to school. I am also currently department chair of my school’s English department. I offer these details in hopes that you will infer or assume that I am a reasonable and dedicated teacher who isn't reckless or rogue in my attempts to teach students in my classes. There are three separate aspects of this policy that I will address, as I see them as three separate issues under the one umbrella.

First of all, the policy suggests that teachers should only be able to use school division products, but with the budget constraints, this seems to be almost laughable. Where my division used to be able to pay for our TeacherWeb.com websites, we now have to pay for them ourselves. Though it is obviously a mode that is 100% academically focused, under this new guideline (should my division accept it fully), I would no longer be able to receive emails from students via this website. What better place for my students to email me than from the site that houses the pacing calendar,
unit handouts, links for enrichment, etc? I have distribution lists set up via that site where I can email just parents, just students, or both with pertinent information. Often for students I send mass emails about deadlines, schedule changes, etc. For parents, often the emails are reminders about conference nights, announcing when grades have been posted, or college prep services put on by the guidance department.

Secondly, the policy addresses possibly banning teacher-student texting. This seems extreme since the policy seems to say nothing about calling, which to me would be harder to trace and easier to be personal. To students of this generation, there is little difference between texting and talking on the cell phone, except that for them they see it as easier and less personal to text. What is the difference, besides the fact that kids are more likely to ask questions and seek out help from teachers if they can do it through the more distant mode of the text message? In years past, I would tell them that they could call when studying if they had a question, but after I had a baby, kids felt nervous about calling, fearing they’d wake up my child. With texting they know that they can text and if I don’t text back I must be busy, asleep or unable to talk. Many of us have started giving out cell numbers and our connections with students have improved. They feel we are really there for them whenever/wherever. For the kid who has no adult who makes that sort of commitment, it means something more. Texting, for this generation, is the only real non-face-to-face mode of communication, even with their parents.

In terms of using social networking such as Facebook: At the beginning of the year, when I pass out my syllabi and offer my contact information, I tell them that I am on Facebook and that they can email me or friend me if they wish. I explain that I will never attempt to friend them, for some of them may have aspects of their page that they would like to keep private from me. As a mother of a kindergartener who is a workaholic and has an equally dedicated husband who also teaches high school, our lives, those portrayed on Facebook and outside of Facebook, are benign. I am careful that no picture, post or piece of information I share on Facebook is inappropriate to my teen “audience.” As I teach this “consider your audience” concept in high school academic writing, it seems to make sense that I would practice it in my private life. For kids whom I have no number, I Facebook email them to remind them of deadlines, missing assignments and ask about tardies. As a senior teacher, texting and Facebook have been valuable tools with which I can ensure I do absolutely everything I can to make my kids avoid truancy and complete makeup work. I have two young ladies this year and one last year who are here every day mainly because of my “nagging” them on Facebook. Because they can’t hide anywhere, they figure they might as well come to class. There was a very short article in the New York Times this Sunday about the use of tweeting in a Bio lecture where they tweet their questions to the professor even during class and all the kids in class get them in real time and an associated research study. The article suggested that because they have this avenue, the students were more apt to seek out the professor even during face-to-face office hours, etc.

In education, we speak out of both sides of our mouths. On one hand, we want to be conservative and make sure everyone’s relationship is professional because a few creepy teachers believe that romantic or physical relationships with kids are justifiable. On the other hand, we talk about working with this new era of kids with 21st century expectations. This summer Tony Wagner, author of The Global Achievement Gap, came in to talk with some of our district’s leadership teams, and he said the #1 thing kids desired and found necessary to perform for a teacher was an authentic relationship. He pointed out that the standoffish, distant, but respectful relationship most of us had with our teachers, where we admired them from a far and knew very little about one another, is not enough for this generation of kids.

If you are interested in hearing from students about what they think of such communication modes and relationships, I could give you some names.

Sexual predators will always find a way to prey on students. With these proposed guidelines, some of us who are reaping the rewards of such communication modes will suffer while the predators will find a way to do what they were doing “back in the day” before cell phones and Facebook.

Julie Hildbold

Communication should always be professional between teachers and students, regardless of the mode or means. The means of communication is clearly widening today: facebook, twitter, cell phones, iphones, etc. So the issue really is not the means, but the manner. Banning communication through cell phone (texting for example) is almost laughable. Focusing on this one technology makes no real sense. As a teacher and coach, it is nice to know, at 5:45 a.m. on a Saturday morning, as we head out to a debate tournament, that one of my students is ill and can't make it. I only get that message through a text. My students and my own teenage children don't
use the same methods we use to use. They don’t call. In fact, on many cell programs, calls are charged, texts are not. My sons tell me that calling is rude while texting is not. On to facebook - it is ubiquitous and is only growing. Rather than banning it, let us instead teach people how to use it politely. Don’t punish all of us for the failings of a few.

Extracurricular activities (debate, SCA, newspaper, yearbook) really involve coordination and much time during the eves and weekends. I use facebook (and I am the administrator) to let students know about evidence, tournaments, etc. I tried calling and emailing them but my team does not use those outdated methods. Let’s again, go to the root of the issue rather than indiscriminately banning technology. It’s a knee-jerk reaction. The state of Virginia needs to do its job of vetting the teacher population and maybe attracting quality educators by offering a living wage!

Kitty Boitnott, Ph.D. 
NBCT and president of the Virginia Education Association

The Proposed Guidelines, dated January 13, 2011, were revised in response to the first call for public comment. I write to briefly review the continued concerns of the Virginia Education Association.

Communication between School Division Employees and Students

VEA continues to question the strict policy limiting conversation with student to matters related to instruction and school activities as we know that teachers create positive learning communities by connecting student interests to the classroom. Research and best practice in classroom management recognize the value of teachers connecting what students learn in class to student experience, hobbies and interests that might serve as "hooks" for engagement with the curriculum. The Proposed Guidelines prohibit “an ongoing series of one-on-one meetings with a student without the knowledge of the principal AND without written permission of a parent or a guardian.”

VEA believes that such an absolute policy could work against teacher strategies to alter disruptive behaviors and engage students in learning, including the highly effective “two minute intervention” strategy.

It is well-documented that schools are often places of safety for children abused or neglected in other settings: by parents, other family members, or family friends, etc. Restricting school employee communication with individual students might prevent a student from disclosing abuse received outside of school.

Electronic Communication with Students

VEA asked for clear definitions of terminology, and whether the policy against “on-line social networking sites” would prohibit "wikis" or "a Facebook fundraising page" set up by a booster club. Revisions did not provide the requested definitions or address the VEA questions. Instead phrases "one-on-one," “privately,” and "personal" were added.

VEA commented that text messaging is a legitimate means of exchanging information and a rapidly growing communications channel. As revised the Proposed Guidelines still prohibit teachers and other school employees from using this communications tool.

VEA explained that many teachers provide cellular phone numbers to students and parents and have no other "landline" telephone number. Language added to the Proposed Guidelines restricts use of "personal communications device or account to contact an individual student" to urgent or emergency circumstance, and requires the teacher to provide a written report to a school supervisor the next school day with the date, time and nature of the contact. Are we to understand that teachers can call students and parents from landline telephones but not from cellular phones?

Physical Contact

VEA commented that the Proposed Guidelines on physical contact with students did not reflect state law authorizing physical contact for purposes such as defense of self or others, maintaining order or control, and enforcing school rules prohibiting weapons and other items. A statement in the proposed Guidelines that "school employees and volunteers should avoid physical contact when alone with an unrelated student" was struck and replaced with statement prohibiting physical contact with a student when other adults are not present "unless necessary to protect the health and well being of the student." This revision is NOT an accurate reflection of statutory authority to use physical contact and reasonable force for self defense, defense of other students, maintaining order and control, and enforcing rules prohibiting weapons and other items.

Further, the Guidelines fail to recognize that a teacher may often be the ONLY adult in a roomful of students. Even if another adult, such as another teacher or an aide is in the classroom, that adult could be occupied with other students and not provide the type of witness that the Guideline requires for every contact with a student. VEA noted a variety of legitimate and appropriate reasons school employees may have for making physical contact offering a partial list including - breaking up a fight, restraining an out-of-control student, spotting a gymnast during a routine, a band instructor helping a novice student properly position his or her hands on a clarinet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Interaction with Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New provision - Procedures for one-on-one and confidential interactions between students and clinicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new section addresses &quot;Clinical Professionals (nurses, psychologist, counselors, therapists etc.)&quot; Other school employees, including teachers, have responsibilities with students under Individualized Education Programs. Special needs students may not be the only school population who benefit from individual meetings with school personnel. VEA commented earlier that the Guidelines could have unforeseen and unintended consequences harmful to educators or students. We appreciate the Board's acknowledgement that f further study and comment were needed. As always, we stand ready to work with the Board and the Department on this and other important policy decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 11, 2011**

**Marissa Williams**

Texting

I think there is a lack of information of what can be done or cannot be done as far as teachers picking up cell phones from students. Here are a few examples. I have picked up cell phones in prior years and have caught various students cheating on tests and major exams. They have texted each other answers and have emailed themselves cheat sheets. In cases like this, we take it up to the administrator and actions are followed accordingly.

One year, I picked up a cell phone and found sexting in which I was sickened at what was found. So much so, that I wanted to make sure that the mom of the girl receiving the text to know what her daughter was seeing. When I took it up to the admin., I was told that it was illegal to go through a child's text and my license was threatened. Nothing was done to the student. It was understood in my eyes that texting was like writing a note in class. I thought I could pick it up. Not so. These rules need to be clear and all teachers need to know what can or can't be done.

**Britt Watwood, Ed.D.**

Online learning specialist with the VCU Center for Teaching Excellence

Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools

In regards to the proposed guidelines, I would like to endorse the attached statement sent to you by the Virginia Society for Technology in Education.

I teach a course in VCU’s School of Education graduate program entitled “Educational Technology for School Leaders (ADMS 647)”. In this course, we examine both the social issues and the instructional potential of web-based social media. Our intent is to help future administrators see both sides of the issue. As the VSTE statement notes, the proposed guidelines, while well intentioned, would eliminate some engaging forms of instruction.

The CNBC documentary on Facebook this past week noted two facts - that Facebook now has 500 million users and that it is becoming part of the infrastructure of the world. Our education system needs to prepare our students on the ethical use of social media and not simply ban its use. In effect, social media is moving from applications used by few to a utility used by most. We do not ban the use of electricity or drinking water, nor should we ban this utility. Instead, we need guidelines covering professional use. To allow the actions of a degenerate few to affect the learning outcomes of the majority runs counter to the ideals of this country and the Commonwealth. As VSTE suggested, I would ask that your team revisit the language of this policy so that teachers seeking to build appropriate relationships with students utilizing new forms of communication via social media will not be hampered by the potential actions of a few.

**Thomas E.M. Hutton**

Attorney with Patterson, Buchanan, Fobes, Leitch & Kalzer Inc. PS of Seattle, WA

Boundary Invasions

If I could chime in as well, Mr. Pyle, I caught wind of your guidelines on The Edjurist, an education law blog, which highlighted some initial criticisms you may be hearing as the discussion continues. I briefly addressed a few of those concerns in a response I posted there: [http://www.edjurist.com/blog/should-state-boards-of-education-issue-guidelines.html?lastPage=true#comment11135775](http://www.edjurist.com/blog/should-state-boards-of-education-issue-guidelines.html?lastPage=true#comment11135775)

As a rule I tend to be sympathetic to all of these kinds of concerns: (1) agency overreach; (2) overblown fears of technology and clumsy efforts to address them; and (3) more generally, the centralization and legalization of all things educational. But on the substantive issue here, I would respectfully suggest that on close reading the VSBOE guidelines appear more thoughtfully done than one might know from some of the initial reactions to them in the blogosphere.

The guidelines are not focused entirely or even primarily on technological communications, for example, although the prevalence with which today's perpetrators groom their victims this way is chilling. As the guidelines urge, districts are finding ways to utilize these great tools while avoiding the real problem: easy one-on-one communications with no third set of eyes. As another example, the argument that we should eschew a broad brush and focus narrowly on perpetrators highlights the whole point of the boundary invasions approach, namely that schools must focus earlier on
addressing norms and behaviors that in most instances are in fact "innocent" -- but that if accepted are exactly what enable perpetrators to victimize children. Addressing the institutional culture in this way can provide the red flags and legal grounds that allow the school district to intervene in time. The narrower approach often has meant that by the time the district learns of the problem or has enough evidence to warrant action, the harm's been done. Case in point: Doe v. Flaherty, 623 F.3d 577 (8th Cir. 2010).

In the interest of full disclosure, my firm has done a great deal of work on this issue, so we're supportive of efforts like VSBOE's. And by the way, ELA's upcoming webinar will address all these issues: http://educationlaw.org/webinar.php.

Sackett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cell phones teachers/students</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate the convenience of my child receiving messages from coaches and teachers. Parents need to watch their children and teach them to tell if anything inappropriate occurs. Let's not punish all the good coaches and teachers in fear that a few may behave inappropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connie McBryde-Keith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Teacher-student texting ban</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I think this is a very bad idea. Not all teachers or students are up to no good. In addition to the stated reasons dealing with athletes and field trips I find that students use text and email to get work when they are home sick or absent as well as clarifying instructions and even submit work electronically. This ban would hinder students from catching up on work, thus making it necessary for the teacher either to stay even longer after school or the student miss current instruction while trying to make up missed work. Let's not throw out the baby with the bathwater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sherri Oesterheld

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comments about sexual abuse policy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have some very real concerns with some of the statements in this policy. I have taught school in VA since 1980. I teach some of my students in Sunday School at church. I live in a neighborhood with some of my students. My children are best friends with some of my students. Some of my students have home situations which affect their school work. Some of my students have had eating disorders that were brought to my attention by other students. In all of these cases, I have initiated conversations about the students' lives at home. I have asked about their sports events, about their extracurricular activities, about whether they needed help. I have also called their parents or gotten guidance counselors involved, but I have certainly asked them about their lives. I thought we were supposed to care about students. I have been in homes of my son's best friend (who also happened to be one of my students) when their parents served alcohol to the adults present (I don't drink, so I didn't partake). These rules are unbelievably restrictive. It would basically require me to no longer participate in life in my community. The policy should not restrict the lives of teachers to this extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Troy R. Hutchings**  
Faculty, Northern Arizona University  
& author of dissertation  
“Teacher Sexual Misconduct with Students: The Role of Teacher Preparation Programs as a Prevention Strategy

[My] dissertation is aimed at the general lack of training given to the topics of educator ethics, boundary violations and misconduct by teacher preparation programs. However, the emergent data contained in the study goes beyond that particular topic. Since the research was completed two years ago, my focus has not really been on teacher education programs, but rather defining the "slippery slope" that leads to misconduct. The most controversial point in my message is that offenders are most often not pedophiles or perverts, rather very effective teachers. In other words, all educators are vulnerable to this slippery slope. In the last two years I have given many, many talks to attorney groups, at school board law conferences, deans of colleges of education, school administrative law conferences, state standards boards and misconduct commissions, the military and other educational constituents. I have even been contacted by the president of one state’s teachers’ union to conduct training for all of their teacher members...in other words, as hard as it is for educators to fully acknowledge that they are vulnerable, the message seems to be resonating.

I am currently starting another research project involving extensive interviews with male and female teacher-offenders that have been incarcerated for sexual misconduct with students. I am discovering that their stories are remarkably similar...excellent teachers, well-regarded, who became "teacher-savior" to needy students while simultaneously struggling with their own need for affirmation that was fulfilled with their interactions with students. It looks as though Virginia is on the cutting edge of educator ethics, boundary violations and misconduct training if the proposal passes...what your team is doing is absolutely critical work.

**Ann Etchison**, executive director on behalf of the Virginia ASCD

The Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development represents over two thousand public school teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty with a mission to advance excellence in teaching, learning, and leadership. In September of 2010, our organization adopted a position statement on Teaching, Learning, and Leading for a Changing World in which...
Board of Directors 

we advocate for high quality instructional programs that include the use of advanced technologies to access and facilitate learning. 

Recently, the VASCD Board reviewed the Board of Education’s Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct & Abuse in Virginia Public Schools dated November 18, 2010 and the revisions to the policy dated January 13, 2011. While VASCD agrees with the overall intention of these guidelines to prevent inappropriate conduct between employees and students in VA public schools, we are concerned by the limitations placed on social media communications and do not feel the revisions go far enough to address these concerns; moreover, we submit these guidelines are in conflict with goals established in the 2010-15 Educational Technology Plan for Virginia and disagree with assumptions that social media communications and one-on-one conversations between teachers and students, if allowed, will be sexual in nature. We do not support the notion that digital conversations or one-on-one interactions between students and teachers should be prohibited to avoid the few inappropriate exchanges that might potentially occur. Instead of denying the social context of the 21st Century, any inappropriate use of technology must be addressed individually based on existing legal and policy guidelines.

VASCD members can cite numerous examples of schools where Facebook, Twitter, iPod applications, Wikispaces, text messaging, and other forms of social media are being used constructively as a means for students to communicate with each other, their teachers, and the community beyond the classroom. In fact, these 21st century forms of communication appeal to the learning styles of the vast majority of public school students and involve the development of skills that are critical to their future success in college and the workforce. As VASCD’s 2010 position statement reads, “Students should apply knowledge and skills to novel situations and authentic problems, demonstrating creativity, innovation, self-reflection, and flexibility in thinking.” The acquisition and use of these important skills routinely involves the use of social media technologies for today’s students.

We appreciate the additional language regarding accounts, systems, and platforms, but remain concerned that students and teachers still have access to outside platforms for instructionally appropriate communications while working at home, while traveling, or on snow days. In fact, one very interesting aspect of the communications revolution and growth of social media is the asynchronous nature of learning. There are dedicated professionals willing to provide instruction and feedback to students during non-school hours and are able to do so because of social media tools.

Similarly, the proposed guideline that teachers “may not use personal communications devices to ‘text’ students and are prohibited from interacting one-on-one with students through personal online social-networking sites” fails to acknowledge the reality of how today’s students interact with both peers and adults. The medium is not the issue; in fact, teachers are the very people who are in a position to model for students the ways in which adults use social media to communicate in appropriate, timely, powerful ways. Without these models, where will our students learn these essential skills? Examples of effective and appropriate use of social media tools exist in schools and classrooms throughout the Commonwealth.

We acknowledge the challenges associated with establishing well intentioned policies designed to prevent inappropriate forms of contact in a world where communications practices are changing rapidly. However, we ask you to revisit the language of this policy so that teachers seeking to build appropriate relationships with students and join today’s new forms of communication won’t be sent back to twentieth century learning environments because of the potential actions of a few with ill intent. If you would like the input of our association in this effort, we would be more than willing to work with you.

January 9, 2011

Chelsea Henderson

Student Response to “Action/Discussion Item J”

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Chelsea Henderson and I am currently a freshman at Christopher Newport University. Last year I graduated from Monticello High School in Albemarle County.

I found the Virginia Department of Education’s proposal for the “Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.” While I can appreciate the goal of this proposal, I find problems in its approach and would like to offer you my perspective.

I come from a broken home and it was tough for me to cope with my circumstances. The end of middle school and the beginning of high school marked the peak of the problems I had dealt with for years. Fortunately, I was able to connect with the assistant principal of my middle school and later the assistant principal of my high school. It was difficult for me to talk about my experiences, so I communicated with them through email. Later, we progressed to phone calls and text
messaging. There were several instances when I needed to talk with someone immediately, and they were the people I called.

When I look at the guidelines of this proposal I think back to those days and wonder what would have happened if I were not able to contact the people I trusted most. I think of other students who are in similar situations and wonder how they will overcome their own hardships, or where the one hug they receive per day will come from if it cannot be the adult at school that they trust. It also seems as though the mandates of the program will negatively impact mentoring programs.

Essentially, one-on-one quality time is a large part of mentoring. I have been a mentor to several students for the past three years and I have learned that being available, reachable, and compassionate are necessary components in being a mentor. I do not see how these factors can be met under the guidelines of the proposal.

One of my family members is in her fourth year of college and plans to become a teacher in the same community she grew up. Her inspiration is found in the need she sees in the students of this area for positive role models, and it is her dream to build relationships with them. If this aspiring teacher was to serve her students in her full capacity, I predict that some students may need her beyond the respective school day hours.

Albemarle County Public Schools’ motto is “Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships.” “Relationships” indicates that the stakeholders in Albemarle County understand the importance of strong, positive rapport between students and their elders. Whether their elder is a bus driver, a custodian, a cafeteria employee, or a teacher, they all have the opportunity to greatly impact a child’s life. In Albemarle County, we represent our appreciation for the “relationships” factor through a “We Notice” program. During this program, any county employee nominated by a student is recognized for their execution of connecting with the students they serve.

I feel strongly about this matter in particular, as my successes are products of the mentoring I received in Albemarle County. I hope that you will consider these things before going through with this mandate. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concern.

Leonid S. Knyshov,
CEO - Qpointment

Electronic communications policy - item J 1/13/2011:
It has come to my attention that your board is about to adopt a potentially unconstitutional policy. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/boe/meetings/2011/01_jan/agenda_items/item_j.pdf
Your students are adopting real-time communication systems faster than your policy can possibly hope to keep up with.

For example, are you familiar with Google Wave technology? That product allows an unlimited number of people to communicate in real-time. It has been donated by Google to Apache Software foundation, which means it will now be developed independently.

Facebook is rolling out its messaging product that is vastly superior to regular e-mail and includes elements that were unique to Google Wave technology.

The role of teachers is transitioning from lecturers to on-demand experts. Facebook offers tools to segment information based on list membership. It also offers real-time presence indicators. A student would benefit from on-demand access to their teacher. Technology from companies like my own permit visibility into availability calendars across systems.

I will be honest with you - I could not care less for the safety aspect of this policy. It will not stop criminals. The argument “think of the children” is incredibly misguided and is stifling much innovation.

Regardless of how much you dislike the concept, a teacher can set Facebook profile to “fully public”. That can include aspects of their private lives that are none of this Board's concern in a free society.

I am not an attorney. I think you understand that a competent attorney will find far more ways to challenge every one of your policies in court.

Now as to actual analysis.

Model policy for electronic communications with students
• Under most circumstances, Teachers and other school board employees must restrict one-on-one electronic communications with individual students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by or accessible to the school division.

Your students are not on the same platform as your teachers. The probability that your system will adopt something as useful as current generation of consumer Internet communication tools is zero. It takes funding to create highly useful systems. That funding simply cannot exist for your usage.

Thus, you are creating a walled garden about which no one among your students cares.

• Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text” students and are prohibited from interacting one-on-one with students through personal
online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact privately through texting and personal social-networking sites.

Why on Earth not? Why is SMS a problem and yet a teacher can call a student's home phone? In my house, a home phone no longer exists.

Teachers can offer guidance on revealing personal profiles and report them to social network site operators if there are terms of use violations. Have you read the terms of use for major social networking websites? They are written by expensive lawyers.

- If, because of an urgent or emergency circumstance, a teacher or other school board employee uses a personal communications device or account to contact an individual student, the date, time, and nature of the contact must be reported in writing to his or her supervisor on the next school day.

This policy has null effect on criminal behavior and imposes red tape where none should be.

- Teachers and other school board employees may not knowingly engage in online gaming unrelated to instruction with students.

What is your definition of "online gaming"? Are you aware that term also refers to online gambling? Why can't a teacher lead a WoW guild?

- School board policy on electronic communications with students also applies to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

Aside from misguided safety concerns, who cares?

Best Practices:

- Division technology and instructional staff collaborate to develop local policies that allow for appropriate electronic communications between school board employees and students while deterring misconduct and providing accountability.

You have accountability today for all SMS, MMS, email, and social media through the subpoena process. By enforcing this policy, you will force clandestine communications without such option.

- Developments in personal digital communications and social networking are reviewed annually by division technology staff and school board policies are revised as needed.

No wonder governments can't get anything done. 12 months is too slow to respond to emerging trends like Chatroulette. Do you know how we do business in Silicon Valley? We have monthly software releases based on immediate customer feedback.

**Best Practice:**

- Information about school board policies on in-person and electronic communication between employees and students is included in student and parent handbooks and posted on the school division Web site.

No one reads that except lawyers when they are getting ready to sue you. Ever.

OK, here is what you should do.

1. Encourage real-time communication using technologies including, but not limited to, Facebook groups and Facebook messaging.

2. Allow teachers to adopt the on-demand expert role rather than babysitter role. That means homework is done in-class and lectures are viewed offline.

3. Clearly define criminal actions in plain English and provide a way to report them with maximum time to respond not to exceed 24 hours, 7 days per week. There should be administrative penalties for allowing an incoming request to be unassigned for over 24 hours and 1 minute.

4. Work with law enforcement to employ lawful channels for electronic surveillance based on credible probable cause.

5. Realize that "think of the children" is not a valid argument for restricting communications channels.

This cat is out of the bag. We have technology for encrypted peer to peer communication commonly available on every smart phone today. I wrote some of such software for a product that is not yet launched. Believe me, students can be quite resourceful when it comes to overriding school policies. I personally wrote a program that disabled all restrictions on all computers I had to use even back in 1997. You do not want them to be motivated enough to start using fully encrypted tools not subject to CALEA.

There is nothing in this policy that will affect criminal behavior. It is not your job to act as law enforcement.

I request this letter be included as a matter of public record as comment on this proposed policy.
It is time to join us and the rest of the world in the 21st century where communication is ubiquitous and access to information sources is real-time.

January 7, 2011

H. Alan Seibert  
Superintendent  
Salem Public Schools

A few thoughts from a small division regarding "social media" and professionalism  
Dr. Wright,
I know that you are profoundly busy, so please feel free to forward this message and the two attachments on to the most appropriate office or disregard entirely. My feelings will not be hurt! I understand that there is some push back regarding the BOE's consideration of guidelines intended to better safeguard students from misuse of social media. While I agree that the unintended effects could outweigh the good intentions, my purpose for this message is not to echo concerns already expressed, but to share the outcomes of our local Board's efforts to set expectations to address a similarly identified need.
I know that Salem City Schools is a small division, and I do not presume that we have answers for the entire Commonwealth, but we did choose to address similar concerns on these issues and establish expectations in a positive way. Also, I know that our Board was a bit of a pioneer in this area because when our Board took this issue on last year the VSBA asked for copies because we were one of the first members of their policy service to try to wrap our arms around these complex issues.
FYI - I am attaching our Board Regulation that specifically addresses the use of social media. I am also attaching the policy it is based upon (only the last bullet in the policy references online environments). We had a high level of participation in addressing the this topic. We knew that we could not address it through Acceptable Use Policy because that only applies to equipment owned by the division. Instead, we elected to use existing expectations about professional conduct, to provide a few examples of what we consider acceptable and unacceptable, and to acknowledge that the technology providing the medium for the challenges today may not be what is vexing us tomorrow.
I encumber your time with all of this only because I think that there may be a way to change the conversation and achieve the desired ends in a constructive and affirming manner.
Thank you for all you do...hang in there!

January 5, 2011

Ann Etchison  
Executive Director,  
Virginia ASCD

Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in VA Public Schools
Can you send me any finalized materials at this point? Has any of the language been changed (so that we don’t spend time objecting to aspects of the guidelines that have been changed as a result of the public comment period)? While we certainly agree with the overall intention of these guidelines (i.e. preventing inappropriate conduct between employees and students in VA public schools), we are disturbed by the suggested limitations placed on social media communications (and would suggest they are inconsistent with aspects of the 2010-15 Educational Technology Plan for Virginia) as well as any assumptions that assume social media communications and one-on-one conversations between teachers and students are sexual in nature. Many teachers effectively build relationships with some of our most challenging students by being available for one-on-one conversations and appropriate support that may occur in a classroom with a closed door in the interest of the student's privacy. We certainly favor the prevention of sexual misconduct and abuse but do not support the notion that digital conversations or one-on-one interactions should be prohibited to avoid inappropriate exchanges. Moreover, we can cite numerous examples of schools where Facebook, Twitter, iPod applications, Wikispaces, and other forms of social media are being used constructively as a way students communicate with each other, their teachers, and the community beyond the classroom---a 21st century form of communication and language that appeals to the learning styles of the vast majority of public school students. In developing guidelines with an important focus (i.e. prevention of sexual misconduct), we disagree with guideline language that suggests "model policies" for electronic communications with students would be restricted to “accounts, systems, and platforms provided by the school division” (not cost neutral) and that teachers “may not use personal wireless communications devices to ‘text’ students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social networking sites”.
Examples of effective and appropriate use--- both for instructional purposes and for needed communication with both students and parents---are working throughout the Commonwealth. Please advise whether the concerns I’ve expressed have been addressed since the first review was shared with the Board in November. If not, we would like you to share our concerns and will find a representative to speak at next week’s Board meeting.
“Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.”

- concerns

I am writing to express my concern that the following guidelines are too broad and infringes on one's freedom of speech. (Freedom of speech is the freedom to speak freely without censorship or limitation, or both. The synonymous term freedom of expression is sometimes used to indicate not only freedom of verbal speech but any act of seeking, receiving and imparting information or ideas, regardless of the medium used. [Wikipedia])

Here are a couple of what if examples... What if the teacher or school employee has their own biological children that they want to text during the day? For reasons such as... hey I am sick, or I need a ride after school or I am riding the bus instead of walking, etc. What if a teacher or school employee wants to monitor their own biological children's social network activity by friending their children's friends or vice versa? They may not actually communicate with their child's friends, but are friends with them to keep an eye on their own biological child's online activity. ?? How can you tell a parent/school employee that they can't communicate on their own time, with their own children using whatever medium they choose? How can you tell a parent/school employee that they cannot communicate with other students especially if it's friends of their own children?? Do you see what I am trying to convey? I have heard that some schools have thought about using social networking(such as facebook) as part of learning. What an awesome way to reach out to kids. This is the generation of savvy technology users and we need to embrace it instead of stopping it. I believe that you need to rethink how this is written. Perhaps the policy needs to be written with more detail instead of using such a broad statement. Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.

- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text” students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites.
- Teachers and other school board employees may not knowingly engage in online gaming with students.
- School board policy on electronic communications with students also applies to teachers and other employees of virtual school programs and other vendors providing instructional services to students.

January 4, 2011

The Student Press Law Center serves as a source of legal information for students and educators in the field of journalism, and we were asked by several of our Virginia members to review the Board of Education agenda item, “Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools” (hereinafter referred to as “the Guidelines”) scheduled for consideration at the Board’s January 13 meeting. For the reasons that follow, we suggest that the public comment period be reopened to enable affected members of the school community to have meaningful input and help address the potential adverse consequences of the Guidelines as they are written.

While the Board’s eagerness to address the disturbing incidence of inappropriate sexual relationships between students and school employees is entirely understandable, some of the proposed restrictions would have significant consequences beyond what the Board and its staff may have envisioned. Our members have concerns specifically about two sections of the Guidelines, on which these comments will focus.

The first section appears at p. 3 of the Guidelines, entitled: “Policy for electronic communications with students,” and specifically includes the following recommended district-level policies:

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school.
- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text” students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites.

We interpret the restriction to school-provided “systems and platforms” to mean that teachers may use neither non-school e-mail accounts nor social-networking sites (including the popular “micro-blogging” site, Twitter) to exchange electronic messages with students. We encourage the Board to solicit input from coaches and from sponsors of extracurricular activities, including newspapers and yearbooks, about how important these communication tools are to those who supervise out-of-class student activities, and in particular, overnight trips. It will hamstring the ability of teachers to manage students attending out-of-state conventions and competitions if they cannot use their personal cell-phones to call or text-message students when the bus is late or the dinner destination...
has changed. If the Board’s paramount concern is for student safety, that purpose is ill-served if the result of the Guidelines is that club sponsors and coaches can no longer effectively keep track of the comings and goings of their students on out-of-town trips. It is certainly true that school employees have, at times, taken students to hotels for illicit purposes. Making it a punishable offense for a teacher and a student to enter a hotel together would theoretically deter such behavior. But you would not enact such a prohibition, because you know that there are many legitimate reasons for which teachers and students would be at the same hotel, and you know that such a rule would greatly complicate overnight trips to conventions and sporting events. If you would not endorse a ban on teacher-student hotel visits, then for the same reasons, you should not endorse a ban on teacher-student texting.

We also encourage you to elicit the input of knowledgeable journalism educators, including those from the Journalism Education Association and from your many fine journalism colleges in Virginia, about “best practices” in the teaching of journalism in the 21st century. What you will hear is that schools are moving rapidly to incorporate social media and Twitter into the teaching and practice of journalism, because that is the way news increasingly is being shared. Many outstanding student publications maintain Facebook sites to recruit staff members, solicit submissions, update readers on breaking news, and otherwise take advantage of the immediacy of social media. Some of the best journalism teachers use Twitter as the equivalent of a targeted “intercom” that enables them to instantly deliver a message to the entire staff of a newspaper or yearbook at once, no matter where the students are located. It is difficult to see the student safety benefit in outlawing the use of Twitter to disseminate a (publicly visible) message that announces the time and place of the yearbook staff meeting.

The second section of concern appears at p. 2 under the heading of “Model policy for in-person communication with students,” and states that no school board employee may conduct an “ongoing series” of individual meetings with a student without notifying the principal and obtaining written parental consent. This policy must be viewed in combination with the aforementioned restrictions on communications using non-school platforms or devices, and with the statement (p. 2) that electronic communications must be “transparent” and “accessible to supervisors.” When these recommendations are viewed in total, they would make it virtually impossible for students to engage in any type of investigative reporting using school employees as sources. If employees may neither meet (in a “series” of meetings, however that term is understood) confidentially with students nor communicate with students except using means that are “transparent” to their supervisors, it will be exceedingly difficult for an employee to furnish information to the student media without risking retaliation. Although student journalism often is treated dismissively by the adult world, high school students have in fact brought important news stories to public attention using confidential sources, and for examples you need only look to the award-winning work of student journalists at Maryland’s Rockville High School, who in 2008 published the results of a three-month investigation of street gangs that the police credited with actually reducing the level of gang activity in their school.

If the Board is intent on enacting restrictions of this kind, we suggest that the Board guard against the anti-whistleblower effects by enacting – either as a part of these Guidelines or as a stand-alone provision – comprehensive whistleblower protection language along the following lines:

WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION: No student or school employee may be disciplined or retaliated against in any manner for seeking to call attention to matters of public concern involving school practices, conditions or events, or for otherwise-lawful acts taken in furtherance of such ‘whistle-blowing’ conduct.

While we appreciate that these Guidelines are advisory and may be revised at the district level, it is important that the Board assume that some districts – if not most of them – will enact the Guidelines exactly as written in deference to the state’s expertise and authority. It is extremely difficult for interested parties to monitor and have genuine input into the actions of 130-plus local districts. If the Guidelines cannot practically be implemented exactly as written, then they should not be distributed with the confidence that “glitches” will be noticed and fixed locally. Regrettably, the 30-day public comment period for the Guidelines coincided with Thanksgiving, final exams and the winter holiday break. This effectively shrunk the 30-day comment period into something more like 10 days. The changes contemplated by the Guidelines are too significant to be hurried into effect without considering the input of all affected stakeholders, and this means reopening the comment period and taking account of all potential consequences.

Thank you for accepting this input beyond the expiration of the initial comment period, and for giving your careful consideration to all ramifications of this important decision.

January 3, 2011
### Kelly Furnas, Executive Director for Journalism Education Association

**Virginia Beach**

While I wish to applaud the efforts of the Virginia Department of Education to draft guidelines for the prevention of sexual misconduct and abuse in Virginia public schools, I would caution the organization from overreaching with its good intentions to the detriment of common sense. I would urge the department to reconsider its proposed model policy for electronic communications with students, specifically:

- Teachers and other school board employees must restrict electronic communications with students to accounts, systems and platforms provided by the school division.
- Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to “text" students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social-networking sites. Teachers and other school board employees must decline or disregard invitations from students to interact through texting and social-networking sites.

Our organization, the Journalism Education Association, is made up of more than 2,300 high school journalism teachers from across the country. In addition to the day-to-day outreach by and for our members, we also conduct two national conventions each year for high school journalism teachers and students, generally drawing more than 10,000 attendees a year. At those conventions, speakers and presenters routinely laud the need for journalism students to use multiple forms of communication when practicing their craft. Texting and the use of social-networking sites are among the most common and most popular examples of the tools student journalists must use.

Virginia enjoys a rich and strong tradition of student journalism, and many of the high school newspapers in your state maintain a presence on one or more social-networking websites. Creating a model policy that would forbid teachers from viewing or commenting on student work is not only creating a poor learning environment for students but also potentially making your teachers out-of-date as educators.

As for the restriction on texting, I fear the Department of Education is simply blaming a modern mode of communication for woes that well pre-date its existence. Texting a student is no more likely to be offensive or misconstrued than a letter, phone call or e-mail. Student journalists use texting to schedule interviews, verify facts, and disseminate breaking news.

(And on a much broader scale, I fear a policy forbidding student-teacher texting is likely to have dire consequences by eliminating an efficient mode of emergency communications. As a former media adviser at Virginia Tech, I’m perpetually thankful that I was able to text my students in 2007.)

Please do not let this letter be misconstrued: I admire the efforts to keep students safe, and I keenly recognize the need to maintain not only the reality of a safe environment but also the appearance of one. However, I think for students/teachers as a whole and scholastic journalism in particular, elements of this policy are a classic example of overreaction and misplaced blame.

### Andy Bedinger, Media Adviser

**Virginia Beach**

**Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse**

I just became aware of the proposed guidelines. I have concerns with the section regarding electronic communications.

It goes without saying that I fully support the spirit of the law and guidelines to protect our students. Unfortunately, the guidelines as written will have a serious impact on my ability to communicate in a positive manner with my students. I use my cell phone to answer questions via texting at least 5 times a week. I would prefer a phone call, but the students would rather leave the questions unasked than make the call.

I know other teachers that use wikis and blogs that are not provided or maintained by the school division. (namely, because they are better than the one provided through Microsoft SharePoint). I hope the Board can table the guidelines, and your office can find some alternatives to the guidelines as they are written.

### Jennifer Seavey, Media Adviser

**Alexandria, VA**

**New Social Media Guidelines - Jan. 13, 2011**

The essence of the content on new social media guidelines that will be voted on next week reached FCPS advisers today. I am very concerned about the rigidity of the guidelines. Let me explain.

First, understand I am one of the "old-schoolers" in the publications adviser ranks. While I have a Facebook account, I don’t allow any current high school students to friend me. I don’t encourage FB pages for school events as a primary method for communicating school activities. I believe there should be non-Internet-accessed means to market events and get the word out. I don’t use smart phones as part of my lesson plans, although a number of teachers at my school have done so successfully. That said, when I travel with my journalism and business students several times a year, I do encourage key individuals to have my cell phone number programmed into their phones. We do use this kind of communication to keep in touch. When you’re at a convention of 5,000 students and need to go different ways over several days, it would be impossible to keep in touch without a text message here and there. I have sent reporters to cover events and found I wanted to...
Valerie P. Kibler  
Harrisonburg, VA

**Deep concern about the new social media guidelines**

As an educator of 23 years in the Commonwealth, I am truly concerned about the proposed legislation that will institute rigid new guidelines in regards to social media. While I totally understand the state trying to prevent sexual relationships between students and teachers, I feel that the limiting of futuristic technologies that we should rather be embracing is not the action that should be taken. As teachers, we're asked to do so much more than simply teach our subject matter, but those of us who are truly teachers 24/7 do not take this responsibility lightly. I teach journalism and AP English in Harrisonburg at the high school. I have a facebook account, my students have both individual and group accounts for our newspaper and they also have twitter. We text constantly (mainly outside of the classroom where I teach the importance of face to face communication) - but when I take my students on field trips both in and out of state, I can't think of a more necessary device than my cell phone to keep up with kids.  

I've always encouraged my kids to have their phones away when we were listening to a keynote speaker. Bus as I scolded one for having it out and "appearing" to be texting at a convention last year, I found out not only was my student tweeting about the speaker we were hearing right then, she was also looking up a word that the speaker had used that she didn't know.  

I get texts from students (current and former) all the time - to tell me things like "I just got accepted to Vassar!!!!!!" or "I want to doublecheck what we have due tomorrow for class". I don't care if I get these - I can make the choice whether to respond or not. I set up guidelines with my kids about what is appropriate and what isn't - they know I'm not going to stay up late to answer their texts - I might just answer them at 4 in the morning when I get up. Same with facebook - they know I only use it when it is necessary to communicate with them, but they also know they can send me a message when they need help with a story, interview or assignment for class. I must also add that as the student council adviser, I have constant communication with my officers and if I see something inappropriate come up in a news feed, I can simply say, "Do you think that photo is something you should have up on your page as the SCA President?" Sometimes the mere suggestion provokes thought in my students that I don't think has happened before. And for that reason since they know some of their teachers and parents are their "friends" on facebook, sometimes they do stop to think twice about what they will post. I can't help but think this carries over to their actions in "real life".  

Running a school publication requires that students be communicating with people constantly. We should be finding ways to TEACH kids to use these modes of communication responsibly rather than making them off limits. I really feel strongly that this legislation will only harm teachers who are trying as hard as they can every single day to enrich the lives of their students. It is not going to deter sexual deviants in the least.  

I'd be glad to discuss my personal use of technologies in my classroom with anyone anytime. I hope I speak for many (and I believe I do) when I say there are many more of us out here using technology properly than there are abusing it.

Martha Covington  
Stafford, VA

I am the photojournalism teacher at Brooke Point High School. I only recently learned through the media of the proposed Guidelines that are calendared for Board action on January 13. Having read Agenda Item H from the November 18, 2010, Board meeting, I am concerned with the language of the proposal. As a teacher there are many times when electronic communication between an educator and a student are not only convenient but necessary. I take students on field trips and always get cell numbers of the students I take. If the student has an emergency they can contact me immediately via cell phone. I know there was a day and time when that was not possible, but why would we not avail ourselves of that technology since it is there for us? These guidelines also have grave potential to hamper the ability of students to work effectively on journalistic publications. Last year during the massive snow storms we had I was able to keep in contact with my students about assignments and deadlines even though they were not in school. We did not miss a single deadline even though we missed many days of school. We have an established networking system using g-mail and google documents where we are able to share, edit and revise copy for our publication. This allows students to work more effectively from home.  

I would ask that much consideration be taken before passing this proposal. Most educators are intelligent people who are very concerned with the welfare of students.
### January 1, 2011

| Thomas Brewster, Falls Mills, VA | I have some concerns about the social media model policy up for passage at the January meeting. I hope you don't mind me sharing my concerns. Currently, the issue of teachers friending students is widespread. I am concerned about enforcement of such a policy at the local level. Especially if no harm has been inflicted. Also, we have teachers who use external networking sites (NING) for educational purposes because their divisions do not have internal networking capacity. I agree with the message. Teacher should not be engaged online with students unless they are on a supervised, monitored, and secure network authorized by the local school division. However, I feel that a policy from RVA would be difficult to manage without local input and support. A strong and clear message from the Board would certainly be appropriate, with further study initiated by Board action in January. |

### December 29, 2010

| Frank D. LoMonte Executive Director Student Press Law Center | Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse
My organization, the Student Press Law Center, only recently learned through the media of the proposed Guidelines that are calendared for Board action on January 13. Having read Agenda Item H from the November 18, 2010, Board meeting, we cannot tell when the 30-day public comment period began and ended. Can you please inform us whether there is time remaining to submit comments and, if so, to whom they should be directed? These guidelines have grave potential to hamper the ability of students to work effectively on journalistic publications, and in light of the significant (and likely unforeseen and unintended) adverse consequences, it would be unfortunate if the Board rushed these guidelines into effect during a holiday period when many students and school personnel are unable to fully participate in the discussion. Thank you for any information you can provide … |

### December 26, 2010

| K. N. Lucas | My name is Kandise Lucas, and I am a parent, child/family advocate, and educator whose God-given life assignment is to speak out for and improve the educational conditions of students and families that have no voice, and are commonly abused, neglected, and/or discriminated against. I stand by the fact that education is a civil right that every child in every family is entitled to regardless of race, creed, ethnicity, economic status, or social standing. Below are the recommendations that I have shared in response to the Virginia Department of Education’s request for public comment regarding establishing policies and procedures as it relates to educator misconduct and abuse/neglect of our children by educators. These recommendations are being proposed in response to an increasing level of abuse, neglect, and misconduct by educators within the Commonwealth toward our most innocent and vulnerable children; our children with disabilities, children of color, and children that are economically disadvantaged. These recommendations are also in response to the increasing hostile, anti-child, illegal, and unethical atmosphere that exists within our schools that not only discourages the reporting of abuse, neglect, and misconduct by our peers, but also subjects those educators, parents, and students that operate in integrity and according to the law by reporting abuse, to retaliation, discrimination, intimidation, or even worse. REDACTED CONTENT Whether it is Kevin Ricks, (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/metro/kevin-ricks-timeline/), or REDACTED CONTENT, the real and horrific threat to our children and their futures is the same. The responsibility of the educational, legal, social services, and overall community at large is still the same. The accountability that is nonexistent must be reclaimed at every level. Most importantly, we must begin to be “the village” again for our children so that our schools reclaim their rightful places as one of the safest places on earth for our children. For some of them, whose faces and names I personally know, school may be the ONLY safe place for them in their world. I. The Crisis That Is Subjecting Our Children To Predators Within The Classroom Fact One: Students within the Commonwealth are being abused and neglected within our public and private schools by licensed educators. Fact Two: Educators that engage in abuse, neglect, and misconduct are often not held accountable by administrators, superintendents, or school boards, social services, law enforcement, elected officials, or the media instead they are often protected and defended. Fact Three: Many superintendents, whether out of ignorance or intentionally, within the Commonwealth fail to report, and even, at times, cover up for and defend educators that have been found to be guilty of abuse, neglect, and/or misconduct to the proper authorities in an effort to avoid bad publicity and/or possible legal liabilities. Virginia Code requires them to report these individuals |
to child protective services within 72 hours if they receive or discover abuse and/or neglect. Superintendents are also required, by law, to report these individuals to the Virginia Department of Education within ten days of the knowledge of or suspicion of abuse and/or neglect of students.

Fact: A significant number of school districts promote and maintain environments that discourage, and at times, even punish those educators that report their peers for misconduct.

Fact: Many of those students that are victims of abuse, neglect, and educator misconduct are students with special needs, students of color, and students that are economically disadvantaged.

Fact: Many human resources departments within school districts fail to properly investigate the criminal backgrounds of the educators they hire. In addition, districts fail to conduct annual criminal background checks on current employees, some of which may have had their last check over thirty years ago.

Fact: School officials, law enforcement, and social services agencies have often received complaints and warnings from parents, students, and others regarding educators that abuse and neglect students, but these complaints often go unaddressed and/or inadequately addressed, allowing classroom predators to not only have full access to abuse and/or neglect students for decades, but to migrate from school district to school district, state to state, as they do so. As a result, classrooms have become a "safe haven" for child molesters, abusers, and those that neglect children.

Fact: In the Commonwealth of Virginia, an individual will be fined more for speeding than for failing to report the suspected and/or actual abuse of a child as required by the Mandated Reporter Law. A proposal should be set forth that is similar to the PREA Federal law, which requires that individuals that knowingly fail to report sexual, physical, and/or emotional abuse and/or neglect, will be sentenced to the same criminal sanctions as the individual that committed the act, in addition to being required to register as a sex offender if warranted. They will be considered to be "accessories after the fact."

II. HOW CAN THOSE THAT ARE CHARGED WITH PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN IMPROVE THEIR EFFORTS TO DO SO?

1) VADOE purchase a criminal background check program that allows for annual reviews of those seeking licensure and those that are licensed. The fee for completing the checks can be charged to educators.

2) VADOE require each educator to submit a current criminal background check from the State Police with each licensure renewal request.

3) VADOE forward a monthly request, via email, to all area superintendents requiring that they report any and all educational professionals that have been found to have committed educator misconduct, abuse, and or neglect, whether they were terminated or permitted to resign. Require that if there are no reported instance for a specific district, that it be documented as well.

4) VCU and VADOE incorporate a mandatory pre-questionnaire component to the "Child Abuse Recognition" online assessment, and require that the assessment be completed annually during each district's staff development week:

"Criminal Disclosure Statement"

Ex) "To my knowledge, I have not committed, been charged, or convicted of a criminal act within the past twelve months." (Educator provides initials to confirm) A listing of criminal acts with a box to be check "yes" or "no" may also be utilized to ensure clarity.

"Mandatory Reporter Acknowledgement Statement"

Ex) "I understand that I am a Mandated Reporter within the Commonwealth of Virginia, and that I am required to report any instances of suspected or actual abuse and/or neglect to the Department of Social Services with 72 hours of having knowledge of the incident. (Educator provides initials to confirm) "Mandatory Reporter Compliance Statement"

Ex) "I affirm that I have fully complied with the Commonwealth of Virginia's Mandatory Reporter Law by reporting any and all suspected and actual incidents of child abuse and/or neglect to the Department of Social Services within 72 hours of having knowledge of the incident. (Educator provides initials to confirm)"

5) VADOE forward a monthly request, via email, to all area court clerks, state police, media sources, and social service agencies requiring that they report any and all educational professionals that have been found to have committed educator misconduct, abuse, and or neglect, whether they were terminated or permitted to resign.

6) Require that each district incorporate mandated reporter compliance, educator misconduct, and child abuse/neglect prevention and reporting training within their professional development calendar. In addition, require that every superintendent and school board member within the Commonwealth receive training regarding this issue as it relates to their legal and moral responsibilities.
responsibilities to protect children by thoroughly completing criminal background checks, quickly reporting suspected and confirmed instances of abuse, neglect, and misconduct. Districts must also be required to include an “Educator Code of Conduct” component with their “Student Code of Conduct” policy document that parents are provided within, and that outlines the policies for reporting abuse, neglect, and misconduct of educators.

7) VADOE establish a toll free number and anonymous email box that allows for reporting educator complaints related to abuse, neglect, and misconduct. Each school district should be required to notify parents, students, guardians, and others of this service that is available through the VADOE on their website

8) VADOE collaborate with the Virginia Attorney General's Office in order to establish a volunteer task force, (educators, VEA, parents, law enforcement, social services, elected officials, Superintendent's Assoc., School Board Ass., faith-based, child advocacy, and civil rights groups), that provides training and support for school districts that request it and for districts that are found to have failed to comply with the mandated reporter laws. In addition to providing training and proposing more severe penalties for those mandated reporters that fail to report.

9) VADOE provide unpaid internships to college and university students within the fields of law and law enforcement in order to provide for the human resources that are required to initiate and maintain criminal background/misconduct data base that is listed on the same data base as the teacher licensure query system. The VADOE may also solicit several teams of educational professionals to carry out these duties and offer licensure renewal credit under "Educational Projects." These methods would prove to place minimal financial burden on the agency, but would still work to ensure that educator data is accurate and current.

10) VADOE sponsor rotating quarterly townhall meetings, which are open to the general public, which allow for public comments regarding educators misconduct, abuse, neglect, and criminal histories. zhes events should be aired via internet on the VADOE’s website, in addition to being posted for later viewing.

11) Initiate legislation that requires that teachers be drug tested when they are initially hired, randomly, and when there is a report and/or suspicion of drug abuse/use manifested on school grounds.

December 5, 2010

Robert Crowder,
Dunsville, VA

Department of Education Guidelines, Virginia Board of Education Guidelines
I am totally appalled that so called “educated adults” see the need for implementing guidelines telling teachers how not to interact with their students. This is totally overkill and tells me that either the Department of Education is of the mindset of penalizing all for the poor judgment of a few OR that teachers are incompetent in knowing how to handle relationships with their students. If it is the latter, this tells me that either we are not properly preparing teachers for their occupation or we are not properly investigating the backgrounds in the employment process. 120 such cases of supposed improper action in 10 years in the entire Commonwealth do not justify the imposition of all these guidelines.

In many cases a Teacher is the only adult that a child receives encouragement from and offers the support needed. Frequently the student, when allowed, feels more comfortable talking out personal concerns with a teacher they respect than any other adult including their parent(s) or other relative. The very first proposed guideline would penalize any Teacher that listened to a student’s “private concerns”. Who is to say who “Initiates’ such a conversation? Most times it is initiated by the student.

Is the Teacher, in such a situation, supposed to walk away for the student and deny them the opportunity to discuss, what to the student, is a major problem with an adult that they respect and trust? I am aware of many occasions when a student in expressing joy at an educational or sport accomplishment will want to hug a coach or teacher. Is the Teacher or Coach supposed to push them away? This is the way any responsible Teacher will react if the first and last proposal is implemented.

I have several family members that have been or are in the educational profession in all three levels and they have related numerous occasions over the years where some of their students would be lost without a teacher spending time in addition to teaching them a subject.

In my opinion the implementation of these guidelines would cause dedicated teachers to function as a robot. It would be better to simply use video tapes or computer programs to teach rather than the cost involved in having an adult function as a video tape. Then who would counselors advise students to turn too when they have a family problem that is a major problem?

Using a shotgun approach to kill an insect is the easy way out and doesn't take a high level of education to use.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the “Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct & Abuse in Virginia’s Public Schools.”

Members of the Virginia Education Association (VEA) are bound by high ethical standards and are committed to a safe learning environment for all students. For example, a VEA resolution passed in 2007 reads as follows: “The VEA believes that school employees should maintain a professional relationship with students free from sexual coercion, innuendo, and/or action.” (Resolution E-10). Further, every member of the VEA and the National Education Association subscribes to the “Code of Ethics of the Education Profession,” which commits them to adhering to “the highest ethical standards.”

In recent years, VEA has reaffirmed these principles while providing additional guidance to our members. For example, we always caution educators to exercise the utmost discretion when using social networking sites or digital technologies. We offer in-service programs to our members regarding the importance of maintaining a professional relationship with students at all times. Especially for our younger educators, who are not that far in age from their high school students, we routinely offer guidance and advice on how to maintain a professional demeanor at all times. We welcome the opportunity to engage in dialogue about this difficult and sensitive issue. A policy on abuse and misconduct provides important clarification and guidance to employees surrounding an issue that may otherwise get swept under the rug.

At the same time, however, we believe the applications of some of these guidelines—without amendment or further explanation—might have unforeseen and unintended consequences that could actually be harmful to either educators or to students. We share your goal of the guidelines being as clear and unambiguous as possible.

**Communication Between School Division Employees and Students**

**In Person Communication**

**Bullet #1** limits conversations with students to “matters related to instruction and school activities.”

**Concern:** If adhered to strictly, this policy would work against teachers’ efforts to connect what students are learning in class to prior experience, to hobbies, and to interests that might serve as “hooks” for engagement with the curriculum. One VEA member related a story of trying to engage a group of disinterested boys in the curriculum of 12th grade English. In conversation about their interests, she discovered that several of them participated in dirt-track racing—not a school activity. She took the time to attend one of the races, potentially violating both this restriction and the restrictions about out of school trips and activities. The students saw her there, realized she was willing to learn about their interests, and they in turn engaged in her class. It isn’t always about school activities. Sometimes, the students who need the best our teachers have to offer are least likely to be part of any school-related activity.

**Bullet #5** states “School board employees may not conduct an ongoing series of one-on-one meetings with a student without the knowledge of the principal and without written permission of a parent or guardian.”

**Concern:** Such an absolute policy could work against teacher strategies to alter disruptive behaviors and engage students in learning. For example, the highly effective “two-minute intervention” requires the teacher to—

- Spend 2-5 minutes with a student for 10 consecutive days;
- Talk to that student about something that interests him/her;
- Keep the conversation on an informal basis;
- Move from teacher talk to student talk and keep the focus on that subject alone.

We also worry that these restrictions on communication may limit students’ access to trusted adults in a time of crisis. For many children, school is one of the few safe and positive environments they experience. These attempts to protect children from abuse and misconduct from school employees may prevent them from having the opportunity to disclose the abuse they are receiving outside of school. Disclosure of abuse rarely happens in front of a group of students. Rather, children get to know an adult, carefully determining who might be safe and trustworthy, and wait until they are alone with the adult to disclose. Preventing the child from having that opportunity to speak one-on-one about details of their private lives with an adult may actually put more children in harm’s way outside of school.

School personnel play a vital role in protecting children from abuse and neglect at home, in the family, or in the community. Guidance regarding reporting suspected misconduct and or abuse should mirror state law Virginia Code section 63.2-1509 mandating school personnel report “reason
to suspect that a child is an abused or neglected child.” Notice to the school principal or his designee can take the place of report to social services if information is received by a teacher or school staff member in the course of professional services in a school. The principal or his designee shall make the report to social services forthwith. School personnel risk fine for failure to file a required report within 72 hours of first suspicion of child abuse or neglect.

Electronic communications with students
Throughout this section, we encourage you to define terminology clearly; for example, “online social-networking sites.” What exactly does that include? Would “wikis” be prohibited? Would a fundraising page on Facebook set up by the choral boosters be prohibited?
Bullet #1 “Teachers and other employees may not use personal wireless communications devices to ‘text’ students and are prohibited from interacting with students through online social networking sites.”

Concern: Some teachers have only cellular phones (no landlines) and make that phone number available to students and their parents. Text messaging is a legitimate means of exchanging information—one of the most rapidly-growing communications channels—and we question whether policy guidance that allows for no legitimate use of a text message between an educator and a pupil will be outdated before it is published.

Physical contact
Guidance regarding physical contact with students should reflect state law prohibiting corporal punishment and authorizing physical contact for purposes such as defense of self or others, maintaining order and control, and enforcing school rules prohibiting weapons and other items. The proposed guidelines do not acknowledge that school employees are responsible to maintain discipline and order in schools. Guidelines should not risk giving students and parents a false impression that school personnel are prohibited from touching students. State statutes Virginia Code sections 22.1-279.1, 18.2-57 and 63.2-1511 prohibit corporal punishment, defined as the infliction of, or causing the infliction of, physical pain on a student as a means of discipline. The prohibition on corporal punishment does not prevent (i) the use of incidental, minor or reasonable physical contact or other actions designed to maintain order and control; (ii) the use of reasonable and necessary force to quell a disturbance or remove a student from the scene of a disturbance which threatens physical injury to persons or damage to property; (iii) the use of reasonable and necessary force to prevent a student from inflicting physical harm on himself; (iv) the use of reasonable and necessary force for self-defense or the defense of others; or (v) the use of reasonable and necessary force to obtain possession of weapons or other dangerous objects.

Concern: The three bulleted items do not address a variety of legitimate and appropriate reasons school employees may have for making physical contact with a student. A partial list would include:
- A teacher attempting to break up a fight or appropriately restrain an out-of-control student
- A coach “spotting” a gymnast during a routine
- A band instructor helping a novice student properly position his or her hands on a clarinet

Social Interactions with Students
We question whether some of these restrictions are feasible in small communities where teachers attend church with their students, coach youth soccer teams, attend neighborhood Christmas parties, and live their lives and raise their own children alongside the families of their students.

Consequences for violations of school board policy
Guidance regarding consequences for violations of school board child abuse policies should reflect state law regarding the standard for determining whether actions taken during the course of school employment constitute child abuse. Virginia Code section 63.2-1511 D provides if actions or omissions of a teacher, principal, or other person employed by a local school board or employed in a school operated by the Commonwealth were within such employee’s scope of employment and were taken in good faith in the course of supervision, care, or discipline of students, then the standard in determining if a report of abuse or neglect is founded is whether such acts or omissions constituted gross negligence or willful misconduct.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed guidelines. On behalf of the 60,000 members of the VEA, we stand ready to work with you to continue to provide the most up-to-date and accurate guidance to educators on this important topic.

Linwood Christian
Petersburg, VA

Dear Virginia Board of Education members,
In the recent month and weeks I have been hearing that this board is considering some type of
January 29, 2010

Troilen Seward
Legislative Liaison
Virginia Academy of School Psychologists

The Virginia Academy of School Psychologists (VASP) strongly supports the guidelines for implementing policies and procedures that establish clear and reasonable boundaries for interactions between students and teachers, other school board employees and adult volunteers. We, however, find the policy for in person communications with students troublesome in several places, given the scope of our duties and responsibilities. The bullet that references "employees and volunteers should not initiate discussions about their private lives or the intimate details of the private lives of unrelated students" could be problematic. If the "their" is referring to only the employee and volunteer, then there is not a problem. If, however, it is referring to the student, the potential for not following the policy exists for school psychologists, who in their testing, for example, may have to question responses or drawings made by students. Those questions could elicit information about students' private lives. Is it possible to re-word that bullet so that it does not apply to school psychologists engaging in the performance of their duties?

The other bullet that presents a problem is the one that states "private one-on-one conversations with students should take place within the potential view, but out of the earshot of other adults--such as in a classroom with the hallway door open." School psychologists are not always in a room with glass in the door so they are visible to others, yet their working environment must be private so as to ensure test security and testing validity. Testing with the door open is not a possibility. We in no way want to exempt school psychologists from the intent of these guidelines, but without a statement that addresses their concern in these two referenced bullets, performance of their
duties could become problematic. Every school psychologist who has read the guidelines and who has contacted me has asked the same questions or expressed the same concerns. Any clarification in the above would be appreciated.
### Appendix B: Public Comments Received After February 12, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Wendell C. Roberts,**  
Staff Attorney  
Virginia School Board Association | Barbara Coyle, Executive Director, Virginia School Board Association ("VSBA") received Dr. Wright's second draft of the "Guidance for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools" in her email dated, February 25th. We very much appreciate the opportunity to review the draft and provide comment in advance of the Superintendents Leadership Advisory Council (SLAC) meeting tomorrow morning. I will be attending the SLAC meeting in Barbara's place on behalf of the VSBA. It is clear that the latest revision takes into account many of the concerns expressed by stakeholders after the distribution of the first draft. Dr. Wright stated in her note accompanying the second draft that her goal was "to maintain a message of importance but leave the strategies and procedures for implementing the policies to those closest to the front line." We believe that Dr. Wright was successful and very much prefer the second draft to the first.  
We have, however, discussed some possible amendments to the second draft which we believe would accentuate the role of parents in the development and implementation of policies that protect children from sexual misconduct and abuse, particularly with regard to their supervision of their child's social networking. Our proposed amendments are detailed in the attached document. Please feel free to contact me directly any time today if you have any questions. As I indicated earlier, I will be at the SLAC tomorrow and can speak to them then if you wish.  
By way of introduction, I recently joined the team here at VSBA as a Staff Attorney on February 28th. I will be working with Elizabeth Ewing, Director, Legal and Policy Services, Gina Patterson, Asst. Executive Director, and, of course Barbara. I will be assuming many of the duties of Kate Kaminski, who left the VSBA last Fall. Prior to VSBA, I served as School Board Counsel to Henrico County Public Schools for six years.  
I look forward to meeting you both in person tomorrow. |
| **Charol Shakeshaft,**  
Professor and Chairperson  
Department of Educational Leadership  
Virginia Commonwealth University | Draft Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools  
I commend the Virginia Department of Education for preparing guidelines for school divisions on the prevention of educator sexual misconduct. This is a good first step toward confronting an issue that affects 10% of students in K-12 education. In Virginia, that percentage translates into more than 125,000 students in elementary, middle, and high school who are the targets of sexual misconduct by those paid to protect and teach them.  
I regret that the latest version of the guidelines has been streamlined. Many of the useful details of how to prevent sexual misconduct have been removed. Prevention of sexual misconduct by educators is a topic about which most school officials have little knowledge. Although most teachers, administrators, and policy makers mean well, they aren't familiar with the repertoire of prevention tools. An earlier version of these guidelines contained supportive and useful approaches to prevention. Educators often fear that guidelines for the prevention of educator sexual misconduct will result in false accusations or restrictions on effective teaching. In fact, comprehensive guidelines have the opposite effect. Good guidelines and regulations result in few false allegations by providing clear instruction for investigation and behavior. Moreover, guidelines and regulations provide educators with clarity around actions without preventing positive interactions with students.  
There are very few times that an educator needs to be alone, behind closed doors, |
after school hours with a student. There are many ways to work with students that do not require boundary crossing and most effective teachers know this. Most of the fear around prevention of boundary crossing proves unfounded when such guidelines and regulations are available.

While screening is necessary and appropriate, it is unlikely to identify the majority of abusers. Most have no criminal record. While there are background protocols that will identify those most at risk for abusing, these are expensive and beyond the available funds in most divisions.

The majority of abusers are employees who lack judgment and/or are emotionally delayed. Education, clear behavioral expectations, and careful supervision are likely to prevent these educators who are at-risk for becoming abusers to take those steps. Many of the guidelines that would help keep those at-risk from abusing have been removed in this version. It is very important that educator sexual misconduct be treated apart from general sexual harassment or child maltreatment policies. The traditional remedies and regulations in those areas are not sufficient to prevent educator sexual misconduct. The guidance on policy elements for divisions in the earlier version was extremely useful.

In the long run, education not only protects children, it also saves money. The average settlement in civil suits against school districts is 6 million dollars, not including attorney fees. Cases that include a trial are most likely to be decided in favor of the plaintiffs and carry even larger financial awards than do settlements. The recommendations for best practice included in the earlier version were drawn from research and enacted policy in other states that have been shown to protect children, to prevent those at-risk for abusing to act, and to save divisions time and money litigating civil suits. Most administrators and teachers need suggestions for best practice. This is not an area that has been included in their university education nor is it an area that most educators understand. Those who don’t abuse (which are the large majority of educators) don’t imagine a world in which these things happen and, therefore, are often blind to behaviors in others that should set off alarms. Providing model policies and practices helps educate everyone.

If the guidelines that are to be adopted do not include these model policies and practices as part of the document, I would hope they might at least be included in an appendix.

Moreover, I would hope that the Department might provide the leadership and support to develop or adopt an online module that specifically addresses educator sexual misconduct, much like the training available online for prevention of abuse of children that is currently offered through VCU. This would provide an inexpensive vehicle for education on the prevention of educator sexual misconduct for divisions. It would also provide a more effective delivery system than workshops in schools. Currently there is very little specific education on the prevention of educator sexual misconduct occurring at any level in Virginia.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairfax County Public Schools</th>
<th>we raised in our letter of February 11, 2011, and we appreciate the department’s responsiveness to our comments. We have only a few, relatively minor suggestions in regards to the February 25 draft. First, we suggest that the second bullet in the “In-Person Communication” section on page one be expanded to cover other off-campus locations. For example: “Frequent invitations to students to visit an educator or volunteer’s home, frequent visits to a student’s home, or frequent meetings/invitations for other social contacts with a student off-campus without the permission or knowledge of the student’s parents.” Second, we recommend the deletion of “formal reprimands” from number five on page six. From our perspective, if an employee actually has engaged in sexual misconduct, a reprimand is too lenient a penalty, and the guidelines should not suggest otherwise. Local school districts ordinarily would (and should) dismiss an employee involved in sexual misconduct with students, and should advise the receiving district of the misconduct dismissal when providing an employment reference. On the other hand, if the local school district simply counseled or reprimanded an employee for risky behavior not yet at the “misconduct” level, it might not be appropriate to forward the personnel document to a subsequent employer. For example, if an employee were counseled in writing about being too “touchy” with students and corrected the offending behavior, it might be unfair to jeopardize future employment. If the employee’s conduct were serious or repeated, however, the sending school district should place the receiving school district on notice of prior problems. Given the range of sexually related incidents that could result in a reprimand, but fall short of dismissible sexual misconduct, we recommend that this guideline be confined to dismissals, leaving the reprimand issue to local discretion. Apart from these concerns, we are comfortable with the new guidelines, and believe that local school boards could productively use them as a starting point for revising their own policies. Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam Moran Superintendent Albemarle County Public Schools</td>
<td>My impression is that this latest draft is right on target to establish a focus on appropriate behaviors and address what constitutes inappropriate behaviors in any venue- face to face or electronic. My comment is not an official VASS position given that we are seeking final feedback from the leadership council but I see this as vastly improved and on point. Thank you for listening to the feedback and adjusting the guidelines to address behavior. You will receive an official position from VASS sometime in the near future. I am copying Tom Smith on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kitty Boitnott President Virginia Education Association | Public Comment Received Concerning Proposed Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct and Abuse in Virginia Public Schools.” Good morning President Saslaw, members of the Board and Superintendent Wright. My name is Kitty Boitnott, and I am president of the Virginia Education Association. I am here this morning to talk about the “Revised Guidelines for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct in Virginia’s Public Schools.” I know that this item has been delayed until the March meeting, and I hope that it is your intention to use the additional time to review and consider the comments that have been sent to you. Many of our members have shared copies of their remarks, and I trust that you will take a serious look at the thoughtful, articulate, professional comments that highly accomplished educators have submitted. Members of the Virginia Education Association (VEA) are bound by high ethical standards and are committed to a safe learning environment for all students. For example, a VEA resolution passed in 2007 reads as follows: “The VEA believes that school employees should maintain a professional relationship with students free from sexual coercion, innuendo, and/or action.” Further, every member of the VEA and the National Education Association subscribes to the “Code of Ethics of the Education Profession,” which commits them to adhering to “the highest ethical
standards.”
In recent years, VEA has reaffirmed these principles while providing additional guidance to our members. For example, we always caution educators to exercise the utmost discretion when using social networking sites or digital technologies. We offer in-service programs to our members regarding the importance of maintaining a professional relationship with students at all times. Especially for our younger educators, who are not that far in age from their high school students, we routinely offer guidance and advice on how to maintain a professional demeanor at all times. We welcome the opportunity to engage in dialogue about this difficult and sensitive issue. A policy on abuse and misconduct provides important clarification and guidance to employees about an issue that may otherwise get swept under the rug. At the same time, however, we believe the applications of some of these guidelines—without amendment or further explanation—might have unforeseen and unintended consequences that could actually be harmful to either educators or to students. Our detailed concerns have been enumerated in the public comments we submitted on December 3, 2010 and January 12, 2011. I’m not going to review them now, since you have copies of them.
Instead, I want to remind you of the unintended consequences to high quality instruction and student achievement that may come from these guidelines. The research is clear and abundant—in order for students to be most successful, teachers must design relevant, responsive and rigorous curriculum. They must connect a student’s interests and prior experiences to the SOL content they are charged with delivering. Students learn best when they feel safe and secure in the learning environment, and much of that safety and security comes from building a trusting relationship with the professionals within the school building. I worry that taking steps to limit educators’ ability to foster these relationships by limiting student and teacher interactions will lead to less responsive and lower quality instruction, which will lead to lower student achievement.
Appendix C:

Sample Policies on Sexual Misconduct & Abuse
Updated educators’ ethics code addresses social media

AUSTIN - Teachers must refrain from inappropriately communicating with students through the use of social media under the requirements of an updated Educators’ Code of Ethics endorsed by the State Board of Education today.

The Code of Ethics was updated by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC), which oversees educator certification issues. Rules proposed by SBEC must come to the State Board of Education for review before they become effective.

Texas Education Agency staff requested the change to the ethics code because they said they are receiving disciplinary case referrals in which teachers were found to have sent students thousands of text messages. Sometimes the content of the messages was not inappropriate on their face but the volume of messages and time of day the messages were sent indicated that the educator was “grooming” the student for a future sexual relationship.

A school district employee commits a second-degree felony under Penal Code Section 21.12 if the employee engages in sexual contact with a student who is not their spouse. The new provision in the Code of Ethics says:

(I) Standard 3.9. The educator shall refrain from inappropriate communication with a student or minor, including, but not limited to, electronic communication such as cell phone, text messaging, email, instant messaging, blogging, or other social network communication. Factors that may be considered in assessing whether the communication is inappropriate include, but are not limited to:

(i) the nature, purpose, timing, and amount of the communication;
(ii) the subject matter of the communication;
(iii) whether the communication was made openly or the educator attempted to conceal the communication;
(iv) whether the communication could be reasonably interpreted as soliciting sexual contact or a romantic relationship;
(v) whether the communication was sexually explicit; and
(vi) whether the communication involved discussion(s) of the physical or sexual attractiveness or the sexual history, activities, preferences, or fantasies of either the educator or the student.
II. 2010 Massachusetts Association of School Committees Model Policy

FACEBOOK AND SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES

The Superintendent and the School Principals will annually remind staff members and orient new staff members concerning the importance of maintaining proper decorum in the on-line, digital world as well as in person. Employees must conduct themselves in ways that do not distract from or disrupt the educational process. The orientation and reminders will give special emphasis to:

1) improper fraternization with students using Facebook and similar internet sites or social networks, or via cell phone, texting or telephone.
   a. Teachers may not list current students as “friends” on networking sites.
   b. All e-contacts with students should be through the district’s computer and telephone system, except emergency situations.
   c. All contact and messages by coaches with team members shall be sent to all team members, except for messages concerning medical or academic privacy matters, in which case the messages will be copied to the athletic director and the school Principal.
   d. Teachers will not give out their private cell phone or home phone numbers without prior approval of the district.
   e. Inappropriate contact via e-mail or phone is prohibited.

2) inappropriateness of posting items with sexual content

3) inappropriateness of posting items exhibiting or advocating use of drugs and alcohol

4) examples of inappropriate behavior from other districts, as behavior to avoid

5) monitoring and penalties for improper use of district computers and technology

6) the possibility of penalties, including dismissal from employment, for failure to exercise good judgment in on-line conduct.

The Superintendent or designee will periodically conduct internet searches to see if teachers have posted inappropriate materials on-line. When inappropriate use of computers and websites is discovered, the School Principals and Superintendent will promptly bring that inappropriate use to the attention of the staff member and may consider and apply disciplinary action up to and including termination.
III. Amended Mississippi Educator Code of Ethics

NEWS RELEASE

Release Date: January 20, 2011
Contact: Wendy Polk, APR, Director of Communications, 601-359-3706

MDE releases its proposed Mississippi Educator Code of Ethics

JACKSON, Mississippi (January 20, 2011) – Leaders from the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) presented a draft of the Educator Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct to the Board of Education today. The proposed draft includes standards for educator/student relationships, unlawful acts and others areas of professional conduct.

“We continue to see the number of incidences of unacceptable behavior, such as inappropriate relationships between teachers and students, increase in number,” said State Superintendent of Education Tom Burnham. “These recommendations set clear guidelines for educators. Our hope is that this Code of Ethics will protect the health, safety and general welfare of our students and educators.”

The purpose of the Code of Ethics is to define the parameters of professional behavior of teachers. The Code was developed by a 20 member task force that included educators, elected officials, community leaders and MDE representatives. Along with the Code of Ethics, there is proposed legislation to amend Section 37-3-2. This would provide specific grounds for revocation or suspension of a teacher or administrator’s license for sexual misconduct and require local Superintendents to report to MDE unethical conduct relating to an educator/student relationship.

“On behalf of the Mississippi Board of Education, I want to emphasize that the Board’s top priority is to do what is best for the children of Mississippi,” said Board Chairman Charles McClelland. “We are committed to the safety and security of all of our students and want each one of them to be in a positive learning environment.”

The standards are defined under the following categories:

- Professional conduct – An educator should demonstrate conduct that follows generally recognized professional standards.
- Trustworthiness – An educator should exemplify honesty and integrity in the course of professional practice and does not knowingly engage in deceptive practices regarding official policies of the school district or educational institution.
- Unlawful Acts - An educator shall abide by federal, state, and local laws and statutes and local school board policies.
- Educator/Student Relationships - An educator should always maintain a professional relationship with all students, both in and outside the classroom.
- Educator/Colleague Relationships - An educator should always maintain a professional relationship with colleagues, both in and outside the classroom.
- Alcohol, Drug and Tobacco Use of Possession - An educator should refrain from the use of alcohol and/or tobacco during the course of professional practice and should never use illegal or unauthorized drugs.
- Public Funds and Property - An educator shall not knowingly misappropriate, divert, or use funds, personnel, property, or equipment committed to his or her charge for personal gain or advantage.
- Remunerative Conduct - An educator should maintain integrity with students, colleagues, parents, patrons, or businesses when accepting gifts, gratuities, favors, and additional compensation.
- Maintenance of Confidentiality - An educator shall comply with state and federal laws and local school board policies relating to confidentiality of student and personnel records, standardized test material, and other information covered by confidentiality agreements.
- Breach of Contract of Abandonment of Employment - An educator should fulfill all of the terms and obligations detailed in the contract with the local school board or educational agency for the duration of the contract.

Excerpt of amended code:

Standard 4. Educator/Student Relationship
An educator should always maintain a professional relationship with all students, both in and outside the classroom.

4.1. Ethical conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
   a. Fulfilling the roles of mentor and advocate for students in a professional relationship. A professional relationship is one where the educator maintains a position of teacher/student authority while expressing concern, empathy, and encouragement for students
   b. Nurturing the intellectual, physical, emotional, social and civic potential of all students
   c. Providing an environment that does not needlessly expose students to unnecessary embarrassment or disparagement
   d. Creating, supporting, and maintaining a challenging learning environment for all students

4.2. Unethical conduct includes, but is not limited to the following:
   a. Committing any act of child abuse
   b. Committing any act of cruelty to children or any act of child endangerment
   c. Committing or soliciting any unlawful sexual act
   d. Engaging in harassing behavior on the basis of race, gender, national origin, religion or disability
   e. Furnishing tobacco, alcohol, or illegal/unauthorized drugs to any student or allowing a student to consume alcohol or illegal/unauthorized drugs
   f. Soliciting, encouraging, participating or initiating inappropriate written, verbal, electronic, physical or romantic relationship with a student.

Examples of these acts may include but not be limited to:
   1. sexual jokes
   2. sexual remarks
   3. sexual kidding or teasing
   4. sexual innuendo
   5. pressure for dates or sexual favors
   6. inappropriate touching, fondling, kissing or grabbing
   7. rape
   8. threats of physical harm
   9. sexual assault
   10. electronic communication such as texting
   11. invitation to social networking
   12. remarks about a student’s body
   13. consensual sex
IV. Louisiana House Bill 570 (2009)

HLS 09RS-735

Regular Session, 2009

HOUSE BILL NO. 570

BY REPRESENTATIVES HOFFMANN, HENRY BURNS, CHAMPAGNE, CORTEZ,
DOVE, FOIL, LITTLE, PERRY, PUGH, ROBIDEAUX, SIMON, SMILEY, JANE
SMITH, AND THIBAULT AND SENATORS APPEL, CROWE, DUPLESSIS,
KOSTELKA, MICHOT, SMITH, AND WALSWORTH

Prefiled pursuant to Article III, Section 2(A)(4)(b)(i) of the Constitution of Louisiana.

SCHOOLS/EMPLOYEES: Provides relative to policies, procedures, and practices at public
elementary and secondary schools concerning electronic communications by an
employee at a school to a student at that school

1

AN ACT

To enact R.S. 17:81(Q) and 3996(B)(21), to require the governing authority of a public
elementary or secondary school to formulate, develop, adopt, and implement
policies, procedures, and practices applicable to school employees relative to
electronic communications by an employee at a school to a student at that school; to
provide policy guidelines and requirements; to provide limitations and exceptions;
to provide that the occurrence of certain electronic communications be reported by
the school employee; to provide for immunity from civil liability; to provide an
effective date; and to provide for related matters.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana:

Section 1. R.S. 17:81(Q) and 3996(B)(21) are hereby enacted to read as follows:
§81. General powers of city and parish school boards

* * *

Q.(1) Each city, parish, or other local public school board shall formulate,
develop, adopt, and implement, by not later than November 15, 2009, policies,
procedures, and practices applicable to school system employees relative to an
electronic communication by an employee at a school to a student at that school.
(2) The policies, procedures, and practices required by Paragraph (1) of this
Subsection, at a minimum, shall:

(a) Define electronic communication. The definition shall recognize the
multiple means available for making such a communication, both those that facilitate
direct communication, including but not limited to voice or text-based
telecommunication devices, or both, and computers, and those that facilitate indirect
communication using an intermediate method, including but not limited to
Internet-based social networks.

(b) Require that all electronic communication by an employee at a school to
a student at that school relative to the educational services provided to the student
shall use a means provided by or otherwise made available by the school system for
this purpose and prohibit the use of all such system means to electronically
communicate with a student for a purpose not related to such educational services
except communication with an immediate family member if such communication is
specifically authorized by school board policy.

(c) Specify that the occurrence of any electronic communication made by an
employee at a school to a student at that school or that is received by an employee
at a school from a student at that school using a means other than one provided by
or made available by the school system shall be reported by the employee in a
manner deemed appropriate by the school board.

(d) Specify that it is a duty of a school system employee to comply with the
policies, procedures, and practices and provide that a failure to comply may
consider willful neglect of duty.

(e) Establish and provide for the imposition of consequences for a violation
of the policies, procedures, and practices, including but not limited to termination of
employment in accordance with applicable provisions of state law.

(f) Provide a means for the timely reporting and investigation at the school
system level of an alleged failure by a school employee to comply with the policies.
procedures, or practices and for concluding such an investigation and resolving the
allegation.

(g) Provide a means whereby any alleged failure by a school employee to
comply with the policies, procedures, or practices that also may be a violation of
state or federal law is reported to the proper authorities.

(h) Provide a means to assure that all school system employees are informed
fully of the policies, procedures, and practices and the possible consequences at the
school and school system level for a failure to comply.

(i) Provide a means to assure that a parent or other person responsible for a
child's school attendance is fully informed of the policies, procedures, and practices.

(j) Provide a means for a parent or other person responsible for a child's
school attendance to request that the child not be contacted through electronic
communication by any school employee unless the purpose of such communication
is directly related to the child's educational services and is sent to and received by
more than one student at the school.

(2) Any city, parish, or other local public school board having existing
policies, procedures, and practices relative to electronic communication by an
employee at a school to a student at that school shall conduct by not later than
November 15, 2009, a formal evaluation of all such policies, procedures, and
practices to determine their compliance with the provisions of Paragraph (2) of this
Subsection and shall take all action necessary to conform the existing policies,
procedures, and practices to such requirements.

(4) No city, parish, or other local public school board or member of such a
board shall be civilly liable for any electronic communication by an employee to a
student that is prohibited as provided in this Subsection.

(5) For the purposes of this Subsection, the term "city, parish, or other local
public school board" shall mean the governing authority of any public elementary
or secondary school.

*     *     *

*     *     *
§3996. Charter schools; exemptions

* * *

B. Notwithstanding any state law, rule, or regulation to the contrary and except as may be otherwise specifically provided for in an approved charter, a charter school established and operated in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter and its approved charter and the school’s officers and employees shall be exempt from all statutory mandates or other statutory requirements that are applicable to public schools and to public school officers and employees except for the following laws otherwise applicable to public schools with the same grades:

* * *

(21) Electronic communication by an employee at a school to a student at that school. R.S. 17:81(Q).

* * *

Section 2. This Act shall become effective on July 1, 2009; if vetoed by the governor and subsequently approved by the legislature, this Act shall become effective on July 1, 2009, or on the day following such approval by the legislature, whichever is later.

DIGEST

The digest printed below was prepared by House Legislative Services. It constitutes no part of the legislative instrument. The keyword, one-liner, abstract, and digest do not constitute part of the law or proof or indicium of legislative intent. [R.S. 1:13(E) and 24:177(E)].

Hoffmann

HB No. 570

Abstract: Requires the governing authority of a public elementary or secondary school, including a charter school, to formulate, develop, adopt, and implement by not later than Nov. 15, 2009, policies, procedures, and practices applicable to school employees relative to electronic communication by an employee at a school to a student at that school. Specifies, at a minimum, that such policies, procedures, and practices include certain provisions.

Proposed law requires each local public school board to formulate, develop, adopt, and implement by not later than Nov. 15, 2009, policies, procedures, and practices applicable to school system employees relative to an electronic communication by an employee at a school to a student at that school.

Specifies that the policies, procedures, and practices, at a minimum, shall:

(1) Define electronic communication and shall recognize the multiple means available for making such a communication, including specified forms of both direct communication and indirect communication.
Summary of Amendments Adopted by House

Committee Amendments Proposed by House Committee on Education to the original bill.

1. Relative to the proposed law prohibition of certain electronic communications by school employees with students, adds an exception to such prohibition for a communication with an immediate family member if such communication is authorized by school board policy.

2. Provides that failure by a school employee to comply with school board policies, procedures, and practices relative to electronic communications may constitute willful neglect of duty instead of shall constitute willful neglect of duty.

3. Adds that the school board policies, procedures, and practices as required by proposed law also shall include a means for a parent or other person responsible for a child's school attendance to request that the child not be contacted through electronic communication by any school employee unless the purpose of such communication is directly related to the child's educational services and is sent to and received by more than one student at the school.

4. Adds that no school board or member of such a board shall be civilly liable for any electronic communication that is prohibited by proposed law.
V. National School Boards Association’s Council of Attorneys Sample Boundaries Policy

Maintaining Professional Staff /Student Boundaries

The purpose of this procedure is to provide all staff, students, volunteers and community members with information to increase their awareness of their role in protecting children from inappropriate conduct by adults.

In a professional staff/student relationship, school employees maintain boundaries that are consistent with the legal and ethical duty of care that school personnel have for students.

A boundary invasion is an act or omission by a school employee that violates professional staff/student boundaries and has the potential to abuse the staff/student relationship.

An inappropriate boundary invasion means an act, omission, or pattern of such behavior by a school employee that does not have an educational purpose; and results in abuse of the staff/student professional relationship.

Unacceptable Conduct

Examples of inappropriate boundary invasions by staff members include but are not limited to the following:

- Any type of inappropriate physical contact with a student or any other conduct that might be considered harassment under the Board’s policy on Harassment and Sexual Harassment of Students;
- Showing pornography to a student;
- Singling out a particular student or students for personal attention and friendship beyond the professional staff-student relationship;
- Socializing where students are consuming alcohol, drugs or tobacco;
- For non-guidance/counseling staff, encouraging students to confide their personal or family problems and/or relationships. If a student initiates such discussions, staff members are expected to refer the student to appropriate guidance/counseling staff. In either case, staff involvement should be limited to a direct connection to the student’s school performance;
- Sending students on personal errands unrelated to any educational purpose;
- Banter, allusions, jokes or innuendos of a sexual nature with students;
- Disclosing personal, sexual, family, employment concerns, or other private matters to one or more students;
- Addressing students, or permitting students to address staff members with personalized terms of endearment, pet names, or otherwise in an overly familiar manner;
- Maintaining personal contact with a student outside of school by phone, email, Instant Messenger or Internet chat rooms, social networking Web sites, or letters (beyond homework or other legitimate school business) without including the parent/guardian.
- Exchanging personal gifts, cards or letters with an individual student;
- Socializing or spending time with students (including but not limited to activities such as going out for beverages, meals or movies, shopping, traveling, and recreational activities) outside of school-sponsored events, except as participants in organized community activities;
- Giving a student a ride alone in a vehicle in a non-emergency situation; and/or
- Unnecessarily invading a student’s privacy, (e.g. walking in on the student in the bathroom)
**Appearances of Impropriety**

The following activities are boundary invasions and can create an actual impropriety or the appearance of impropriety. Whenever possible, staff should avoid these situations. If unavoidable these activities should be pre-approved by the appropriate administrator. If not pre-approved, the staff person must report the occurrence, to the appropriate administrator, as soon as possible.

- Being alone with an individual student out of the view of others;
- Inviting or allowing individual students to visit the staff member’s home;
- Visiting a student’s home; and/or
- Social networking with students for non-educational purposes.

**Reporting Violations**

Students and their parents/guardians are strongly encouraged to notify the principal (or other administrator) if they believe a teacher or other staff member may be engaging in conduct that violates this policy.

Staff members are required to promptly notify the principal (or other administrator) or the superintendent if they become aware of a situation that may constitute a violation of this policy.

**Disciplinary Action**

Staff violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action up to and including dismissal. The violation will also be reported to the state Office of Professional Practices. Violations involving sexual or other abuse will also result in referral to Child Protective Services and/or law enforcement in accordance with the board’s policy on Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect.

**Training**

All new employees and volunteers will receive training on appropriate staff/student boundaries within three months (or insert number of days/months) of employment. Continuing employees will receive training every three years.

**Dissemination of Policy and Reporting Protocols**

This policy and procedure shall be included on the district Web site and in all employee, student and volunteer handbooks. Annually, all administrators and staff will receive copies of the district’s reporting protocol.

---

**Date: 02.10**
Arkansas PLSB Recommendations Regarding the Educational Applications of Social-Networking Technology

Increasingly, educators are utilizing for educational purposes social-networking technology tools. The Professional Licensure Standards Board, in concert with the Arkansas Education Association, the Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators, and the Arkansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, offers the following cautionary guidelines to assist educators in assuring that their usage of these tools is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Code of Ethics for Arkansas Educators:

1) To the extent possible, use the social-networking tools provided through school accounts rather than tools available through your own personal accounts.
2) Provide parents/guardians and appropriate school officials a written explanation of your reasons/purposes for using each tool.
3) Use social-networking tools only during appropriate business/school hours.
4) Regularly check for inappropriate material on any tool site that you use to which your students and/or the public can post. Report any such material to your school’s administration.

Approved 5/14/2010

Professional Licensure Standards Board
Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Topic: First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Alexandria City Public Schools

Presenter: Ms. Anne Wescott, Assistant Superintendent for Policy and Communications
Dr. Morton Sherman, Superintendent, Alexandria City Public Schools

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2403 E-Mail Address: Anne.Wescott@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

X Board review required by

___ State or federal law or regulation

___ Board of Education regulation

___ Other: ____________________________________________________________

___ Action requested at this meeting

X Action requested at future meeting: April 28, 2011

Previous Review/Action:

X No previous board review/action

___ Previous review/action

Date ___________________________________________________________________

Action ___________________________________________________________________

Background Information: 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.B.3 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….
B. For purposes of this section, "good cause" means:

…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….

The Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, at 8 VAC 20-131-290.D, permit local school boards to seek approval to implement experimental or innovative programs under the following conditions:

D. With the approval of the local school board, local schools seeking to implement experimental or innovative programs, or both, that are not consistent with these standards shall submit a waiver request, on forms provided, to the board for evaluation and approval prior to implementation. The request must include the following:

1. Purpose and objectives of the experimental/innovative programs;
2. Description and duration of the programs;
3. Anticipated outcomes;
4. Number of students affected;
5. Evaluation procedures; and
6. Mechanisms for measuring goals, objectives, and student academic achievement….

The following school divisions with innovative or experimental programs were approved for the 2010-2011 school year: Alexandria (two schools), Arlington County (one), Charlotte County (six), Covington (two), Danville (five), Harrisonburg (five), and Richmond City (one).

Summary of Major Elements: The Alexandria City School Board (ACPS) is requesting approval of waivers for innovative programs to allow all of its schools to open prior to Labor Day:

- John Adams Elementary School
- Charles Barrett Elementary School
- Patrick Henry Elementary School
- Douglas MacArthur Elementary School
- George Mason Elementary School
- Matthew Maury Elementary School
- James K. Polk Elementary School
- William Ramsay Elementary School
• Samuel W. Tucker Elementary School*
• Jefferson-Houston K-8 School
• Cora Kelly School for Math, Science and Technology
• Lyles-Crouch Traditional Academy
• Mount Vernon Community School*
• George Washington Middle Schools 1 and 2
• Francis C. Hammond Middle Schools 1, 2, and 3
• T.C. Williams High School

*Samuel W. Tucker Elementary School and Mount Vernon Community School already open before Labor Day, as these schools were approved by the Virginia Board of Education in 2004 and 2005 to operate on a Modified School Calendar as year-round schools.

The school division is requesting the waiver in order to facilitate the implementation of numerous innovative programs ACPS is initiating to help schools meet state and federal standards:

• To increase learning time for students;
• To better connect professional learning with the school calendar by creating additional professional learning time and reducing the amount of time teachers are pulled from classrooms;
• To provide time for teachers to work on school education goals and their Individual Professional Learning Plans; and
• To provide professional opportunities for teachers to update Individual Achievement Plans for students as part of the transformation model for school improvement as an option under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) have 11,999 students with thirteen elementary schools, five middle schools, and one high school. Students come from more than a hundred different countries and speak 65 native languages. Fifty-two percent of ACPS students are eligible for free or reduced price meals, and three schools have more than 70 percent of their students classified as disadvantaged. About 21.5 percent of the students receive English Language Learner (ELL) services. ACPS also has a highly mobile population, with some immigrant students entering the system in middle or high school with little formal education in any language. ACPS currently has 1,661 students, or 13.8 percent, receiving special education.

T.C. Williams High School, the school division’s only high school, has been federally designated as a Persistently Lowest Achieving High School and has adopted the Transformation Model of Improvement. It has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) since 2002 when Congress amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Twelve other schools did not make AYP in the 2010-2011 school year. Eighteen of the 19 schools are fully accredited. Jefferson-Houston Elementary School is warned in English and history.

The school division’s on-time graduation rate (students who enter 9th grade and finish within four years) is currently 79 percent, compared to the statewide average of 85.5 percent for the class of 2010.

In March 2009, the Alexandria City School Board, adopted a strategic plan that commits to “Set[ting] the international standards for educational excellence, where all students achieve their potential and
actively contribute to our local and global communities.” The School Board further declared “We will achieve our vision as we provide the environment, resources, and commitment to ensure that each and every student succeeds – academically, emotionally, physically, and socially.” The school board and administration have also pledged to ensure that all students graduate prepared for college or higher learning if that is their choice.

In its request, ACPS indicates that it has begun an assertive transformation of its schools and central office. When T.C. Williams High School was designated as one of Virginia’s Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools, the Transformation Model that was put into place recognized that teachers are the core to school improvement. The following transformation efforts are being implemented:

- Hiring additional high school counselors to adjust the student load from 260 to about 180;
- Hiring additional middle and high school mathematics and English teachers to enable these teachers to provide individualized instruction and interventions for at-risk students;
- Creating Individual Learning Plans for every middle and high school student in mathematics and language arts and providing additional tutoring for students;
- Requiring Professional Learning Plans for every licensed employee and providing enhanced professional development and coaching for teachers;
- Transforming the two large middle schools into five smaller schools to create more personalized and customized learning environments; and
- Creating limits on elementary class size.

In its request, ACPS proposes to provide more time for learning to all students with the following actions:

- The 2011-2012 school year would begin on August 29, 2011, and end on June 15, 2012, which would allow ACPS to offer five days of instruction prior to Labor Day.
- ACPS plans to add two instructional days to the school calendar, increasing the number of instructional days from 183 to 185, as part of the larger effort to increase instructional time.
- ACPS also plans to use other strategies to maximize student time in the classroom, such as adding teacher work days for professional development rather than pulling teachers out of class for professional development and reducing half-day classes.
- ACPS has recently adopted a new policy to hold elementary summer school the first two weeks of August, rather than immediately after the end of the school year, to prepare students better for the upcoming school year.

A copy of the complete package submitted by the ACPS School Board is attached.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:** The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept the request from Alexandria City Public Schools for first review, pursuant to the provisions of §22.1-79.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

**Impact on Resources:** The impact on resources is not expected to be significant.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:** The request will be presented to the Board of Education for final review at the April 28, 2011 meeting.
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
P.O. Box 2120
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23218-2120

REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF CERTAIN ACCREDITING STANDARDS
AND/OR APPROVAL
OF AN INNOVATIVE OR EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, (8 VAC 20-131-10 et seq.) set the minimum standards public schools must meet to be accredited by the Board of Education. Accreditation of public schools is required by the Standards of Quality (§§ 22.1-253.13:1 et seq.). The annual accrediting cycle for public schools is July 1 through June 30.

This cover sheet, with the supporting documentation, must be submitted to the Department of Education for review and recommendation to the board at least 90 days prior to the beginning of an accrediting cycle or the proposed implementation of the program or activity that precipitates the request for the waiver. The types of waivers available and the corresponding section of the standards are indicated below. Please attach additional sheets or information deemed appropriate. [The board will consider this request in its monthly meeting and school divisions may be requested to appear before the board to explain a waiver request.]

SCHOOL DIVISION

Alexandria City Public Schools (101)

TITLE OF PROGRAM/ACTIVITY
Early Opening Waiver for all ACPS Schools

TYPE OF APPROVAL REQUESTED:

☐ Approval of an Alternative to the Standard School Year and School Day (8 VAC 20-131-150)
☐ Approval of an Alternative Accreditation Plan (8 VAC 20-131-280.D)
☐ Approval of an Experimental Program (8 VAC 20-131-290.D)
☐ Approval of an Innovative Program (8 VAC 20-131-290.D)
☐ Approval of a Waiver of Other Provision(s) of the Standards (8 VAC 20-131-330)

(Complete Pages 1 and 3 of the application only.)

SCHOOL(S) INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED PROGRAM/ACTIVITY

All ACPS schools - listed in the
attachment

March 3, 2011
Date Approved
by the Local School Board

March 4, 2011
Submission Date

Attachment B to Supts. Memo 059-09
March 6, 2009

Signature
Chairman of the School Board

Signature
Division Superintendent

Form SA.020 Revised 12/2005
SCHOOL DIVISION Alexandria City Public Schools (101)

TITLE OF PROGRAM/ACTIVITY An earlier start will facilitate a number of innovative programs, some of which are required. TC Williams is a Persistently Lowest Achieving School and thus has adopted the Transformation Model of improvement. We are applying for the International Baccalaureate Programme for two elementary schools and for the middle schools, necessitating much collaborative planning. Exemplary programs such as CETA, MindUp, Habits of Mind and AVID (described in the attached application) each require significant training of teachers. We hope to reduce the amount of time that teachers are pulled from class by working in more days for professional development during the year. These are only some of the examples.


See the attached application for full details. The early opening waiver is requested for the entire school division. Fifty-two percent of ACPS students are disadvantaged. It is a highly mobile population. More than thirty percent are Hispanic, and 21.5 percent receive ELL services. Some of our schools, including the high school, have never made Adequate Yearly Progress.

The required transformation of TC Williams, because of the PLA designation, indicates the need for some transformation and innovations throughout the school system, all of which require additional teacher training. One important innovation is the creation of Individual Achievement Plans for every middle and high school students in math and language arts. IAPs are also being developed for “at risk” students in the elementary schools. This individualized approach requires days interspersed throughout the year for the IAP student-led conferences. Teachers’ professional development will be guided by Professional Learning Plans (PLPs). We assert that the extensive use of IAPs and PLPs is highly innovative. ACPS is also developing professional learning teams in each school. More details are in the attached application.

DOES THE PROGRAM REQUIRE THAT SCHOOLS IN THE DIVISION OPEN PRIOR TO LABOR DAY? Yes

IF YES, EXPLAIN WHY.

Details are in the application. In brief,
- Additional days of meaningful instruction before spring SOL testing by adding two days to the calendar and by pushing more instructional time to early in the year, so that students will gain more than two days of instruction before tests
- More meaningful professional development throughout the year rather than “front loaded”

IF THE PROGRAM IS EXPERIMENTAL, INCLUDE INFORMATION THAT EXPLAINS WHY THERE IS REASON TO EXPECT THAT THE PROGRAM WILL BE SUCCESSFUL.

The programs being implemented are not experimental. They are tried and tested throughout the country. They are, however, innovative, particularly in Alexandria City Public Schools. The only aspects of the innovations that might be considered experimental are the Individual Achievement Plans implemented for
so many students. Already, anecdotal evidence indicates that they will be successful, as does the extremely high rate of participation by parents and guardians in the conferences...more than 90 percent. The conferences are student-led, student centered, and goal oriented. Parents have expressed appreciation for this approach.

DESCRIBE THE ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAM(S)

We anticipate that all schools will become fully accredited and make AYP
We anticipate that the dropout rate will be reduced.
We anticipate significantly higher student achievement.
We anticipate a better-trained staff of teachers, engaged in professional learning communities that nurture the development of teachers and students alike.

IF YOU ARE SEEKING A WAIVER OF A PROVISION OR PROVISIONS OF THE ACCREDITING STANDARDS, STATE THE PROVISION AND THE RATIONALE FOR SEEING A WAIVER FOR EACH.

Not applicable

DESCRIBE THE PROCEDURES THAT WILL BE USED TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WAIVER/PROGRAM/ACTIVITY. (Include information that includes measurable goals, objectives, and student academic achievement that will be expected as a result of the implementation of the program/activity.)

The early start of school will provide an opportunity for innovation. As such, the evaluative component of the effort takes a constructivist bent in capturing the process aspects of the endeavor, as well as its summative outcomes. With the concurrent initiation of multiphasic efforts to transform, not only our PLA designated T.C. Williams, but our entire school system, many disparate threads of action must be denoted. The bottom line, however, is that time is a critical variable.

Ultimately, the most compelling evaluative criteria revolve around the improved achievement of Alexandria’s students. Presently, every ACPS AYP subgroup, save whites, score below their State counterparts on the VSAP. By the end of the 2011-12 school year, the 2009-10 reading and mathematics gaps between ACPS subgroups and their equivalents will have been reduced by at least one half (presently only black students in reading equal their colleagues.).

Surveys will be conducted during the coming school year to determine how staff and students are using the additional time. ACPS has conducted investigations of this sort in the past (see for example the report entitled Lengthened School Day Survey at http://www.acps.k12.va.us/mes/reports/20100828-lengthened-school-day-full.pdf where nearly 500 staff responded to survey items involving the lengthen school day (made necessary by snow closings in the 2009-10 school year). From proven survey methodology, best practices will be gleaned and replicated in other settings.

The rollout of the Schoolnet software, which is a management information and assessment system, means additional needed staff training time, but also means that a wealth of discrete data will now be available not only to administrators, but to the classroom teacher. Implementation of this software will allow tracking of newly developed (again as a function of more time) formative assessments that are better aligned to the SOLs and to our emerging new curricula. This system will move us toward diagnosis of student achievement issues rather than autopsy. By the end of 2011-12, every teacher will have been trained to bring up an achievement and affective snapshot of her students.
The reformatted Title I Quarterly reports will be a vehicle for reflective school-level discussions and growth. By capturing unique or individualized indicators for the schools in Title I improvement, these newly customized Quarterly Reports will be another medium for transformation. Again, time is the variable that will permit these in-depth contemplations to occur, grow, and eventually help students to achieve.

The first national database of schools that have added learning time to their schedules, which was released in December 2009, suggests that the extra time might play a role in boosting middle and high school achievement. The National Center on Time & Learning, which assembled and analyzed the database, found a moderate association between increased time and how well students did on their states’ standardized English and mathematics tests compared with their peers in nearby schools on regular schedules.

Time is not a panacea, it is a present.

Number of students involved in the program: Official enrollment this year is 11,999. Projections indicate it will be higher next year.

What is the anticipated length of the program or duration of the waiver? ACPS seeks an early opening waiver for the 2011-12 school year. We expect to repeat the request each year.

This application and supporting documentation must be sent to:

Division of Policy and Communications  
Department of Education  
P.O. Box 2120  
Richmond, VA 23218-2120
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Remarks by Alexandria School Board Chairman, Yvonne Folkerts, after unanimous adoption of the early Opening Waiver Request, March 3, 2011.

I am glad the resolution, calling for a waiver from the State Board of Education to open ACPS before Labor Day, has passed.

I appreciate the input we received from parents, teachers and other interested community members. Each Board member takes seriously the views of the community on each matter that comes before us.

I acknowledge this issue was not without some initial controversy. And, I acknowledge that if State Board of Education approves our request, this calendar will inconvenience many families and ACPS employees who have already made summer plans.

Yet as elected officials, we are required to do what we believe is best for the school division – even if it imposes hardships on some and benefits for others.

This vote is another change for ACPS, and one that I believe will benefit our students – whether they be our highest-achieving students, or our students on the verge of dropping out, or every student in between. Adding time to our calendar will help our students with more in-class time before AP and other exams. This calendar will also allow our teachers to be in their classrooms more – and pulled out less for professional development. This is a fair, and frequent complaint of teachers that we are trying to address.

Dr. Sherman initially proposed this waiver to the School Board because the state has requested ACPS add more time to its calendar, as part of its oversight of moving TC Williams out of its persistently-lowest achieving status.

This vote signals we are responding to a state request, we are moving forward, and we are working to do what is right for our students.
Executive Summary

The modified school calendar (MSC) was implemented at Samuel Tucker Elementary School (Tucker) in 2004-05 and at Mount Vernon Community School (Mount Vernon) in 2005-06. This report briefly summarizes some of the relevant literature on the MSC, recapitulates discussions with Tucker and Mount Vernon school staff, and compares student test scores for MSC schools with the division and the state. The student data are also disaggregated by the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) subgroups outlined in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. While this report provides an overview of the two MSC schools and offers a snapshot of current performance and some insight into the differences, a more extensive evaluation is highly recommended. The report concludes with a list of recommendations intended to improve planning, operations, and implementation of Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) division-wide initiatives at the two MSC schools.

Staff at both MSC schools indicated the importance of having ACPS Central Office support for intersession planning and operations and throughout the entire year. Both MSC schools had participation rates of over 96 percent of all students in the fall 2010 intersession.

Review of test results indicated that Tucker tended to outperform the division and state in nearly all measures. For Mount Vernon, the White subgroup tended to outperform the division and state in nearly all indicators; however, the Hispanic, Meal Status, and Limited English Proficient subgroups tended to be roughly on par with the division and well below Tucker and the state. Given the demographics at Tucker and Mount Vernon, it is all the more impressive that Tucker tended to outperform the division and the state and that Mount Vernon was roughly on par with the division. It is also helpful to consider that Mount Vernon had larger proportions of Hispanic, Special Education and Limited English Proficient students than Tucker or the division. These AYP subgroups tend to have greater proportions of at-risk students (i.e., students who fail the SOL tests).

With the three intersessions included, most MSC students benefit from having an additional 25 days of instruction. However, challenges tended to arise due to MSC schools being out of sync with the rest of the division (see Appendix 1 for a side-by-side comparison of the MSC and traditional school calendars for the 2010-11 academic year). In conclusion, there are a number of key differences between the two MSC schools, which include the student populations, the staff culture, and school facilities.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Modify the calendar to eliminate a five-day intersession.
Recommendation 2: Have ACPS Central Office develop an intersession policy and procedures manual.
Recommendation 3: Increase ACPS Central Office awareness of MSC schedules and support needs.
Recommendation 4: Increase ACPS Central Office support for planning and running intersessions.
Recommendation 5: Coordinate and plan professional development to include the MSC staff.
RESOLUTION TO REQUEST SCHOOL CALENDAR WAIVER
PURSUANT TO VA. CODE §22.1-79.1

Whereas the Code of Virginia provides generally that local school division calendars shall be set so as to provide that the school year begins after Labor Day; and

Whereas the Code of Virginia further provides that for good cause, the Virginia Board of Education may, upon the application of a local school board, waive this requirement; and

Whereas after careful study, review and consideration, and with the recommendation of the Division Superintendent, the Alexandria City School Board has determined that such a waiver would facilitate the implementation of numerous innovative academic programs that Alexandria City Public Schools is initiating to help all of its schools meet federal and state standards.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Alexandria City School Board:

a) Certifies that its request for a calendar waiver pursuant to Va. Code §22.1-79.1 meets the “good cause” requirements of Va. Code §22.1-79.1(B)(3); and

b) Authorizes the Division Superintendent to take those actions necessary to request from the Virginia State Board of Education a school calendar waiver pursuant to Va. Code §22.1-79.1, allowing all schools within the Alexandria City Public Schools not already on a modified calendar to open prior to Labor Day 2011 for the 2011-12 school year.

So resolved this the 3rd day of March, 2011.

[Signature]

Yvonne A. Folkerts, Chairman, Alexandria City School Board
FROM: Alexandria City Public Schools  
Morton Sherman, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools  

TO: The Virginia Board of Education  

RE: Request for Waiver to Begin School Before Labor Day  

Background  

Section 22.1-79.1 of the Code of Virginia prohibits local school boards from adopting a school calendar that requires schools to open prior to Labor Day unless a waiver is granted by the Virginia Board of Education for “good cause.” The conditions under which the State Board of Education may grant such waivers are outlined in the Code.

Summary of Major Elements of the Application  

The Alexandria City School Board is requesting approval for all Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) to open prior to Labor Day. These schools include: T.C. Williams High School; George Washington Middle School #1; George Washington Middle School #2; Francis C. Hammond Middle Schools #1, #2, and #3; and thirteen elementary schools: John Adams, Charles Barrett, Patrick Henry, Jefferson-Houston, Cora Kelly School for Math, Science, and Technology, Lyles-Crouch Traditional Academy, Douglas MacArthur, George Mason, Matthew Maury, Mount Vernon Community School, James K. Polk, William Ramsay, Samuel W. Tucker. (Note: Mount Vernon and Samuel Tucker already open before Labor Day, as they are on a Modified School Calendar.)

The waiver request is based on academic reasons and on the fact that the waiver would facilitate the implementation of numerous innovative programs ACPS is initiating to help our schools meet federal and state standards:

- To increase learning time for students  
- To better connect professional learning with the school calendar by creating additional professional learning time by reducing the amount of time teachers are pulled from classrooms  
- To provide time for teachers to work on school education goals and their individual Professional Learning Plans  
- To provide professional opportunities to update Individual Achievement Plans for our students as part of the Transformation Model for school improvement as an option under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
The Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) have 11,999 students with thirteen elementary schools, five middle schools, and one high school. ACPS is a diverse school division, with a student population that includes 34 percent Black, 30.7 percent Hispanic, 25 percent White, 5 percent Asian Pacific. Students come from more than a hundred different countries and speak 65 native languages. Fifty-two percent of ACPS students are eligible for free or reduced price meals, and three schools have more than 70 percent of students who are classified as disadvantaged. About 21.5 percent receive English Language Learner (ELL) services. ACPS also has a highly mobile population, with some immigrant students entering the system in middle or high school with little formal education in any language.

T.C. Williams High School has been designated as a Persistently Lowest Achieving High School and has adopted the Transformation Model of Improvement. T.C. Williams High School has not made Adequate Yearly Progress since the federal law went into effect in 2002; and, in fact, has a long record of under-serving significant portions of our school population. Twelve of nineteen schools did not make Adequate Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind this past year. Several schools have been under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) sanctions for years. (Attached is Schools Not Making AYP for 2010-11)

ACPS student demographics clearly indicate that ACPS is very different from its school division colleagues in Virginia. Very few school divisions in the country have high percentages of both ELL students and disadvantaged students, as well as a sizeable percentage of special education students. ACPS currently has 1,661 students receiving special education services, or 13.8%. ACPS welcomes the challenge, responsibility, and the opportunity presented to us with this diverse student population.

ACPS is fortunate to have a long tradition of success for many of our students and a firm foundation on which to build, while welcoming the ongoing challenge of creating a school division well steeped in and responsive to the expectations of 21st century learning. Recent Standards of Learning (SOL) results indicate that reading scores for white 4th graders are at the top of the state. However, overall reading scores for 4th graders fall slightly below the state average. ACPS 4th graders who are Latino score in the bottom fourth in the state. The average overall percent passing 8th grade math SOL ranks in the bottom fourth in the state. The same is true for the 2010 Algebra I End-of-Course SOL. More time for instruction and more skilled teaching (time for professional development) are needed.

Overall in the Alexandria City Schools, all groups of students have made improvements in recent years, although only one NCLB category of students stays above the average of their counterparts in Virginia: white students, who constitute about 25 percent of the student body. The on-time graduation rate (students who enter 9th grade finishing within four years) is currently only 79 percent, with ELL students at 68 percent and Hispanic students, in particular, at 69 percent.
Strategies in Place to Improve Student Achievement

The Alexandria City School Board, in March 2009, adopted a strategic plan that commits to “Set the international standard for educational excellence, where all students achieve their potential and actively contribute to our local and global communities.” The School Board further declared, “We will achieve our vision as we provide the environment, resources, and commitment to ensure that each and every student succeeds—academically, emotionally, physically, and socially.”

ACPS has firmly committed to the development of The Whole Child. Each school has adopted an exemplary program that aims to create well-balanced, healthy students, in the belief that this contributes to academic achievement. Some examples of the strategies ACPS has embraced that enrich the lives of our students are:

- Changing Education Through the Arts (CETA), a cooperative program with the Kennedy Center, which incorporates the fine arts into academic instruction
- Habits of Mind, which help to develop a student’s thinking skills, with emphasis on metacognitive processes.
- MindUp which emphasizes the Optimistic Classroom and the development of confidence and calm (curriculum to be published by Scholastic this fall)
- Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Program
- International Baccalaureate Programme
- Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)
- Core Knowledge Curriculum (in cooperation with the University of Virginia)

While one goal is to demonstrate academic success on traditional testing procedures, the challenge for 21st century teachers is to adhere to required guidelines while also allowing for spontaneity, curiosity, adventure, exploration, and fun.

The Alexandria School Board and administration have also pledged to ensure that all students graduate prepared for college or higher learning if that is their choice. No student should fail to achieve in college because he or she was not prepared adequately in high school. Thus, an emphasis this year is placed on the five key college preparation competencies:

1. reading comprehension,
2. writing to promote post-secondary success,
3. data analysis and interpretation,
4. discourse within the disciplines,
5. speaking and listening.

Very specific professional learning must take place to prepare teachers to embrace these new strategies, which in turn lead to more active and participatory learning. Development of creative thinking and higher order thinking skills is, we believe, the best way to ensure that students do well on required tests, whether SOL, SAT, AP, or any
other. Thus, significant time throughout the year for professional development is a hallmark of this proposal.

ACPS goals for the proposal to begin school early and add to the time for student learning and professional development are:

- High levels of learning for all students
- Personalized and customized instruction
- Exemplary levels of respect and responsibility for oneself and others among staff and students.

The good news is that, building on historical strengths, over the past three years ACPS has seen division-wide SOL improvement in every NCLB student category and a slight decrease in the achievement gaps. Since Superintendent Morton Sherman started as ACPS Superintendent in 2008, ACPS has created several structural and conditional changes to enhance learning, such as maintaining some of the smallest class sizes in the region. Advanced Placement participation and test scores and middle school participation in world languages are at all-time highs. Through aggressive placement efforts, 8th grade Algebra I participation has increased dramatically.

ACPS has begun an assertive transformation of its schools and central office. When T.C. Williams, Alexandria’s only public high school, was designated as one of Virginia’s Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools, the Transformation Model put into place recognized that teachers are the core to school improvement. The reality that T.C. Williams has never made the federal NCLB standards compelled change. With the support, professionalism, and energy of our teachers and staff, significant transformation efforts are being implemented this year. Efforts include:

- Hiring additional high school counselors to reduce the student load from 260 to about 180
- Hiring additional middle and high school math and English teachers to enable these teachers to provide individualized instruction and interventions for “at promise” students (The term often used is “at risk.” In ACPS we refer to “at promise” students as those who are not achieving up to their ability or fulfilling their promise.)
- Creating Individual Achievement Plans for every middle and high school student in math and language arts
- Requiring Professional Learning Plans for every licensed employee
- Providing a Professional Learning Center and enhanced coaching for teachers
- Providing training in The Skillful Teacher and The Skillful Leader (Research for Better Teaching)
- Opening a High School Saturday Academy, where additional tutoring by qualified instructors is provided
- Creating Secondary Math and Writing Centers that offer tutoring by licensed teachers throughout the day and after school
• Establishing partnerships with several organizations and experts in their fields, including:
  o Writer's Project of Columbia Teachers College
  o Dr. Lucy West (coaching)
  o Conspiracy to Succeed and the Tripod Model: led by Dr. Ron Ferguson, Harvard University
  o The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST - Staff from Stanford and Columbia Universities)
  o Dr. Jon Saphier, Research for Better Teaching

Transformation of the two large middle schools into five smaller schools was designed to create more personalized and customized learning environments. For example, ACPS introduced the AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) Program to boost achievement of the so-called “middle achievers,” those students who do average work, or prove at risk to fall behind but also have the potential to do much better. The Middle Years International Baccalaureate Programme (IB) is being introduced in all middle schools.

The creation of limits on elementary class size through a Board policy is a proud and important counter to what is happening across the country given difficult economic conditions. The increase in licensed staff and the prudent fiscal management of budgets which have remained flat over three years are all deliberate efforts to focus limited resources. Each of these decisions is designed to give teachers a fighting chance to help our students learn, because real transformation must start at the teacher and classroom level.

Specifics of the Proposal

ACPS proposes to provide more learning time to students with these actions:

• Begin the school year on August 29. This would allow the division to add two extra student days (14 ½ hours) as part of the larger effort to increase instructional time. The last day of school will be June 15 in 2012.

• Also, by use of other strategies, such as use of Individual Achievement Plans (IAPs) instead of secondary release time for student conferences, reduction of half-days during and at the end of the school year, and addition of teacher work days during the school year rather than pulling teachers out of class for professional development, even more student time can be added. The start before Labor Day allows ACPS to “stretch” the calendar, add student days, and return approximately four additional days of instructional time in addition to increasing the school year from 183 days to 185 days. This adds at least six days to instruction, all before SOL testing.

• Elementary school summer learning will take place during the first two weeks of August and will be specifically tied to the schools students attend and their
specific learning needs to prepare them for the school year. Summer learning is intended to offer remedial instruction for students to better prepare them for the next grade level or who have not successfully completed required courses. A recently adopted practice is to hold elementary summer school just before the next school year, rather than at the end of the year and to locate the learning at the school that the child will attend, rather than at a central location.

ACPS proposes to provide more time for teacher reflection, collaboration, and professional development with these actions:

- A recommendation has been made to the School Board to increase the number of teachers’ hours by more than 20 hours, besides adding the two instructional days. The local teachers association and the Committee for Compensation and Benefits Review have endorsed this proposal. A community and staff survey indicated support for the proposal.

- Full days for professional development/collaboration are interspersed throughout the year.

Areas to Be Addressed in Additional Professional Development

- Required instructional focus areas:
  - Differentiation of instruction for all learners at all levels, with particular attention to students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Inclusive Learning Environments.
  - Formative Assessments to support continual student learning growth
  - High levels of achievement for all students

- Curriculum/Content focus areas:
  - Developing Career and College Readiness Skills for 21st-century learners in the following areas:
    - Writing college-ready essays
    - Reading and analyzing complex text
    - Using data and evidence in all subjects
    - Developing discipline-based Inquiry
    - Speaking and Listening

- Relationships focus areas:
  - Respect and responsibility
  - Cultural competence
  - Civic responsibility

Principals will be required to be involved in professional development to administer effective, fair, objective and consistent teacher evaluations.

- Assessing teacher performance and evaluating education professionals are about more than just test scores.
Professional evaluations of teachers must include opportunity for demonstration of data and evidence of student growth, and should provide opportunity for peer and team collaboration.

Reasons for Additional Days Occurring Prior to Labor Day

- The timing would provide additional meaningful student learning time before Standards of Learning and Advanced Placement exams. Used wisely and well, the additional student time will provide opportunity to enhance learning for all students; thus, blow away the ceiling and raise the floor through personalized and customized education.

- In 2011, all teachers would report during the week of August 22 and all new teachers during the week of August 15. This training/planning time would not be "front-loaded" as in the past. More meaningful professional development and collaboration would come during the course of the school year, for reflection upon specific students and specific student Individual Achievement Plans and for teachers to work on their Professional Learning Plans (PLP), which are tied to student performance.

- Two ACPS elementary schools, Mount Vernon Community School and Samuel W. Tucker Elementary School, are already on a modified calendar and these schools normally begin in July or the first week of August. Samuel Tucker, with a highly mobile student population with many students qualifying for free and reduced price lunch, is among our best performing schools. Samuel Tucker is fully accredited and has always made Adequate Yearly Progress. In 2005, after the first year of Tucker's modified calendar, the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation conducted an evaluation and concluded that the school met or surpassed all of the anticipated outcomes. ACPS is working to bring Mount Vernon's scores to the level of Tucker's, as it builds on exceptional community support for Mount Vernon Community School. Typical attendance for the intersessions at both schools is more than 95 percent. ACPS plans an updated evaluation of the effectiveness of both modified calendar schools within the next year.

- An additional five days of instruction before Labor Day will add 36 hours of instruction before state testing and many hours of additional professional development that proves more meaningful, occurring during the school year so that review of data and necessary adjustments can occur.

Obviously, simply adding days to the school calendar or minutes to the school day are not sufficient measures to improve student learning, though the added time is the essence of our proposal/request. Additional time must be matched with quality instruction gained through revised and improved professional development, teacher evaluation, and student assessment. Since a highly qualified teacher is the most important factor in a student's
success, it follows that having integrated frequent professional development days imbedded in the calendar would positively impact student achievement. Adding these days would not be possible without beginning the school year before Labor Day.

Due to the impact that approval could have on the budget and the need for planning and early notification of the community, we request approval at first review for a waiver to begin school before Labor Day for innovative changes to our academic program.

Note: The Alexandria City School Board voted unanimously on March 3, 2011, to submit this waiver request to the Virginia Board of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>2010-11 AVP Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made AVP</td>
<td>Fully accredited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AVP benchmarks for Virginia's public schools to be administered in 2009-2010 were English: 98% and Mathematics: 89%. The AVP benchmarks for Virginia's public schools to be administered in 2010-2011 will be English: 99% and Mathematics: 87%.

The school accreditation and AVP statuses are shown below. Eligibility of AVP schools are preliminary.
Figure 4

Graduation Percentages for No Child Left Behind Subgroups
Alexandria City Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort on-Time Graduation Rates, 2008-2010
Topic: First Review of a Request for Continuation of an Alternative Accreditation Plan from Danville City Public Schools for J. M. Langston Focus School

Presenter: Dr. Kathleen M. Smith, Director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement
Dr. Sue B. Davis, Superintendent, Danville City Public Schools

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2865 E-Mail Address: Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

__ Board review required by
 ___ State or federal law or regulation
 __ Board of Education regulation
 ___ Other: __________

___ Action requested at this meeting __ Action requested at future meeting: Final Review on April 28, 2011

Previous Review/Action:

___ No previous board review/action

__ Previous review/action
date September 26, 2007
action Board approved alternative accreditation plan

Background Information:

Section 8 VAC 20-131-280 C. of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia states:

Subject to the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-330, the governing school board of special purpose schools such as those provided for in §22.1-26 of the Code, Governor’s schools, special education schools, alternative schools, or career and technical schools that serve as the student’s school of principal enrollment may seek approval of an alternative accreditation plan from the Board of Education. Special purpose schools with alternative accreditation plans shall be evaluated on standards appropriate to the programs offered in the school and approved by the Board prior to August 1 of the school year for which approval is requested. Any student graduating from a special purpose school with a Standard, Advanced Studies, or Modified Standard Diploma must meet the requirements prescribed in 8 VAC 20-131-50.
Section 22.1-253.13:1.D.8 of the Standards of Quality requires local school boards to provide educational alternatives for students whose needs are not met in programs prescribed elsewhere in these standards. Such students shall be counted in average daily membership (ADM) in accordance with the regulations of the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE). Regulations governing programs such as this are found in the accrediting standards, which permit alternative accreditation plans and allow the VBOE to grant waivers to certain provisions of the standards.

Summary of Major Elements

Danville City Public Schools is seeking an extension of an alternative accreditation plan for J. M. Langton School. The VBOE approved the first alternative accreditation plan in September 2007. Since that time, the school has not met the Standards of Accreditation targets. The school demonstrated an increase in English, mathematics, and history over the past three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Passing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following data was used to determine the alternative accreditation status (Accredited with Warning) of J. M. Langston Focus School for the 2010-2011 year based on data from the 2009-2010 year:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL Core Subject Index Points</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>SOL Scaled Score</th>
<th>Points Awarded for Each Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>600-500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>499-400</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>399-375</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Below 400 where a basic score is not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Points Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Total Number of Points Awarded 20890

(B) Total Number of Grades 6-12 Tests Administered 376

SOL Core Subject Index Score = (A)/(B) = 55.6
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course GPA of students completing the College Success Skills at Danville Community College meets or exceeds 3.0 for 80% of completers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Accreditation Composite Index Score Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL Core Subject Index Score = (A)/(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Additional Index Points (up to 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Accreditation Composite Index Score = [(A)/(B)] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Additional Index Points (up to 8 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed alternative education plan, Attachment A, includes both student achievement and graduation criteria since the graduation and completion index becomes an accreditation criteria for ratings awarded in 2011-2012.

Danville City Public Schools is requesting waivers from specific provisions of sections 8 VAC 20-131-90 A-C and 8 VAC 20-131-100 A-B. Foreign language, music and career and technical education are not provided in the middle grades. At the secondary level, foreign language and advanced placement courses are not provided. Danville City Public Schools is requesting the following waivers:

- **8 VAC 20-131-90. Instructional program in middle schools**
- Music, foreign language, and career and technical exploration

- **8 VAC 20-131-100. Instructional program in secondary schools**
- Foreign language and Advanced Placement (AP) courses

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**
The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Virginia Board of Education accept for first review the request for a continuation of an alternative accreditation plan from Danville City Public Schools for J. M. Langston Focus School.

**Impact on Resources:**
None

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**
Final action will be requested at the April 28, 2011, meeting.
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE ACCREDITATION PLAN

Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, (8 VAC 20-131-10 et. seq.) set the minimum standards public schools must meet to be accredited by the Board of Education. Accreditation of public schools is required by the Standards of Quality (22.1-253.13:1 et. seq.). This cover sheet, with the supporting documentation, must be submitted to the Department of Education for review and recommendation to the Board at least 90 days prior to August 1 of the school year in which the plan is to be implemented.

8 VAC 20-131-280 of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia states (in part): Special purpose schools such as regional, special education, alternative, or career and technical schools that serve as the student's school of principal enrollment shall be evaluated on standards appropriate to the programs offered in the school and approved by the Board prior to August 1 of the school year for which approval is requested. Any student graduating from a special purpose school with a Standard, Advanced Studies, or Modified Standard Diploma must meet the requirements prescribed in 8 VAC 20-131-50.

The Board of Education, in its Guidelines Governing the Implementation of Certain Provisions of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, states:

Schools described in this section are those that serve as a student's school of principal enrollment and where students are reported in fall membership for the school. Fall membership determines whether or not these schools are subject to the provisions of the accrediting standards; therefore, schools reporting fall membership are subject to the provisions of the standards. These schools may or may not administer Standards of Learning (SOL) tests.

In accordance with the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-330 of the standards, local school boards may seek waivers of provisions of the standards to address the unique needs of these special purpose schools. Such requests may include an alternative accreditation plan. Applications must be submitted to the Board for consideration at least ninety days prior to August 1 of the school year. Requests for consideration must be accompanied by information that documents the need for approval of the request.

We, the undersigned, submit this request for review and approval by the Board of Education and understand that we are expected to appear before the Board to discuss the program and respond to questions raised.

________________________
December 2, 2010
Date Approved
by the Local School Board

________________________
December 3, 2010
Submission Date

________________________
Signature
Chairman of the School Board

________________________
Signature
Division Superintendent
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE ACCREDITATION PLAN

INTRODUCTION:
J. M. Langston Focus School is in its fourth year as an alternative school in the Danville Public School System. Langston meets the state definition of a special purpose school and seeks approval for an alternative accreditation plan as provided in the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, Part VIII, Section 8 VAC 20-131-280 D.

INTENT:
- To prepare students in grades 6-8 who are experiencing significant academic and behavior difficulties in a traditional education setting, to successfully complete middle grade content with the goal of promotion to high school.

- To prepare students in grades 9-12 who are experiencing significant academic and behavior difficulties in a traditional education setting, to successfully complete secondary grade content and earn a standard diploma.

VISION/MISSION:
J. M. Langston Focus School is designed to foster a learning environment for middle and secondary grade students who have experienced academic and behavior difficulties in a traditional education environment.

TARGET POPULATION:
J. M. Langston Focus School serves students in grades 6-8 and 9-12 who are overage, under credited, and are deficient in reading and/or math as measured by Istation’s Indicators of Progress and/or the result of the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) and/or who continuously experience behavior deficits that are outlined in the school board’s Student Standards of Conduct.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM:
- The academic program for grades 6-8 will focus on reading, writing and mathematics. Students will receive instruction in organization and study skills as well as goal setting and problem-solving strategies. Interdisciplinary instruction will address the history and science content that is necessary for students to be successful in 9th grade entry level classes. The academic program for grades 9-12 will focus on the four core subject areas English, mathematics, history and social science, and science. Students will receive instruction and guidance in goal setting, career awareness, and post-secondary education.

- Students will be administered Istation’s Indicators of Progress in reading and/or ARDT mathematics, respectively, at the beginning of the school year and periodically throughout the year to assist teachers with the development of a differentiated instructional program that addresses the needs of each student.

- Grades 6-12 students will have opportunities for career exploration offered using internet resources. Students will take aptitude and interest inventories to be used in planning academic and vocational choices.
- Credit recovery programs will be provided to students in grades 9-12 using on-site technology and after-school programs.
- Students will be given additional time to master specific course objectives, particularly in courses that have an EOC/SOL test. This decision will be based on students’ six weeks benchmark assessment scores, or social/environmental issues.
- A 30-minute lunch and recess will allow students time to eat and engage in physical activities.

STAFFING:
J. M. Langston Focus School is staffed with a faculty of highly qualified teachers certified to teach the core subject areas proposed. Grades 6-12 teacher/pupil ratio will be limited to 1:15 per class. Paraprofessionals will be assigned to the school to serve as instructional assistants. Pupil support services will be on-site to assist students in grades 6-12 and their families with issues that serve as barriers to academic and behavior successes.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION:
Istation’s Indicators of Progress and/or ARDT will be administered to all students at the beginning of the school year. The results will be used as baseline data for the students and to assist in instructional planning. Students will be administered benchmark assessments each six weeks in the core subject area with the achievement data tracked and analyzed. Grades 6-12 students will participate in the Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment Program.

WAIVER REQUESTED:
Waivers are requested from sections 8 VAC 20-131-90 and 8 VAC 20-131-100 of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia as follows:

8 VAC 20-131-90. Instructional program in middle schools
Music, foreign language, and career and technical exploration

8 VAC 20-131-100. Instructional program in secondary schools
Foreign language and Advanced Placement (AP) courses

ACCREDITATION:

*Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index Point System*

Grades 6-12 students will participate in grade level SOL tests and end-of-course tests as required by No Child Left Behind and Standards of Accreditation. Student performance for accreditation will be determined based on students passing the following SOL tests: grades 6-7 reading, grades 6-7 mathematics, and content specific history; grade 8 reading, writing, mathematics, content specific history, and science; and SOL end-of-course tests. The SOL scores of students, who receive an AYP Adjustment Code of A, B, or C, will be considered transfer students for the purpose of calculating the state accreditation rating. See *Clarification on the Application of AYP Adjustment Codes* in Appendix A.

Due to the small student population, a composite pass rate is necessary to create a larger number of student scores upon which to calculate state accreditation. An Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index score of at least 70 points and an Alternate Graduation and Completion Composite Index score of 85 points must be earned for J. M. Langston Focus School to meet fully accredited status.
The SOL Core Subject Index includes points assigned for student performance on each of the SOL tests and additional other subject area indicators. The SOL test component of the Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index will be calculated by multiplying the number of grades 6-12 tests receiving a Tier I score by 100; the number of grades 6-12 tests receiving a Tier II score by 95; the number of grades 6-12 tests receiving a Tier III score by 85; and the number of grades 6-12 tests receiving a Tier IV score by 0. The total points awarded will be divided by the total number of tests administered. The criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of a test score will be based on those used in calculating AYP. See Table 1.

Table 1

SOL Core Subject Index Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Tests Meeting Criteria</th>
<th>SOL Scaled Score</th>
<th>Tiers</th>
<th>Points Awarded for Each Tier</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600-500</td>
<td>Tier I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>499-400</td>
<td>Tier II</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>399-375</td>
<td>Tier III</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 375</td>
<td>Tier IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A)Total Number of Points Awarded
(B)Total Number of Grades 6-12 Tests Meeting Criteria
SOL Core Subject Index Score = (A)/(B)

Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) and Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) scores will be counted as described below. Historically, this school has not submitted VAAP.

The number of tests meeting criteria for VAAP and VGLA will be included in Table I as follows:

VAAP scores-
- Advanced Proficient will be included in Tier I
- Proficient will be included in Tier II
- Scores below Proficient will be included in Tier IV

VGLA scores-
- Advanced Proficient will be included in Tier I
- Proficient will be included in Tier II
- Basic will be included in Tier III
- Scores below Basic will be included in Tier IV

Additional SOL Core Subject Index points may be earned by meeting the performance criteria in the other subject indicators category. See Table 2.

Table 2

Additional Subject Index Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Subject Indicators</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forty percent of remediation recovery students pass the Math SOL test</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty percent of remediation recovery students pass the Reading SOL test</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily attendance meets or exceeds 81%</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from the previous year the number of students enrolled in dual enrollment courses</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from the previous year the number of students in grades 6-8 who complete high school credit courses</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course GPA of students completing the College Success Skills at Danville Community College meets or exceeds 3.0 for 75% of completers</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty percent of graduates enrolled in post-secondary studies in a 2- or 4-year college, vocational school or enter the military | 4 points

Eighty percent of students administered the WorkKeys during the school year receive at least a score of 3 | 1 point

The categories used to calculate the Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index Score are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index Score Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL Core Subject Index Score = (A)/(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Additional Subject Index Points (Up to 12 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index Score = [(A)/(B)] + Total no. of additional subject index points up to 12 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternate Graduation and Completion Composite Index Point System*

An *Alternate Graduation and Completion Composite Index (GCI)* will be used to determine the score for the school’s graduation and completion index. The index includes points assigned for the type of diplomas awarded during the school year. The Graduation and Completion Index will be calculated by multiplying the number of students receiving a Standard, Modified Standard, and Special diploma by 100; the number of students receiving a GED by 75; and the number of students receiving a certificate of program completion by 25. The total points awarded will be divided by the total number of seniors counted in membership during the school year. See Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Graduation and Completion Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Program Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C)Number of Points Awarded

(D)Number of Seniors Counted in Membership During School Year

Graduation and Completion Index Score (C)/(D)

Additional GCI points may be earned by meeting the performance criteria in the other GCI indicator category. See Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Graduation and Completion Index Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other GCI Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from the previous year the percent of students who complete high school with a Standard, Modified Standard, Special Diplomas, or GED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of students who earn a GED and enter post-secondary studies in a 2- or 4-year college, vocational school or enter the military</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase the number of students who have 20 or more credits before exiting without graduating.  

2 points

The categories used to calculate the Alternate Graduation and Completion Index Score are summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Alternate Graduation and Completion Index Score Calculations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation and Completion Index Score = (C)/(D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Additional Index Points (Up to 6 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Graduation and Completion Index Composite Index Score = [(C)/(D)] + Total no. of additional GCI indicator points up to 6 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternate Accreditation Composite Index Point System**

An *Alternate Accreditation Composite Index Point System* will be used to determine the accreditation rating. See Table 7.

**Table 7**

*Accreditation Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score Required</th>
<th>Status (Met or Not Met)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate SOL Core Subject Composite Index Score = [(A)/(B)] + Total no. of additional other subject indicators points up to 12 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must Meet or Exceed 70 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Graduation and Completion Composite Index Score = [(C)/(D)] + Total no. of additional GCI points up to 6 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must Meet or Exceed 85 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM EVALUATION:**

The effectiveness of the program will be evaluated using several criteria. Student achievement will be monitored using report card grades, six weeks benchmark assessments, and summer, fall and spring SOL test results. Student attendance and behavior will be monitored weekly by using the Star Base student management system to track attendance and violations of the *Student Standards of Conduct*. Surveys will be distributed to students, faculty/staff and parents to gather data for school improvement at least twice during the school year.

**TRANSITION PLAN:**

Students and their parents will be interviewed face-to-face by the director of Alternative Education, and the principal, guidance counselor, and curriculum facilitator of Langston School. The purposes of this interview are: (1) to explain the academic and behavior expectations of students entering J. M. Langston Focus School, and (2) to explain the different support services available to students and parents of J. M. Langston Focus School.
Virginia Department of Education  
Evaluation Criteria  
J. M. Langston Focus School, Danville Public Schools  
Alternative Accreditation Plans for Special Purpose Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School characteristics and instructional program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The mission, purpose, and target population of the school justify its</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorization as a “special purpose” school and, therefore, eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to request an alternative accreditation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The characteristics and special needs of the student population are</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly defined, and the criteria for student placement require</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental consultation and agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The program of instruction provides all students with opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to study a comprehensive curriculum that is customized to support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The plan requests a waiver of 8 VAC 20-131-90 A-C and 8 VAC 20-131-100 A-B</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The school provides transition planning to help students be</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful when they return to a regular school setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Students do not return to a regular school setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strategies used to evaluate student progress are aligned to the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission/purpose of the school and include academic achievement measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Convincing evidence has been provided that students enrolled in the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school have not been successful in other schools subject to all the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrediting standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students will be taught with highly qualified teachers who meet the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education’s licensure requirements for instructional personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Accreditation Accountability Criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rationale and documentation provide convincing evidence that the “special purpose”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature of the school precludes its being able to reach and maintain full accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status as defined in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Virginia* (SOA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alternative accreditation criteria described in the plan include academic achievement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures that are objective, measurable, and directly related to the mission and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The plan includes use of statewide assessment student achievement results of English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mathematics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The plan meets the testing requirements of the SOA.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The plan meets the testing requirements of NCLB and describes how the school plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to meet “adequate yearly progress” requirements of the federal law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The plan does not specifically state that students will be tested as required by NCLB.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The plan provides convincing evidence that all pre-accreditation eligibility criteria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are met for standards in which waivers have not been requested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Waivers have been requested for accrediting standards that are not being met, and</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rationale for the waivers are clear and appropriate for the mission/purpose of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: K Date: March 24, 2011

Topic: First Review of a Request for Continuation of an Alternative Accreditation Plan from Richmond City Public Schools for Richmond Alternative School

Presenter: Dr. Kathleen M. Smith, Director of the Office of School Improvement
Dr. Yvonne Brandon, Superintendent, Richmond City Public Schools

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2865 E-Mail Address: Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:
___ Topic presented for information only (no board action required)
___ Board review required by
   ___ State or federal law or regulation
   ___ Board of Education regulation
   ___ Other: 

___ Action requested at this meeting ___ Action requested at future meeting: Final Review April 28, 2011

Previous Review/Action:
___ No previous board review/action
___ Previous review/action date April 27, 2007
   action Board approved an alternative accreditation plan

Background Information:

Section 8 VAC 20-131.280.C. of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia states:

Subject to the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-330, the governing school board of special purpose schools such as those provided for in §22.1-26 of the Code, Governor’s schools, special education schools, alternative schools, or career and technical schools that serve as the student’s school of principal enrollment may seek approval of an alternative accreditation plan from the Board of Education. Special purpose schools with alternative accreditation plans shall be evaluated on standards appropriate to the programs offered in the school and approved by the Board prior to August 1 of the school year for which approval is requested. Any student graduating from a special purpose school with a Standard, Advanced Studies, or Modified Standard Diploma must meet the requirements prescribed in 8 VAC 20-131-50.
Section 22.1-253.13:1.D.8 of the Standards of Quality requires local school boards to provide educational alternatives for students whose needs are not met in programs prescribed elsewhere in these standards. Such students shall be counted in average daily membership (ADM) in accordance with the regulations of the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE). Regulations governing programs such as this are found in the accrediting standards, which permit alternative accreditation plans and allow the VBOE to grant waivers to certain provisions of the standards.

Summary of Major Elements:

Richmond City Public Schools partners with the Community Education Partners (CEP) to provide services through the Capital City Program (CCP) at Richmond Alternative School for students in grades 6-11. The purpose of the partnership is to support low-performing and disruptive students so that they can return to their home schools prepared to be successful. This program focuses on the most difficult students with learning and behavioral issues as a result of factors beyond the control of public education.

Richmond City Public Schools is seeking an extension of an alternative accreditation plan for Richmond Alternative School. The VBOE approved the first alternative accreditation plan on April 27, 2007. Since that time, the school has met the alternative accreditation targets. Achievement data is indicated below. It should be noted that the student population in this alternative school changes from year to year. It is difficult to analyze data across time as the needs of students in one year may be quite different from the next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following data was used to determine the accreditation status of Richmond Alternative School for the 2009-2010 year based on data from the 2010-2011 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF STUDENT SCORES</td>
<td>INDEX POINTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Advanced 100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Proficient 90 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Basic 70 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fail 0 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL Score Points Awarded</td>
<td>20,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Student Scores</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL Index Points</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONUS POINTS</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least 2 semesters) achieving at the proficient and advanced levels on the SOL assessments in science and history and social science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage of students enrolled for at least 2 consecutive semesters who complete high school with a diploma or GED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage or number of students in grades 6-8 taking Algebra I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of high school students earning a career and technical industry certification or national occupational assessment credential</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased percentage or number of high school students taking at least one dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, or other college-level course</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased number of students identified as truants by 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily attendance meets or exceeds 80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of students successfully transitioned into the regular school setting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased number of serious incidents while at CCP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BONUS POINTS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALTERNATIVE ACCREDITATION INDEX SCORE</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed alternative education plan, Attachment A, includes student achievement criteria. It does not include graduation criteria as students return to their home school for graduation.

Richmond City Public Schools is requesting waivers from specific provisions of sections 8 VAC 20-131-90 A-C and 8 VAC 20-131-100 A-B as foreign language and the fine arts are not provided. At the secondary level, students have opportunities to receive the needed credits for graduation in foreign language and fine arts when they return to their home school. Richmond City Public Schools is requesting the following waivers:
Superintendent's Recommendation:
The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Virginia Board of Education accept for first review the continuation of an alternative accreditation plan from Richmond City Public Schools for Richmond Alternative School.

Impact on Resources:
None

Timetable for Further Review/Action:
Final action will be requested at the April 28, 2011, meeting.
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE ACCREDITATION PLAN

Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, (8 VAC 20-131-10 et. seq.) set the minimum standards public schools must meet to be accredited by the Board of Education. Accreditation of public schools is required by the Standards of Quality (22.1-253.13:1 et. seq.). This cover sheet, with the supporting documentation, must be submitted to the Department of Education for review and recommendation to the Board at least 90 days prior to August 1 of the school year in which the plan is to be implemented.

8 VAC 20-131-280 of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia states (in part): Special purpose schools such as regional, special education, alternative, or career and technical schools that serve as the student’s school of principal enrollment shall be evaluated on standards appropriate to the programs offered in the school and approved by the Board prior to August 1 of the school year for which approval is requested. Any student graduating from a special purpose school with a Standard, Advanced Studies, or Modified Standard Diploma must meet the requirements prescribed in 8 VAC 20-131-50.

The Board of Education, in its Guidelines Governing the Implementation of Certain Provisions of the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia, states:

Schools described in this section are those that serve as a student’s school of principal enrollment and where students are reported in fall membership for the school. Fall membership determines whether or not these schools are subject to the provisions of the accrediting standards; therefore, schools reporting fall membership are subject to the provisions of the standards. These schools may or may not administer Standards of Learning (SOL) tests.

In accordance with the provisions of 8 VAC 20-131-330 of the standards, local school boards may seek waivers of provisions of the standards to address the unique needs of these special purpose schools. Such requests may include an alternative accreditation plan. Applications must be submitted to the Board for consideration at least ninety days prior to August 1 of the school year. Requests for consideration must be accompanied by information that documents the need for approval of the request.

We, the undersigned, submit this request for review and approval by the Board of Education and understand that we are expected to appear before the Board to discuss the program and respond to questions raised.

12/6/10
Date Approved
by the Local School Board

12/17/10
Submission Date

KIMBERLIE B. BRIDGE
Chairman of the School Board

VIORENE M. BRADEN
Division Superintendent
Alternative Accreditation Plan
for
Richmond Alternative School - Capital City Program

School Name: Richmond Alternative School - Capital City Program
Division: Richmond City Public Schools
School Address: 100 West Baker Street  Richmond, VA 23220
Contact Person: Victoria S. Oakley, Chief Academic Officer
Phone: 804-780-7727
Fax: 804-780-5414
E-mail Address: voakley@richmond.k12.va.us

Proposed Duration of the Plan: 3 yrs.

Grade Levels Served: 6-11

No. Students Enrolled by Grade Level

   Grades 6-8: 108
   Grades 9-11: 195 (12th graders graduate from their home schools)

Describe the mission and purpose of the school.

Purpose: To ensure that no child is left behind, the Capital City Program (CCP) works in partnership with the Richmond Public Schools and the community to get low performing and disruptive students back on track in their learning and behavior, enabling them to successfully return academically and socially prepared to their home schools. This partnership focuses on the most difficult students with learning and behavioral issues as a result of a variety of factors beyond the control of traditional education.

Mission: The Capital City Program provides quality alternative education services to the middle and high school students of Richmond Public Schools by making a positive difference in the lives of the students served and by achieving measurable results in academic and behavioral skills. A rigorous instructional program and a personal/social development program are provided for each child in a safe and secure learning environment. CCP works in partnership with Richmond Public Schools and the community to get low performing and disruptive students back on track in their learning and behavior so they can return to their home schools prepared to be successful.
Describe the characteristics of the student population served by the School. Include demographic information that identifies the subgroups attending the school, the criteria used to determine the students’ placement in this school, and the policies governing parental involvement in determining the placement.

Target Population: CCP encompasses secondary students who experience severe behavioral problems and for whom no other appropriate services have been successful. Students are placed at CCP for a period of 180 days through a referral from their current school principal or the hearing officer due to poor academic performance, inappropriate behavior and poor attendance. Most of the students are assigned to the alternative school by the district’s hearing officer or by school board decision after a disciplinary hearing has been completed. Placement decisions are based on the belief that students can improve their behavior and academic performance if given the time, opportunity, tools, structure and encouragement they need. Students assigned to our alternative program have failed to respond positively to the traditional schools’ intervention strategies and may face the possibilities of being retained and/or of dropping out of school.

Student Selection Criteria: CCP has a specialized design that offers instructional strategies and a unique organizational structure to meet the needs of challenged students who have been unsuccessful in the traditional comprehensive school setting. Student selection evidence in the following areas is considered for placement:

• Severe behavioral needs that interfere with learning
• Severe social/emotional needs that are barriers to the student’s success and/or the learning of others
• Attendance/truancy issues
• Poor academic performance
• A referral from the hearing officer for violation of the RPS Students’ Code of Conduct

Parental Involvement: Prior to the assignment to CCP, the parent(s), student, and the principal discuss the components of the program. Parents are intricately involved in the assignment process. When a student is referred by the principal for placement, a parental conference is convened. Parents must agree to the placement. In the case of assignment by the Hearing Officer, parents are included in the process and have the right to appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer. Appeals are reviewed by the School Board Discipline Committee. The decision by the School Board is final. Parent and student meetings are also held upon enrollment with the Welcome Center Coordinator. Parents and students must participate in an orientation session at the alternative school. Parents are provided an overview of the program and encouraged to become active in the school’s parental programs. Home/school communication plans are also reviewed. Academic and behavioral progress is accomplished and monitored through each student’s individual plan for success that is reviewed and shared with parents. Additionally, parents participate in the transition program in preparation for the child to return to his/her home school environment.

Student Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Students Served</th>
<th>303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Boys</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Girls</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Boys</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Girls</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe the instructional program and support services offered by the school. Include a profile of the teaching staff and its qualifications, characteristics of the program that makes it a special purpose school, any differentiated instructional methodologies used, and transition plans for the students.

Capital City Program offers a challenging curriculum aligned with state and local standards in safe, supportive, small learning communities to provide quality-learning opportunities affording students skills and behaviors necessary to become lifelong learners. Students are offered appropriate grade-level core courses in English/Reading, science, mathematics, and social science. The students also receive instruction in workplace readiness, basic academic skills and personal social development.

Upon enrollment, each student participates in a four-day orientation program that is designed to provide an overview of the school and its program. Each student takes a reading and math assessment to determine reading and math strengths and weakness. These data are then used to develop a plan for the student’s success at CCP.

Instruction is provided in four small learning communities staffed by a learning community instructional leader and learning community assistant in leadership/supervisory roles. High school boys and high school girls are enrolled in six classes daily with each class lasting 55 minutes. Middle school boys and middle school girls are enrolled in five classes daily with each class lasting 65 minutes. Reading and math computer labs are included in all communities.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) are taught through grade level courses in the four academic areas: reading, math, science and social studies at the middle school level and the full range of appropriate courses for high school students. Additionally, electives are required in personal/social development, reading and math intensive enrichment offered through a computer lab setting, and Employment Seminar (career education), Life Planning and Family Relations which are offered through the computer lab at the high school level. High School students have the opportunity to take business career and technical education classes leading to industry certification and middle school students have the opportunity to take career investigation courses.

Plans for academic, attendance/truancy, and behavioral improvements are developed with students to address their specific needs. These plans will guide students during the 180-day stay at CCP so that they may successfully transition to the next placement at a comprehensive middle or high school.

Academic growth is monitored bi-weekly at department chair meetings to ensure gains for each student. It is expected that each student will show at least a 1.5 years of growth in both reading and mathematics by the 120th day of enrollment. Administrators meet with departments monthly to monitor student progress in all subject areas. Nine week benchmark assessment data are analyzed to determine mastery of SOL objectives. These data are used to develop appropriate intervention and remediation strategies.

CCP is staffed with a faculty of highly qualified teachers certified to teach in the assigned core subject areas. The teacher / pupil ratio is 1:16 per class. Paraprofessionals are assigned to each core class to provide academic and behavioral support. Pupil support services are on-site to assist students and their families with issues that serve as barriers to academic and behavior successes.

Forty hours of school level professional development are required for all instructional staff during the week preceding the beginning of each school year. A week long Teacher Academy is held in the summer. Teachers receive instruction on data analysis, differentiation of instruction and how to relate and work with students who have behavioral issues. All CCP staff members receive training in the program, Handle with Care. Monthly, district instructional meetings for representative lead teachers are
held to provide support for continuous improvement as a high quality instructional program. CCP teachers use all of the instructional resources available from the Richmond Public Schools. These resources were developed based upon the Standards of Learning. Instructional staff members have been trained in using these resources as well as how to use data to make instructional decisions.

All students receive counseling services which focus on coping skills strategies. Select students receive concentrated therapeutic day counseling. Intensive in-home counseling services are provided by Associated Educational Services (AES), a local agency, to ensure that the social needs of students continue to be met. Medical data concerning unmet needs or those that require maintenance are coordinated between the nurses of CCP and the home school.

Services from Department of Juvenile Justice, Richmond City Social Services, Richmond Behavioral Health Authority, Richmond Division of Public Health, Family Focus, Associated Educational Services, and other service providers are coordinated by two Student Service Specialists.

CCP’s Student Service Specialists are assigned to visit weekly the students who transition back to their home schools. During these visits, the following information is collected and reviewed:

- Attendance
- Behavior
- Classes
- Grades earned
- Test results

Specific plans for improvement are developed and monitored. Students who have transitioned back to their comprehensive school meet with CCP Student Service Specialists weekly to ensure success. Learning community leaders send letters of congratulations to former students who make grades of C or better at the end of each marking period. Students who earn Ds and Fs are sent a note of encouragement telling them to continue trying and to offer assistance from the CCP Student Service Specialist. Letters from principals to transitioned students are mailed at the end of each year wishing them well on their future studies and job selections.

When rising seniors are ready to transition, their transcripts and behavioral/life skill strategies are reviewed to determine the most appropriate placement. Students may transition back to their comprehensive high school or to a Performance Learning Center or to the Adult Career Development Center to earn a GED. Each senior’s transition plan addresses both academic and social/life skills. This plan is monitored weekly by the CCP Student Service Specialists and the school counselor to ensure that each senior is successful academically and is continuing to use behavioral and life skill strategies learned at CCP. If a student needs additional assistance, an intervention/remediation plan is developed and monitored bi-weekly. Students will receive tutoring in any academic class where standards are not being achieved. A behavioral specialist will work with students if needed to reinforce behavioral and life skill strategies learned at CCP to ensure transfer to the new school setting. Each student’s progress is monitored and supported to ensure graduation and successful transition to post-secondary options or the world of work.

Describe the strategies and instruments used by the school to evaluate student progress toward established goals and objectives.

Student Assessment and Evaluation:

- Students at all grade levels participate in SOL testing in all four content areas. Each year progress is monitored to ensure steady gains toward meeting state and district goals.
Benchmark nine-week assessment data are used to monitor student progress toward mastery of the SOL. Data are analyzed so that appropriate interventions and program improvement are implemented.

Diagnostic assessments are administered to each student upon enrollment and regularly thereafter to monitor student growth in reading and math.

Progress reports are sent to parents on a weekly basis.

Weekly teacher-made assessments monitor students’ mastery of objectives taught during the week based upon the teaching of an aligned curriculum. Re-teaching activities are planned and implemented.

Richmond Public Schools report cards are given to students according to the district’s guidelines and calendar.

**Does the school meet the pre-accreditation eligibility requirements outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-280.F. of the accrediting standards? (If not, waivers must be requested for each accreditation standard not being met.)**

Yes, this school meets all pre-accreditation eligibility requirements.

**List each standard and provide a detailed explanation of why the standard is not appropriate for the school. (Note: Waivers of the assessment requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia are not available.)**

Much of the time spent by students at CCP program focuses on teaching life skills needed for success. Due to this time required for this focus, foreign language and fine arts are not offered. For this reason, the Capital City Program is requesting a waiver from 8 VAC 20-131-90 A-C and 8 VAC 20-131-100 A-B of the Standards of Accreditation that requires foreign language and fine arts.

**List the standards or student academic achievement criteria on which you propose to base the school’s accreditation and provide a detailed rationale for selecting each. The standards/criteria must be objective, measurable, and related directly to the mission and purpose of the school. Provide data to support your rationale.**

The alternative accreditation index model is the alternative accountability system for increasing the achievement levels of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least 2 semesters) in reading and mathematics and uses science and history and social science and other indicators of school and student performance that are aligned with the mission and goals of the school as value-added components.

Student achievement is a fundamental component in determining the accreditation status of Virginia’s public schools. The alternative accreditation index model will measure student achievement based on students’ progress in moving from basic to proficient to advanced levels of performance on Standards of Learning assessments. The index will have a primary focus on reading and mathematics achievement. The index is based on a set of core achievement objectives and measures (SOL test scores) as well as “reach” or excellence goals for the student population.

An alternative accreditation index score (0 to 100 points) will be calculated primarily based on the total number of students performing at each proficiency level in reading and mathematics. SOL Index Points are assigned for student performance on the SOL tests by multiplying the number of student scores at each level by the points awarded, adding the total points earned, and dividing by the total number of student scores. Additional Index Points may be earned for meeting performance measures in the core “other academic” and optional “reach” objectives categories. The Alternative Accreditation Index Score
for each content area (English and Mathematics) is calculated by combining the SOL Index Score and the Additional Index Points.

An Alternative Accreditation Index Score of at least 70 points must be earned in both English and mathematics to achieve fully accredited status. If the school fails to achieve fully accredited status, the rating will be in accordance with provisions of the Standards of Accreditation. Attached is the Alternative Accreditation Index Point System based on 2009-10 assessment data.

Goal and Performance Objectives for Alternative Accreditation Plan

**Goal:** All students will improve their academic performance so that they may successfully transition back to their home school environment through intensive focus on the core areas of English and mathematics and through achieving certain behavioral and conduct modifications that are indicative of being a responsible and productive student in an academic environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Achievement Objectives:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the percentage of students in grades 6-11 passing SOL English (Reading and Writing tests)</td>
<td>Weighted index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least two semesters) achieving at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels on the SOL reading in grades 6-7 and high school and at the proficient and advanced levels in writing tests in grade 8 and high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase the percentage of students in grades 6-8 passing SOL mathematics tests</td>
<td>Weighted index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least two semesters) achieving at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels on the SOL mathematics tests in grades 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase the percentage of students in grades 9-11 passing Algebra I, Geometry, or Algebra II SOL exams</td>
<td>Weighted index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least two semesters) achieving at the proficient and advanced levels on the SOL end-of-course exams in Algebra I, Geometry, or Algebra II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core “Other Academic” Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase the percentage of students in grades 6-8 and high school passing science and history and social science SOL tests</td>
<td>Weighted index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least two semesters) achieving at the proficient and advanced levels on the SOL assessments in science and history and social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase the percentage of high school graduates and completers</td>
<td>Percentage of students enrolled for at least two consecutive semesters who complete high school with a diploma or GED certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core “Other Indicator” Objectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Decrease number of students identified as truants by 10%</td>
<td>Truancy rates for students in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average Daily Attendance meets or exceeds 80%</td>
<td>Average Daily Attendance rates for students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Increase number of students successfully transitioned into regular school setting

Successful transition shall be measured by a student completing the program who passes three or more subjects in the transition school during the first semester at the transition school.

9. Decrease the number of serious incidents while at CCP.

Serious incident data for CCP students

Optional “Reach” Objectives:

10. Increase the percentage or number of middle school students taking Algebra I

Percentage or number of students in grades 6-8 taking Algebra I increases annually.

11. Increase number of high school and/or middle school students successfully completing online courses through Virtual Virginia

Percentage or number of students who pass online courses offered through Virtual Virginia.

12. Increase the percentage or number of high school students taking dual-enrollment, Advanced Placement, or other college-level Courses

Percentage or number of high school students taking at least one dual-enrollment, Advanced Placement, or other college-level courses

Alternative Accreditation Index Point System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOL Scaled Score</th>
<th>SOL Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Points Awarded Each SOL Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-600</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 399 (varies by test)</td>
<td>Basic (Reading and Math 3-8)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 400 (except Basic)</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Other Academic Objectives (points maximum)

Weighted index of students enrolled for a full academic year (at least 2 semesters) achieving at the proficient and advanced levels on the SOL assessments in science and history and social science

Index scores and Points Earned:

- 70 and above……..3 points
- 60 – 69……………1 point

Increased percentage of students enrolled for at least 2 consecutive semesters who complete high school with a diploma or GED certificate

2 points

Optional Reach Objectives (3 points maximum)

Increased percentage or number of students in grades 6-8 taking Algebra I

1 point

Increase number of high school and/or middle school students successfully completing online courses through Virtual Virginia.

1 point

Increase the percentage or number of high school students taking dual-enrollment, Advanced Placement, or other college-level courses

1 point
**Core Other Indicator Objectives (8 points maximum)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease number of students identified as truants by 10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily attendance meets or exceeds 80 percent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of students successfully transitioned into regular school setting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the number of serious incidents while at CCP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative Accreditation Index Score Calculations Illustrated:**
Example: English/Reading Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Student Scores</th>
<th>SOL Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Points Awarded Each SOL Score</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) SOL Score Points Awarded 7,300
(b) Total No. of Student Scores 100
(c) SOL Index Points = Total Score Points (a) divided by Total No. Scores (b) 73
(d) Additional Index Points (up to 15 points maximum from other objective measures) [Example: 5 pts. Earned] 5
(e) Alternative Accreditation Index Score = SOL Score Index Score (c) + Additional Index Points (d) 78

Met content area alternative accreditation requirements: YES

Example: Mathematics Index Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Student Scores</th>
<th>SOL Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Points Awarded Each SOL Score</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) SOL Score Points Awarded 7,650
(b) Total No. of Student Scores 100
(c) SOL Index Points = Total Score Points (a) divided by Total No. Scores (b) 76.5
(d) Additional Index Points (up to 15 points maximum from other objective measures) [Example: 5 pts. Earned] 5
(e) Alternative Accreditation Index Score = SOL Score Index Score (c) + Additional Index Points (d) 81.5

Met content area alternative accreditation requirements: YES
No Child Left Behind (NCLB): The Capital City Program is in compliance with all testing requirements under NCLB. Progress will be continuously assessed toward meeting all required goals. CCP students are taught by highly qualified teachers who are licensed and endorsed in their content areas.

**Describe who was involved in the development of the proposed plan.**

Dr. Kirk Schroder  
Mrs. Alberta Person, CCP Principal  
Mr. Frank Butts, CCP Facilitator  
Mr. Angelo Cuffee, Assistant Principal for Curriculum and Instruction  
Mrs. Rebecca Beard, CCP Testing Coordinator  
Victoria S. Oakley, Chief Academic Officer, Richmond Public Schools

**Describe the method(s) to be used in evaluating the success of the plan.**

- Bi-weekly and nine-week benchmark assessment data will be used to monitor student mastery of objectives.
- Bi-monthly Charting the Course visits by RPS administrative and instructional personnel.
- Classroom observations and walkthroughs by CCP administrators.
- Monthly analysis of Plato Lab data for reading and mathematics.
- Bi-monthly monitoring of the School Improvement Plan on Indistar.
- Monthly analysis of student support services provided to students.
Virginia Department of Education  
Evaluation Criteria  
Richmond Alternative School, Richmond City Public Schools  
Alternative Accreditation Plans for Special Purpose Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School characteristics and instructional program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The mission, purpose, and target population of the school justify its</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorization as a “special purpose” school and, therefore, eligible to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request an alternative accreditation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The characteristics and special needs of the student population are</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly defined, and the criteria for student placement require parental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultation and agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The program of instruction provides all students with opportunities to</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study a comprehensive curriculum that is customized to support the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan requests a waiver of 8 VAC 20-131-100 A-B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The school provides transition planning to help students be successful</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when they return to a regular school setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strategies used to evaluate student progress are aligned to the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission/purpose of the school and include academic achievement measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Convincing evidence has been provided that students enrolled in the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school have not been successful in other schools subject to all the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrediting standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students will be taught with highly qualified teachers who meet the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education’s licensure requirements for instructional personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Alternative Accreditation Accountability Criteria:**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rationale and documentation provide convincing evidence that the “special purpose” nature of the school precludes its being able to reach and maintain full accreditation status as defined in the <em>Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia</em> (SOA).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Alternative accreditation criteria described in the plan include academic achievement measures that are objective, measurable, and directly related to the mission and purpose of the school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The plan includes use of statewide assessment student achievement results of English and mathematics.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The plan meets the testing requirements of the SOA.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The plan meets the testing requirements of NCLB and describes how the school plans to meet “adequate yearly progress” requirements of the federal law.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The plan provides convincing evidence that all pre-accreditation eligibility criteria are met for standards in which waivers have not been requested.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Waivers have been requested for accrediting standards that are not being met, and the rationale for the waivers are clear and appropriate for the mission/purpose of the school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background Information:

In response to the 1999 *Education Accountability and Quality Enhancement Act* (HB2710 and SB1145) approved by the Virginia General Assembly, the Board of Education approved the *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents* in January 2000. In May 2008, the Board of Education approved the guidance document, *Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers* that responded to a recommendation from the Committee to Enhance the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia established by the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

The Board of Education is required to establish performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers, principals, and superintendents to serve as guidelines for school divisions to use in implementing educator evaluation systems. The *Code of Virginia* requires (1) that teacher evaluations be consistent with the **performance objectives (standards)** set forth in the Board of Education’s *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents* and (2) that school boards’ procedures for evaluating instructional personnel address student academic progress.
Section 22.1-253.13:5 (Standard 5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership) of the Code of Virginia states, in part, the following:

...B. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, teacher, administrator, and superintendent evaluations shall be consistent with the performance objectives included in the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents. Teacher evaluations shall include regular observation and evidence that instruction is aligned with the school's curriculum. Evaluations shall include identification of areas of individual strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for appropriate professional activities. 

Section 22.1-295 (Employment of teachers) states, in part, the following:

...C. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, student academic progress [emphasis added] and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.

Instructional personnel employed by local school boards who have achieved continuing contract status shall be evaluated not less than once every three years. Any instructional personnel, who has achieved continuing contract status, receiving an unsatisfactory evaluation who continues to be employed by the local school board shall be evaluated no later than one year after receiving such unsatisfactory evaluation. The evaluation shall be maintained in the employee's personnel file.

At its July 2010 meeting, the Board of Education received a report from the Virginia Department of Education that provided a work plan to study and develop model teacher and principal evaluation systems that would result in revisions to the Board’s uniform performance standards and evaluation criteria. The initial work focused on developing a model teacher evaluation system that could be used by school divisions in making decisions about performance pay.

Summary of Major Elements

The Virginia Department of Education established a work group to conduct a comprehensive study of teacher evaluation in July 2010. The work group included teachers, principals, superintendents, human resources representatives, a higher education representative, and representatives from professional organizations (Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, Virginia Education Association, Virginia School Boards Association and the Virginia Parent Teacher Association), expert consultants, and Department of Education personnel. The roster of work group members is provided in the attached documents.
Department of Education staff consulted with the Center for Innovative Technology (CIT) to coordinate the activities of the work group. Working with the Department, CIT engaged the services of two expert consultants to assist in revising the documents, developing revised standards, and creating new evaluation models. The consultants were Dr. James Stronge, Heritage Professor of Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership, The College of William and Mary; and Dr. Terry Dozier, Associate Professor, Teaching and Learning, and Director, Center for Teacher Leadership, Virginia Commonwealth University.

The goals of the work group were to:

- compile and synthesize current research on:
  - comprehensive teacher evaluation as a tool to improve student achievement and teacher performance, improve teacher retention, and inform meaningful staff development, and effective models of differentiated and performance-based compensation including differentiated staffing models;

- examine selected research being conducted by faculty at Virginia colleges and universities involving teacher evaluation and differentiated and performance-based compensation;

- examine existing state law, policies, and procedures relating to teacher evaluation;

- examine selected teacher evaluation systems currently in use across Virginia;

- develop and recommend policy revisions related to teacher evaluation, as appropriate;

- revise existing documents developed to support teacher evaluation across Virginia, including the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers, Administrators and Superintendents and the Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers to reflect current research and embed the requirement to consider student growth as a significant factor of all teacher evaluation protocols;

- examine the use of teacher evaluation to improve student achievement with particular focus on high-poverty and/or persistently low-performing schools in Virginia;

- examine the use of teacher evaluation to improve teacher retention and guide meaningful professional development with particular focus on hard-to-staff, high-poverty, and/or persistently low-performing schools in Virginia;

- examine the use of teacher evaluation as a component of differentiated compensation or performance-based compensation both in Virginia and nationally;

- develop new models of teacher evaluation, including a growth model, that can be field tested by selected school divisions;

- provide technical support to selected school divisions as they field test new models; and

- evaluate field test results and use results to refine evaluation models, inform further policy development, inform legislative priorities, and support applications for federal or other grant
funding to support further implementation of new evaluation models and performance-based
compensation models across Virginia.

Work group meetings were held in Richmond in August 2010, Charlottesville in October 2010, and
Newport News in December 2010. The work group concluded its work in December 2010, and a
subcommittee of the work group met on March 9, 2011, to review the draft documents.

The work group developed two guidance documents requiring Board of Education approval:

**Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers**
State statute requires that teacher evaluations be consistent with the performance standards
(objectives) included in this document. The additional information contained in the document is
provided as guidance for local school boards in the development of evaluation systems for
teachers.

**Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers**
The standards in this document define what teachers should know and be able to do, and they
establish a foundation upon which all aspects of teacher development from teacher education to
induction and ongoing professional development can be aligned. The revised *Guidelines for
Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers* incorporate these
teaching standards. This document serves as a resource for school divisions in the
implementation of the Board of Education’s performance standards and evaluation criteria for
teachers and for colleges and universities in teacher preparation.

Also included in the Board item is a document, *The Research Base for the Uniform Performance
Standards for Teachers*, that provides the research base supporting the selection and implementation of
the proposed performance standards and evaluation criteria. This is an informational Department of
Education document that does not require Board of Education approval.

The *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers* set forth
seven performance standards for all Virginia teachers. Pursuant to state law, teacher evaluations must
be consistent with the following performance standards (objectives) included in this document:

**Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge**
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the
developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

**Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning**
The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective
strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

**Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery**
The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies
in order to meet individual learning needs.
Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning
The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment
The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Performance Standard 6: Professionalism
The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress
The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

The first six standards closely parallel the work of the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium as well as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The seventh standard adds an increased focus on student academic progress. For each standard, sample performance indicators are provided. In addition, the evaluation guidelines provide assistance to school divisions regarding the documentation of teacher performance with an emphasis on the use of multiple measures for teacher evaluation rather than relying on a single measure of performance.

The Code of Virginia requires that school boards’ procedures for evaluating teachers address student academic progress; how this requirement is met is the responsibility of local school boards. Though not mandated, the Board’s Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers recommend that each teacher receive a summative evaluation rating, and that the rating be determined by weighting the first six standards equally at 10 percent each, and that the seventh standard, student academic progress, account for 40 percent of the summative evaluation. There are three key points to consider in this model:

1. Student learning, as determined by multiple measures of student academic progress, accounts for a total of 40 percent of the evaluation.

2. At least 20 percent of the teacher evaluation (half of the student academic progress measure) is comprised of student growth percentiles as provided from the Virginia Department of Education when the data are available and can be used appropriately.

3. Another 20 percent of the teacher evaluation (half of the student academic progress measure) should be measured using one or more alternative measures with evidence that the alternative measure is valid. Note: Whenever possible, it is recommended that the second progress measure be grounded in validated, quantitative, objective measures, using tools already available in the school.
The Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers provide school divisions with a model evaluation system, including sample forms and templates that may be implemented “as is” or used to refine existing local teacher evaluation systems. Properly implemented, the evaluation system provides school divisions with the information needed to support systems of differentiated compensations or performance-based pay.

Plans are underway to pilot teacher evaluation and performance pay models based on the new guidance documents for the 2011-12 school year. Two pilots are anticipated, one funded through the federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) and the other from state funding for hard-to-staff schools.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept for first review the revised guidance documents, Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers and the Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers.

**Impact on Resources:**

There is a minimal impact on resources.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

Revised documents will be presented to the Board of Education for final review on April 28, 2011. Phases II and III of the Department’s study of evaluation systems will result in proposed revisions to the Board’s guidelines for uniform performance standards and evaluation criteria for principals and superintendents.
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Part 1: Introduction

Why Good Evaluation is Necessary

Teacher evaluation matters because teaching matters. In fact, “the core of education is teaching and learning, and the teaching-learning connection works best when we have effective teachers working with every student every day.” Evaluation systems must be of high quality if we are to discern whether our teachers are of high quality. The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. The role of a teacher requires a performance evaluation system that acknowledges the complexities of the job. Teachers have a challenging task in meeting the educational needs of an educationally diverse student population, and good evaluation is necessary to provide the teachers with the support, recognition, and guidance they need to sustain and improve their efforts.

Because teachers are so fundamentally important to school improvement and student success, improving the evaluation of teacher performance is particularly relevant as a means to recognize excellence in teaching and to advance teacher effectiveness. A meaningful evaluation focuses on instructional quality and professional standards, and through this focus and timely feedback, enables teachers and leaders to recognize, appreciate, value, and develop excellent teaching. The usage of the terminology is consistent with the professional literature, but that “effective” is not intended to connote a particular technical definition. The benefits of a teacher evaluation system are numerous and well documented. Johnston (1999) noted that the process of teacher evaluation can be valuable in several ways, including:

- assessing the effectiveness of classroom teachers;
- identifying areas in need of improvement;
- making professional development more individualized; and
- improving instruction schoolwide.

Sanders (2000) observed that once teachers are given feedback pertaining to classroom-level instructional outcomes, they start to modify their instruction to address their weak areas. It is important, however, that when administrators make decisions and provide feedback to teachers on their performance, that the information is a valid measure of their actual job performance, which means it should include a teachers’ responsibilities both in-class and out-of-class.

Problems with Current Evaluation Systems

Unfortunately, even though a teacher’s effectiveness is recognized as the most important factor in improving student achievement, schools rarely measure, document, or use effectiveness ratings to inform decision-making. The result is that it is difficult to distinguish between poor, average, good, and excellent teachers. Sometimes termed the “Widget Effect,” schools tend to assume that teachers’ effectiveness in the classroom is the same from teacher to teacher and,
thus, treat them as interchangeable parts. Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, and Keeling (2009)\textsuperscript{10} indicated that \textit{all teachers are rated as great or at least good}. In fact, in their study, 99 percent of teachers were rated as \textit{satisfactory} when their schools used a \textit{satisfactory/unsatisfactory} rating system; in schools that used an evaluation scale with a broader range of options, an overwhelming 94 percent of all teachers received one of the top two ratings. Further, they noted that evaluation systems reinforce this indifference to the variations in teacher performance in several ways:

\textit{Excellence is not recognized}. A rating scale that does not distinguish the truly outstanding performers from the average ones creates a situation where the exceptional teachers are not identified and cannot be recognized formally.

\textit{Professional development is inadequate}. School divisions cannot identify the needs of teachers and provide professional development if their shortcomings are never identified.

\textit{Novice teachers do not receive special attention}. When evaluation systems do not identify the specific developmental needs of new teachers (who are widely recognized as needing support to build and implement the most effective practices), they do not receive the assistance they need to correct their deficiencies.

\textit{Poor performance does not get addressed}. Schools that provide teachers with inflated, unrealistic ratings rarely dismiss teachers for poor performance, even though they are recognized by other teachers and administrators as being ineffective.

Other flaws in the current teacher evaluation process include:\textsuperscript{11}

- problems with the evaluation instruments themselves (e.g., subjectivity, low validity);
- issues related to time and resources;\textsuperscript{12}
- a tendency to focus on paperwork routines rather than improving instruction;
- an absence of standard protocols and practices in teacher practices;
- an absence of meaningful and timely feedback to teachers;
- inadequate administrator training;
- a lack of time to perform adequate evaluations;\textsuperscript{13}
- a lack of impact; and
- a lack of constructive criticism on the evaluation that can be used to improve professional practice and often are based on sparse evidence.
Historically, the result is that little has been done to develop, support, and retain effective teachers and most teachers, even the ineffective ones, become tenured or gain continuing contract status. In short,

Evaluation systems fail to differentiate performance among teachers. Excellent teachers cannot be recognized or rewarded, chronically low-performing teachers languish, and the wide majority of teachers performing at moderate levels do not get the differentiated support and development they need to improve as professionals.  

**Importance of Recognizing Teacher Effectiveness**

Characterizing teacher effectiveness is important because of the direct impact teachers have on student performance. In fact, teacher effectiveness is the most significant school-related variable impacting student learning outcomes. Stronge, et al., (in press) conducted a study on teacher effectiveness and discovered that a 30+ percentile point difference in student achievement in mathematics and English could be attributed to the quality of teaching that occurred in the classroom over an academic year.  

**Purposes of Evaluation**

The primary purposes of a quality teacher evaluation system are to:

- contribute to the successful achievement of the goals and objectives defined in the school division’s educational plan;
- improve the quality of instruction by ensuring accountability for classroom performance and teacher effectiveness;
- implement a performance evaluation system that promotes a positive working environment and continuous communication between the teacher and the evaluator that promotes continuous professional growth and improved student outcomes;
- promote self-growth, instructional effectiveness, and improvement of overall professional performance; and, ultimately
- optimize student learning and growth.

A high quality evaluation system includes the following distinguishing characteristics:

- benchmark behaviors for each of the teacher performance standards;
- a focus on the relationship between teacher performance and improved student learning and growth;
• a system for documenting teacher performance based on multiple data sources regarding teacher performance;

• the use of multiple data sources for documenting performance, including opportunities for teachers to present evidence of their own performance as well as student growth;

• a procedure for conducting performance reviews that stresses accountability, promotes professional improvement, and increases teacher involvement in the evaluation process; and

• a support system for providing assistance when needed.

**Purposes of this Document**

The Board of Education is required to establish performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers, principals, and superintendents to serve as guidelines for school divisions to use in implementing educator evaluation systems. The *Code of Virginia* requires (1) that teacher evaluations be consistent with the **performance objectives (standards)** set forth in the Board of Education’s *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents* and (2) that school boards’ procedures for evaluating instructional personnel address student academic progress.

Section 22.1-253.13:5 (Standard 5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership) of the *Code of Virginia* states, in part, the following:

...B. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, teacher, administrator, and superintendent evaluations shall be consistent with the performance objectives included in the *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents*. Teacher evaluations shall include regular observation and evidence that instruction is aligned with the school's curriculum. Evaluations shall include identification of areas of individual strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for appropriate professional activities....

Section 22.1-295 (Employment of teachers) states, in part, the following:

...C. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, **student academic progress** [emphasis added] and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.

The Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers provide school divisions with a model evaluation system, including sample forms and templates that may be implemented “as is” or used to refine existing local teacher evaluation systems. Properly implemented, the evaluation system provides school divisions with the information needed to support systems of differentiated compensations or performance-based pay.

The Code of Virginia requires that school boards’ procedures for evaluating teachers address student academic progress; how this requirement is met is the responsibility of local school boards. Though not mandated, the Board’s Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers recommend that each teacher receive a summative evaluation rating, and that the rating be determined by weighting the first six standards equally at 10 percent each, and that the seventh standard, student academic progress, account for 40 percent of the summative evaluation.

The document was developed specifically for use with classroom teachers. For other non-classroom educators who are required to hold a Virginia teaching license, revisions likely will be necessary. For example, guidance counselors and library-media specialists may require modified performance standards and data sources different from classroom teachers.
Endnotes

1 Portions of this section were adapted from teacher evaluation handbooks published in various states, copyright [2010] by J. H. Stronge. Adapted with permission.


7 The usage of the terms “effective” and “ineffective” is consistent with that used in professional literature. These terms are not intended to connote particular technical definitions.


11 Stronge, J. H. (2006), p. 120.


Part 2: Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers

The uniform performance standards for teachers are used to collect and present data to document performance that is based on well-defined job expectations. They provide a balance between structure and flexibility and define common purposes and expectations, thereby guiding effective instructional practice. The performance standards also provide flexibility, encouraging creativity and individual teacher initiative. The goal is to support the continuous growth and development of each teacher by monitoring, analyzing, and applying pertinent data compiled within a system of meaningful feedback.

Defining Teacher Performance Standards

Clearly defined professional responsibilities constitute the foundation of the teacher performance standards. A fair and comprehensive evaluation system provides sufficient detail and accuracy so that both teachers and evaluators (i.e., principal, supervisor) reasonably understand the job expectations.

The expectations for professional performance are defined using a two-tiered approach.

Performance Standards

Performance standards define the criteria expected when teachers perform their major duties. For all teachers, there are seven performance standards as shown in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Performance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment
The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Performance Standard 6: Professionalism
The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress
The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators provide examples of observable, tangible behavior that indicate the degree to which teachers are meeting each teaching standard. This helps teachers and their evaluators clarify performance levels and job expectations. That is, the performance indicators provide the answer to what must be performed. Performance indicators are provided as examples of the types of performance that will occur if a standard is being fulfilled. However, the list of performance indicators is not exhaustive, and they are not intended to be prescriptive. Teachers are not expected to demonstrate each performance indicator, as all performance indicators may not be applicable to a particular work assignment. However, some teaching positions may need to identify specific indicators that are consistent with job requirements and school improvement plans. Teachers of students with disabilities, for example, are required to participate in Individual Educational Program (IEP) meetings and maintain appropriate documentation regarding student performance. This might be added as a performance indicator under Performance Standard 7 (Student Academic Progress). Similarly, science teachers might add a performance indicator regarding laboratory safety under Performance Standard 5 (Learning Environment).

Evaluators and teachers should consult the sample performance indicators for clarification of what constitutes a specific performance standard. Performance ratings are NOT made at the performance indicator level, but at the performance standard level. Additionally, it is important to document a teacher’s performance on each standard with evidence generated from multiple performance indicators. Sample performance indicators for each of the performance standards follow.
**Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge**

*The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning**

*The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans and adapts plans when needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery

*The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

#### Sample Performance Indicators

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

1. Engages and maintains students in active learning.
2. Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
3. Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
4. Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout lessons.
5. Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
6. Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
7. Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

### Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning

*The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

#### Sample Performance Indicators

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

1. Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.
2. Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.
3. Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.
4. Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.
5. Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
6. Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.
7. Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.
Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment
The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Sample Performance Indicators
Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

5.1 Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.
5.2 Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.
5.3 Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.
5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.
5.5 Promotes cultural sensitivity.
5.6 Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.
5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.
5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

Performance Standard 6: Professionalism
The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Sample Performance Indicators
Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school and division policies, and ethical guidelines.
6.3 Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
6.5 Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
6.6 Works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, other school personnel, and the community.

6.7 Builds positive and professional relationships with parents/guardians through frequent and effective communication concerning students’ progress.

6.8 Serves as a contributing member of the school’s professional learning community through collaboration with teaching colleagues.

6.9 Demonstrates consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

7.1 Sets acceptable, measurable, and appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data.

7.2 Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.

7.3 Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other multiple measures of student growth.

7.4 Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student academic progress and develop interim learning targets.

Note: Performance Standard 7: If a teacher effectively fulfills all previous standards, it is likely that the results of teaching -- as documented in Standard 7: Student Academic Progress -- would be positive. The Virginia teacher evaluation system includes the documentation of student growth as indicated within Standard 7 and recommends that the evidence of progress be reviewed and considered throughout the year.
Part 3: Documenting Teacher Performance

The role of a teacher requires a performance evaluation system that acknowledges the complexities of the job. Multiple data sources provide for a comprehensive and authentic “performance portrait” of the teacher’s work. The sources of information described in Figure 3.1 were selected to provide comprehensive and accurate feedback on teacher performance. These suggested documentation sources for teacher evaluation can be used for both probationary and continuing contract teachers.

Figure 3.1: Suggested Documentation Sources for Teacher Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Observations</strong></td>
<td>Observations are an important source of performance information. Formal observations focus directly on the seven teacher performance standards. Classroom observations also may include a review of teacher products or artifacts, and review of student data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Observations</strong></td>
<td>Informal observations are intended to provide more frequent information on a wider variety of contributions made by the teacher. Evaluators are encouraged to conduct observations by visiting classrooms, observing instruction, and observing work in non-classroom settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Surveys</strong></td>
<td>Student surveys provide information to the teacher about students’ perceptions of how the professional is performing. The actual survey responses are seen only by the teacher who prepares a survey summary for inclusion in the portfolio. The surveys provided in this document are designed to be used in grades 1 – 12 (e.g., not with pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolios/Document Logs</strong></td>
<td>Portfolios/document logs provide documentation generated by the teacher for the seven performance standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Self-evaluations reveal the teachers’ perceptions of their job performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

Observations are intended to provide information on a wide variety of contributions made by teachers in the classroom or to the school community as a whole. Administrators are continually observing in their schools by walking through classrooms and non-instructional spaces, attending meetings, and participating in school activities. These day-to-day observations are not necessarily noted in writing, but they do serve as a source of information.

Direct classroom observation can be a useful way to collect information on teacher performance; as a stand-alone data collection process, however, it has major limitations. If the purpose of a teacher evaluation system is to provide a comprehensive picture of performance in order to guide professional growth, then classroom observations should be only one piece of the data collection puzzle. Given the complexity of the job responsibilities of teachers, it is unlikely that an evaluator will have the opportunity to observe and provide feedback on all of the performance standards in a given visit.

Observations can be conducted in a variety of settings and take on a variety of forms, including quick, drop-by classroom visits, to more formal, pre-planned observational reviews using validated instruments for documenting observations. Furthermore, observations may be announced or unannounced. Evaluators are encouraged to conduct observations by observing instruction and non-instructional routines at various times throughout the evaluation cycle.

Formal Observation

In a formal observation, the evaluator conducts a structured or semi-structured, planned observation -- either announced or unannounced -- typically of a teacher who is presenting a lesson to or interacting with students. Evaluators can use formal observations as one source of information to determine whether a teacher is meeting expectations for performance standards. A sample Formal Classroom Observation Form is provided on pages 16-18; many other observation forms are available. Formal classroom observations should last a specified period of time (for example, 30 or 45 minutes, or the duration of a full lesson). For maximum value, the building level administrator should ensure that formal observations occur throughout the year.

Typically, the evaluator provides feedback about the observation during a review conference with the teacher. During the session -- which should occur within a specified number of school days following the observation -- the evaluator reviews all information summarized on the Formal Classroom Observation Form as well as any other applicable documentation. Sample post-observation inquiries are shown in Figure 3.2. One copy of the observation form should be given to the teacher, and one copy should be maintained by the evaluator for the entire evaluation cycle to document professional growth and development.
Figure 3.2: Sample Post-Observation Inquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What went well during the lesson I observed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you do differently the next time you teach this lesson and/or use a particular instructional strategy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the learning climate of the classroom during the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What occurred during the day before I arrived for the observation that may have influenced what happened during the time I spent in your class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you address students who needed more time to fully understand and master the concept?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observed a “snapshot” of your instruction. How well did the students’ learning reflect your intended learning outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What informal or formal assessments did you conduct prior to teaching this lesson? How did the data from the assessments influence this lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you let students know what the objective for the lesson was and how the students would know if they successfully achieved it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What student characteristics or needs do you keep in mind as you are giving directions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What goal(s) did you set this year for student achievement? How are your students progressing on that/those goal(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAMPLE: Formal Classroom Observation Form**

*Directions: This form is to be used for probationary teachers and teachers with continuing contract status. Observers should use the form to provide feedback to teachers about the observation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Name</th>
<th>Date Observed</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer’s Name</td>
<td>The teacher is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✧ Probationary</td>
<td>✧ Continuing Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. **Professional Knowledge**

The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

- Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.
- Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.
- Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.
- Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.
- Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.
- Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.
- Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

*Comments:*

### 2. **Instructional Planning**

The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

- Uses student learning data to guide planning.
- Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.
- Plans for differentiated instruction.
- Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.
- Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans and adapts plans when needed.

*Comments:*
3. Instructional Delivery
The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

- Engages and maintains students in active learning.
- Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
- Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
- Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout lessons.
- Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
- Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

Comments:

4. Assessment of and for Student Learning
The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

- Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.
- Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.
- Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.
- Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.
- Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

Comments:

5. Learning Environment
The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

- Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.
- Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.
- Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.
- Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.
- Promotes cultural sensitivity.
- Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.
- Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.
- Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

Comments:
### 6. Professionalism

*The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

- Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
- Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies, and ethical guidelines.
- Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
- Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
- Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
- Works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, other school personnel, and the community.
- Builds positive and professional relationships with parents/guardians through frequent and effective communication concerning students’ progress.
- Serves as a contributing member of the school’s professional learning community through collaboration with teaching colleagues.
- Demonstrates consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

*Comments:*

### 7. Student Academic Progress

*The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.*

- Sets acceptable, measurable, and appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data.
- Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.
- Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other measures of academic progress.
- Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student progress and develop interim learning targets.

*Comments:*

**Additional Comments:**

Teacher’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature ___________________________________ Date _______________

Observer’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Observer’s Signature ___________________________________ Date _______________
Informal Observations

Informal observations are intended to provide more frequent information on a wide variety of contributions made by teachers in the classroom or to the school community as a whole. Evaluators are encouraged to conduct informal observations by observing instruction and non-instructional routines at various times throughout the evaluation cycle. These informal observations typically are less structured than formal observations.

Informal observations might include observing instruction for a short duration (i.e., ten to fifteen minutes) or observing work in non-classroom settings at various times throughout the school year. For example, an informal observation might include briefly visiting a classroom during a science laboratory experiment or observing a teacher participating in a faculty meeting or committee meeting. An important factor for evaluators to remember when collecting informal observation data is to focus on specific, factual descriptions of performance. Also, it is important to obtain a representative sampling of performance observations through regular, repeat visits to classrooms. A sample Informal Classroom Observation Form is provided on pages 20-21. One copy of this form should be given to the teacher and one copy should be maintained by the evaluator for the entire evaluation cycle to document growth and development.

---


---

a Note: An evaluation cycle refers to an ongoing process of data collection, evaluator-evaluatee discussion, summative review, and performance improvement. The various cyclical steps in a quality evaluation system (e.g., classroom observation - feedback - improvement) are inextricably linked and seamless.
SAMPLE: Informal Classroom Observation Form

Directions: This form can be used by the evaluator to document during informal classroom observation. One form should be given to the teacher and one copy should be maintained by the evaluator for the entire evaluation cycle to document growth and development.

Teacher Observed: ________________________ Date: _______ Time: _______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Professional Knowledge</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses appropriate curriculum standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates an understanding of the knowledge of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicates clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Instructional Planning</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uses student learning data to guide planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans time for realistic pacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plans for differentiated instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aligns lesson objectives to curriculum and student needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans and adapts plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Instructional Delivery</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Engages students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Builds on prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiates instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforces learning goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses a variety of strategies/resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses instructional technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicates clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Assessment of and for Student Learning</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uses pre-assessment data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves students in setting learning goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses valid, appropriate assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aligns assessments with standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses a variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses assessment tools for formative/summative purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives constructive feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Learning Environment</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Arranges the classroom to maximize learning and provides a safe environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishes clear expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximizes instruction/minimal disruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Professionalism</td>
<td>Specific Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborates/communicates effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adheres to laws/policies/ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporates professional development learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporates learning from professional growth activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sets goals for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activities outside classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Builds positive relationship with parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contributes to professional learning community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrates mastery of standard oral and written English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Student Academic Progress</th>
<th>Specific Examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sets student achievement goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides evidence of goal attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops interim learning targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** It is unlikely that all teacher performance standards would be documented in a single classroom visit. In fact, an observation might focus on a specific standard.

Teacher’s Name ____________________________

Teacher’s Signature _________________________ Date _______________

Observer’s Name ____________________________

Observer’s Signature _________________________ Date _______________
Walk-through Observations

Walk-through observations have been popularized in recent years as a means for documenting and assessing practices and trends throughout a school. Typically, walk-through observations are designed to provide brief (three to five minutes) visits in multiple classrooms. While walk-through visits can be helpful in checking for standard instructional practices or for vertical and horizontal curriculum articulation across the school, evaluators should be cautious in relying on these visits for individual teacher evaluation as, generally, they are not designed for teacher evaluation. Visits of three to five minutes, even if conducted frequently, may not do justice to teachers in terms of understanding their instructional or assessment practices, student time-on-task, learning environment, and so forth.

Student Surveys

Student surveys represent an additional source of information regarding teacher performance. The purpose of a student survey is to collect information that will help the teacher set goals for continuous improvement (i.e., for formative evaluation). In most pre-kindergarten through grade 12 teacher evaluation systems, the sole purpose of the surveys is to provide feedback directly to the teacher for professional growth and development.

Student surveys are unique in that, although they may be required for most teachers, teachers will retain exclusive access to the results of the surveys regarding his or her performance.

Teachers should administer annual student surveys according to school division guidelines during a specified time period (for example, the second nine weeks). Teachers at the middle and high school levels should administer surveys to two classes of students that are representative of their teaching assignment(s) during a specified year. At the teacher’s discretion, additional questions may be added to the survey. The teacher will retain sole access to the student surveys; however, the teacher will provide a summary of the surveys to the evaluator. (Note: The student survey summary can be included in the teacher’s portfolio/document log.)

There are four different versions of the student survey (Grades 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) designed to reflect developmental differences in students’ ability to provide useful feedback to their teacher. Student Surveys and the accompanying Survey Summary Sheet on pages 23-27 provide a unique form of formative feedback. All surveys should be completed anonymously to promote honest feedback.

**SAMPLE: GRADES 1-2 STUDENT SURVEY**

Directions: Teachers, please explain that you are going to read this sentence twice: As I read the sentence, color the face that describes how you feel about the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: I ride a school bus to school.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My teacher listens to me.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My teacher gives me help when I need it.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My teacher shows us how to do new things.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I know what I am supposed to do in class.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am able to do the work in class.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I learn new things in my class.</td>
<td>☺ ☒ ☣</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
**SAMPLE: Grades 3-5 Student Survey**

*Directions: Follow along as I read the statements. Respond to the statements by placing a check mark (✓) beneath the response – “YES,” “SOMETIMES,” or “NO” – that best describes how you feel about the statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Name</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Class Period</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Example: I like listening to music.*

1. My teacher listens to me.  
2. My teacher gives me help when I need it.  
3. My teacher shows us how to do new things.  
4. My teacher encourages me to evaluate my own learning.  
5. I am able to do the work in class.  
6. I learn new things in my class.  
7. I feel safe in this class.  
8. My teacher uses many ways to teach.  
9. My teacher explains how my learning can be used outside of school.  
10. My teacher explains why I get things wrong on my work.  
11. My teacher shows respect to all students.  
12. My teacher demonstrates helpful strategies or skills for my learning.  
13. There are opportunities to reflect on my learning in my class.  
14. My teacher allows me to make some choices about my learning.

**COMMENTS:**
**SAMPLE: Grades 6-8 Student Survey**

The purpose of this survey is to allow you to give your teacher ideas about how this class might be improved.

*Directions: DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS SURVEY. Write your class period in the space provided. Listed below are several statements about this class. Indicate your agreement with each statement. If you strongly disagree, circle 1; if you strongly agree circle 5. If you wish to comment, please write your comments at the end of the survey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Name</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Class Period</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Example: I like listening to music.*

1. My teacher creates a classroom environment that allows me to learn.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
2. My teacher encourages me to evaluate my own learning.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
3. My teacher allows me to demonstrate my learning in a variety of ways.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - 1 2 3 4 5
5. My teacher shows respect to all students.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
6. My teacher is available to help outside of class.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
7. My teacher grades my work in a timely manner.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
8. My teacher relates lesson to other subjects or the real world.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
9. My teacher respects different opinions.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
10. My teacher uses a variety of activities in class.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
11. My teacher encourages all students to learn.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
12. My teacher expects me to be successful.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
13. My teacher is knowledgeable about the subject.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
14. My teacher provides helpful feedback.
    - 1 2 3 4 5

**COMMENTS:**
SAMPLE: Grades 9-12 Student Survey

The purpose of this survey is to allow you to give your teacher ideas about how this class might be improved.

Directions: DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS SURVEY. Write your class period in the space provided. Listed below are several statements about this class. Indicate your agreement with each statement. If you strongly disagree, circle 1; if you strongly agree circle 5. If you wish to comment, please write your comments at the end of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Name</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Class Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: I like listening to music.

In this class, my teacher...

1. gives clear instructions.  
2. treats everyone fairly.  
3. is available for help outside of class time.  
4. clearly states the objectives for the lesson.  
5. grades my work in a reasonable time.  
6. relates lesson to other subjects or the real world.  
7. allows for and respects different opinions.  
8. encourages all students to learn.  
9. uses a variety of activities in class.  
10. communicates in a way I can understand.  
11. manages the classroom with a minimum of disruptions.  
12. shows respect to all students.  
13. consistently enforces disciplinary rules in a fair manner.  
14. makes sure class time is used for learning.  
15. is knowledgeable about his/her subject area.  
16. clearly defines long-term assignments (such as projects).  
17. sets high expectations.  
18. helps me reach high expectations.  
19. assigns relevant homework.  
20. communicates honestly with me.

COMMENTS:
SAMPLE: Student Survey Summary

Directions: Summarize according to your best judgment. At the secondary level, results may be analyzed by class, subject, grade, etc., and reported as appropriate.

Teacher’s Name: _______________________________________________________________

Grade: ____________________ Subject: __________________________________

Survey form used: □ Grades 1-2   □ Grades 3-5   □ Grades 6-8   □ Grades 9-12

1. How many surveys did you distribute?

2. How many completed surveys were returned?

3. What is the percentage of completed questionnaires you received (#1 divided into #2)?
   __________ percent

Student Satisfaction Analysis

4. Describe your survey population(s) (i.e., list appropriate demographic characteristics such as grade level and subject for students).

5. List factors that might have influenced the results (e.g., survey was conducted near time of report cards or progress reports).

6. Analyze survey responses and answer the following questions:

   A) What did students perceive as your major strengths?

   B) What did students perceive as your major weaknesses?

   C) How can you use this information for continuous professional growth?

(Include a copy of the survey summary and a blank survey in the portfolio’s Learning Environment section.)
Portfolios/Document Logs

Artifacts of a teacher’s performance can serve as valuable and insightful data source for documenting the work that teachers actually do. These artifacts can be organized as portfolios or document logs as a formal aspect of the data collection system. Various school divisions call the teachers’ own documentation of their work by various names, but their purpose is essentially the same – to provide evidence of teaching excellence. The items included provide evaluators with information they likely would not observe during the course of a typical classroom visit. They also provide the teacher with an opportunity for self-reflection, demonstration of quality work, and are a basis for two-way communication with an evaluator. The emphasis is on the quality of work, not the quantity of materials presented.

Portfolios

The professional portfolio is an organized collection of work that demonstrates the educator’s skills, talents, and accomplishments for the evaluation cycle. It contains a broader, more comprehensive collection of material than does a document log, and the selection of material to be included is often at the discretion of the teacher. The portfolio provides an opportunity to demonstrate professional competence with regard to meeting division teaching standards and is therefore an important part of the evaluation process. Written analysis and reflection about artifacts should be included in the portfolio to provide insight into the rationale for the events and process documented in each entry. If student work samples are used in the portfolio, all personally identifiable information should be removed. The portfolio is an official document that is maintained by the teacher and reviewed periodically by the evaluator. It is the property of the teacher and follows the teacher when work assignments change.

Portfolios are an important element of an evaluation system because they allow evaluators to get a more accurate portrait of a teacher’s performance, while assisting teachers in monitoring and improving their own performances, which in turn, can result in better instructional delivery and learning opportunities for students. They also help in making the instructional relationship between a teacher’s lesson plans, student work, and assessments clear. Tucker, Stronge, and Gareis (2002) discussed the beneficial nature of portfolios pointing out:

Teacher portfolios are appealing for many reasons, including their authentic nature, recognition of the complex nature of teaching, encouragement of self-reflection, and facilitation of collaborative interaction with colleagues and supervisors. In addition, the inherent flexibility and adaptability of portfolios makes them an attractive vehicle for a range of purposes, particularly professional growth and evaluation. Portfolios embody professionalism because they encourage the reflection and self-monitoring that are hallmarks of the true professional.

The amount of material that can be collected for a portfolio is limited to the size of a binder -- generally a 1.5 inch three-ring binder -- thus, the employee must be selective. The portfolio should include only material that is applicable for the individual teacher’s evaluation cycle. The division should provide the guidelines for the portfolio as well as the physical notebook, cover, and dividers to create it.
There are several key features of a quality teaching portfolio:

- It is grounded in the professional teaching standards.
- Artifacts of teacher and student work are selected purposefully to document teacher responsibilities accurately.
- It includes reflection on what the artifacts mean and how the teacher learned from them.4

**Performance Artifacts**

Performance artifacts are “the products and by-products of teaching that demonstrate a teacher’s performance. They are the raw materials on which teachers reflect and from which they learn.”5 Artifacts are not created solely for a portfolio or document log, but are readily reviewed in portfolio/document log form. They should provide evidence of one or more of the teacher performance standards. Each artifact may include a caption since the artifact will be viewed in a context other than that for which it was developed. Figure 3.3 offers suggestions for creating captions.

**Figure 3.3: Artifact Captions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive title of the artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standard documented by the artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who created the artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of the context in which the artifact was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional commentary by the teacher (if desired)6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tips on Creating a Portfolio**

The professional portfolio:

- is a work in progress and should be continually maintained throughout the evaluation period;
- should be user-friendly (neat, organized);
- includes a brief description or explanation for each entry;
- contains appropriate documentation based on contract status (i.e., probationary teachers, teachers with continuing contract);
- contains the items the teacher wishes to present to your evaluator, but will not be graded. The teacher will have full responsibility for contents, pacing, and development;
is limited to items that will fit within the binder. Larger items can be photographed or photocopied for inclusion. Artifacts that do not fit in the binder (e.g., video or audio tapes) may be submitted, if agreed to by the evaluator in advance; and

should contain summary information and analysis whenever possible.

**Implementing Portfolios**

Initially, teachers may be hesitant to begin keeping a portfolio. Tucker, Stronge, and Gareis (2002) point out that implementing the use of portfolios is a cyclical, not a linear, process. They offer several considerations to ensure effective implementation (see Figure 3.4).

**Figure 3.4: Suggestions for Implementing Portfolios**

- **Enlist volunteers**: To make a change requires change agents. Find an initial cadre of teachers who are open to creating portfolios and are willing to become advocates for the initiative.

- **Start small**: Creating portfolios requires a time investment and thus buy-in from the teachers. By starting with a small group of teachers and gradually increasing the numbers, a school may be better able to cultivate acceptance of the portfolio initiative.

- **Offer incentives and provide support**: Provide the necessary moral and material support to encourage teachers to willingly participate in initiating portfolios. Freeing up time to allow teachers to create portfolios is key.

- **Study examples of best practice**: Determine what has not worked in your own evaluation system and what aspects of a teacher portfolio are important to addressing these shortfalls. Find out what has been successful in regard to implementing portfolios in other schools.

- **Allow time for change**: Acceptance by stakeholders, internal and external factors, and a variety of other issues make implementation of teacher portfolios a lengthy process. School divisions which have successfully implemented teacher portfolios report that the process can take over two years.

- **Provide training**: Both teachers and their evaluators need to be familiar with the portfolio system. Consider creating a portfolio handbook to explain the process, expectations, timelines, and format.

- **Conduct field tests and refine the portfolio process**: Prior to implementing any high-stakes consequences, make sure the portfolio is manageable for the teachers tasked to create it. Is the format realistic? Are all relevant performance responsibilities addressed? Is the timeline feasible? Feedback from the initial implementers should be addressed to make the portfolio system more usable, feasible, accurate, and fair.
Communicate and collaborate: Implementing a portfolio system is a multi-year process that involves an increasing number of stakeholders. As such, two-way communication is crucial to address expectations and concerns, and thus receive buy-in for the initiative. Collaboration among the stakeholders is an important way to gain the feedback which is necessary to refine the portfolio system.

Evaluate the use of portfolios after implementation: Evaluation of the portfolio system should be ongoing. Surveys and focus groups provide useful avenues to determine what is working with the portfolio system and what needs to be adjusted.

Document Logs

Document logs are similar in many ways to portfolios, yet are typically more concise. They tend to contain a more confined collection of specific artifacts, sometimes containing just those documents required by the school division. For probationary teachers and for teachers on Performance Improvement Plans (see Part 6), the document log contains items relevant to a single evaluation year. A new document log is begun for each evaluation cycle. Teachers with continuing contracts on a three-year evaluation cycle maintain the document log for three years and empty it upon completing the three-year cycle. Therefore, these teachers will have multiple versions of the required items. Teachers should make sure each item is labeled such that it is clear which school year it represents (for example: 2010-2011 Parent Contact Log).

Sample Documentation

Suggested documentation for each of the seven performance standards is listed below.

1. **Professional Knowledge**: The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

   - Summary of a plan for integrating instruction
   - Class profile
   - Annotated list of instructional activities for a unit
   - Annotated photographs of teacher-made displays used in instruction
   - Annotated samples or photographs of instructional materials created by the teacher
   - Lesson/intervention plan (including goals and objectives, activities, resources, and assessment measures)
   - Summary of consultation with appropriate staff members regarding special needs of individual students
2. **Instructional Planning:** The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

- Course Syllabus
- Lesson Plan
- Intervention Plan
- Substitute Lesson Plan

3. **Instructional Delivery:** The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

- Samples of handouts/presentation visuals
- Technology samples on disk

4. **Assessment of and for Student Learning:** The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

- Brief report describing your record-keeping system and how it is used to monitor student academic progress
- Copy of teacher-made tests and other assessment measures
- Copy of scoring rubric used for a student project
- Summary explaining grading procedures
- Photocopies or photographs of student work with written comments
- Samples of educational reports, progress reports, or letters prepared for parents or students

5. **Learning Environment:** The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

- Student Survey Summary (for teachers of students in grades 1-12)
- List of classroom rules with a brief explanation of the procedures used to develop and reinforce them
- Diagram of the classroom with identifying comments
- Diagram of alternative classroom arrangements used for special purposes with explanatory comments
- Schedule of daily classroom routines
- Explanation of behavior management philosophy and procedures
6. **Professionalism:** The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Résumé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of presentations given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates or other documentation from professional development activities completed (e.g., workshops, conferences, official transcripts from courses, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you letter for serving as a mentor, cooperating teacher, school leader, volunteer, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of communication with students, parents/guardians, and peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Student Academic Progress:** The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

| Student Achievement Goal Setting Form     |
| Chart of student academic progress throughout the year |
| Analysis of grades for the marking period |
| Log of collegial collaboration            |
| Documentation of meeting established annual goals |
| Test critique                            |
| Table of key knowledge and skills which indicates level of student mastery |
| Student growth percentile data if available |
| Data on student achievement from other valid, reliable sources |

**Sample Portfolio Templates**

A sample of the table of contents for a portfolio is provided on the next page. The teacher should complete a table of contents for each performance standard including the activity names and any comments and place the artifacts immediately behind it.

- **Standard 1:** Professional Knowledge
- **Standard 2:** Instructional Planning
- **Standard 3:** Instructional Delivery
- **Standard 4:** Assessment of and for Student Learning
- **Standard 5:** Learning Environment
- **Standard 6:** Professionalism
- **Standard 7:** Student Academic Progress
# SAMPLE: Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard _____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation is a process by which teachers judge the effectiveness and adequacy of their performance, effects, knowledge, and beliefs for the purpose of self-improvement. When teachers think about what worked, what did not work, and what type of changes they might make to be more successful, the likelihood of knowing how to improve and actually making the improvements increases dramatically. Evidence suggests that self-evaluation is a critical component of the evaluation process and is strongly encouraged. A sample Teacher Self-Evaluation Form is provided on the following pages.

Teachers are faced with a dynamic context in which to apply their knowledge, skills, and abilities. What worked last year may not work this year for a variety of reasons, some of which are outside the teachers’ control. When teachers take the time to think about how they might improve their delivery, instructional strategies, content, and so forth, they discover ways to make their practice more effective, which, in turn, may impact student learning. Aiarasian and Gullickson (1985) offered several strategies to enhance teachers’ self-evaluation (see Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.5: Strategies to Enhance Self-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to Enhance Self-Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-reflection tools</strong>: These involved check lists, questionnaires, and rating scales which are completed by the teacher to evaluate performance in terms of beliefs, practice, and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media recording and analysis</strong>: Audio and video recordings provide a useful method for the teachers and their peers to review and analyze a teacher’s performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student feedback</strong>: Surveys, journals, and questionnaires can provide a teacher with the students’ perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher portfolio</strong>: Teachers have an opportunity for self-evaluation as they collect and analyze the various artifacts for their portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student performance data</strong>: Teachers can assess their instructional effectiveness by using test results, projects, essays, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External peer observation</strong>: Colleagues, peers, and administrators can provide useful feedback on particular aspects of another teacher’s behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journaling</strong>: Teachers can identify and reflect on classroom activities, needs, and successes by keeping track of classroom activities or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegial dialogue/experience sharing/joint problem solving</strong>: By collaborating on strategies, procedures, and perceptions, teachers are exposed to the practices of colleagues, which can serve as a catalyst for them to examine their own practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE Teacher Self-Evaluation Form

Directions: Teachers should use this form annually to reflect on the effectiveness and adequacy of their practice based on each performance standard. Please refer to the performance indicators for examples of behaviors exemplifying each standard.

Teacher’s Name ___________________________         Date ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Professional Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of strength:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Instructional Planning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of strength:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Instructional Delivery</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of strength:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Assessment of and for Student Learning

The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Areas of strength:**

**Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:**

### 5. Learning Environment

The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

**Areas of strength:**

**Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:**

### 6. Professionalism

The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

**Areas of strength:**

**Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:**

### 7. Student Academic Progress

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

**Areas of strength:**

**Areas needing work/strategies for improving performance:**
Endnotes

Part 4: Connecting Teacher Performance to Student Academic Progress

Despite the preponderance of evidence that the most important school-related factor in students’ education is the quality of their teachers, teacher evaluation frequently ignores the results of teaching – student learning. Schalock, Schalock, Cowart, and Myton (1993) stated that if the purpose of teaching is to nurture learning, then both teachers and schools as a whole should be judged for their effectiveness on the basis of what and how much students learn. Using student academic progress (as a measure of student achievement) to inform teacher evaluation only makes sense because the most direct measure of teacher quality appears to be student achievement. Research strongly supports the argument that ineffective teachers negatively impact students’ learning while effective teachers lead to higher student achievement growth.

In addition, linking student academic progress with teacher evaluation offers significant potential because progress:

- provides an objective measure of teacher effectiveness and recognizes that students bring different levels of achievement to each classroom;
- can serve as meaningful feedback for instructional improvement;
- can serve as a barometer of success and a motivation tool; and
- is derived from student assessment and is an integral facet of instruction.

Why Connect Teacher Performance to Student Academic Progress?

There are many reasons for including student academic progress in achievement information as part of the teacher evaluation process.

- There is an abundant research base substantiating the claim that teacher quality is the most important school-related factor influencing student achievement.
- Using measures of student learning in the evaluation process provides the “ultimate accountability” for educating students.
- Another requirement for the fair determination of learning gains is a defensible methodology for analyzing measures of student learning (for example, well-tested applications such as residual learning gains derived from regression analyses or percentile growth scores). Note: while various applications that currently are available have been carefully and thoughtfully developed and tested with the best psychometric elements considered, there are no applications that are perfect.
• The variance in student achievement gains explained by teacher effects is greater in low socio-economic status schools than in high socio-economic status schools.\(^7\)

Furthermore, there are several other compelling findings related to the impact a teacher’s effectiveness has on students:

• A teacher in the 90\(^{th}\) percentile of effectiveness can achieve in half a year what a teacher at the 10\(^{th}\) percentile can do in a full year.\(^8\)

• Teachers who were highly effective in producing higher-than-expected student achievement gains (top quartile) in one end-of-course content test (reading, mathematics, science, and social studies) tended to produce top quartile residual gain scores in all four content areas. Teachers who were ineffective (bottom quartile) in one content area tended to be ineffective in all four content areas.\(^9\)

• The variance of teacher effects in mathematics is much larger than that in reading, possibly because mathematics is learned mostly in school and, therefore, may be more directly influenced by teachers. This finding also might be a result of greater variation in how well teachers teach mathematics.\(^10\)

Several of the studies shown in Figure 4.1 have examined this variability.

**Figure 4.1: Student Achievement Accounted for by Teacher Effects\(^{11}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Approximate Variability in Student Achievement Explained by Teacher Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber (2002)</td>
<td>8.5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heistad (1999)</td>
<td>9.2 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye, Konstantopoulos, &amp; Hedges (2004)</td>
<td>7-21 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivkin, Hanushek, &amp; Kain (2005)</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munoz &amp; Chang (2007)</td>
<td>14 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at it another way, Figure 4.2 shows just how large an impact on student achievement effective teachers can have over ineffective teachers.

Figure 4.2: *Comparative Impact of Effective Versus Ineffective Primary Grade Teachers*\(^{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Effectiveness Level</th>
<th>Comparative Impact on Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: 25(^{th}) vs. 75(^{th}) percentile teacher</td>
<td>+0.35 Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math: 25(^{th}) vs. 75(^{th}) percentile teacher</td>
<td>+0.48 Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: 50(^{th}) vs. 90(^{th}) percentile teacher</td>
<td>+0.33 Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math: 50(^{th}) vs. 90(^{th}) percentile teacher</td>
<td>+0.46 Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* To illustrate the conversion of a standard deviation into percentiles, if a student started at the 50\(^{th}\) percentile on a pre-test and her performance increased by 0.50 standard deviation on the post-test, the student would have a score at approximately the 67\(^{th}\) percentile -- a gain of 17 percentile points.

**Implementation Concerns**

When deciding to include student academic progress in teacher evaluation, schools need to be aware of several implementation concerns:

- The use of student learning measures in teacher evaluation is novel for both teachers and principals. Thus, there may be initial resistance to this change in evaluation practices.

- The impact on student learning must be assessed in multiple ways over time, not by using just one test, to reliably and accurately measure teacher influence.

- Testing programs in many states and school districts do not fully reflect the taught curriculum, and it is important to choose multiple measures that reflect the intended curriculum.

- While the Virginia Department of Education is developing the capability to calculate student growth percentiles, there are multiple ways of measuring student academic progress. It may be appropriate to use student achievement in the context of goal setting as an additional measure. It is unclear what the fairest and most accurate methodology is for determining gains.\(^{13}\)

**Virginia Law**

Virginia law requires principals, assistant principals, and teachers to be evaluated using measures of student academic progress. Article 2, §22-1.293 of the *Code of Virginia: Teachers, Officers and Employees*, states, in part, the following:

> A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel.
assigned to his supervision. Beginning September 1, 2000, (i) principals must have received training, provided pursuant to §22.1-253.13:5, in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance, which evaluation and documentation shall include, but shall not be limited to, employee skills and knowledge and [emphasis added] student academic progress, prior to submitting such recommendations; and (ii) assistant principals and other administrative personnel participating in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance must also have received such training in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance.14

Article 2, §22.1-295 states, in part, the following:

School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, [emphasis added] student academic progress and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.15

Methods for Connecting Student Performance to Teacher Evaluation

The Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria incorporate student academic progress as a significant component of the evaluation while encouraging local flexibility in implementation. These guidelines recommend that student academic progress account for 40 percent of an individual’s summative evaluation. There are three key points to consider in this model:

1. Student learning, as determined by multiple measures of student academic progress, accounts for a total of 40 percent of the evaluation.

2. At least 20 percent of the teacher evaluation (half of the student academic progress measure) is comprised of student growth percentiles as provided from the Virginia Department of Education when the data are available and can be used appropriately.16

3. Another 20 percent of the teacher evaluation (half of the student academic progress measure) should be measured using one or more alternative measures with evidence that the alternative measure is valid. Note: Whenever possible, it is recommended that the second progress measure be grounded in validated, quantitative, objective measures, using tools already available in the school.

It is important to understand that less than 30 percent of teachers in Virginia’s public schools will have a direct measure of student academic progress available based on Standards of Learning assessment results. When the state-provided growth measure is available, it is important that the data be reviewed for accuracy and appropriateness before including in a teacher’s performance evaluation. Guidance for applying student growth percentiles to teacher performance evaluation are provided in Figure 4.3. It is important to recognize that, there must be additional measures
for all teachers to ensure that there are student academic progress measures available for teachers who will not be provided with data from the state, and to ensure that more than one measure of student academic progress can be included in all teacher’s evaluations. Quantitative measures of student academic progress based on validated achievement measures that already are being used locally should be the first data considered when determining local progress measures; other measures are recommended for use when two valid and direct measures of student academic progress are not available.

In choosing measures of student academic progress, schools and school divisions should consider individual teacher and schoolwide goals, and align performance measures to the goals. In considering the association between schoolwide goals and teacher performance, it may be appropriate to apply the state growth measure -- student growth percentiles (SGP) -- as one measure of progress for teachers who provide support for mathematics or reading instruction. For example, a school-level median growth percentile could be applied to all teachers in a grade-level, department, or whole school as one of multiple measures for documenting student academic progress. This would be appropriate only if all teachers were expected to contribute directly to student progress in mathematics or reading. Ultimately, the choice of how to apply student growth percentiles to teachers who are supporting mathematics and reading achievement would be a local one; it is critical that decisions to apply SGP data to support teachers as part of their evaluation must be made in a manner that is consistent with individual, school or school division goals.

In considering schoolwide goals, school leaders could decide that all teachers would be evaluated, in part, based on state-provided student growth percentiles. An example of an appropriate application of the student growth percentile is presented in the box below.

If a school was focused on schoolwide improvement in mathematics, the leadership might identify strategies that enable all instructional personnel -- including resource teachers -- to incorporate into their classroom instruction that supports schoolwide growth in mathematics. In this situation, the school also may choose to incorporate the school-level median growth percentile in mathematics as an indicator of progress for teachers who are responsible for supporting mathematics instruction, as well as other progress indicators such as those developed through student goals based on content specific goals (e.g., student achievement goals developed for learning in music class). Teachers who have primary responsibility for providing mathematics instruction (primary classroom teachers) incorporate the median student growth percentiles from students in their classes and another measure of student academic progress as indicators of progress documented to meet Standard 7.

Other measures of student academic progress are critical for determining teacher impact on performance. To the extent possible, teachers and administrators should choose measures of student academic progress that are based on validated quantitative measures, and provide data that reflect progress in student learning. Validated assessment tools that provide quantitative measures of learning and achievement should be the first choice in measuring student academic progress. Often, a combination of absolute achievement, as measured by nationally validated assessments and goal setting (described later in this document) is appropriate.
There also are teachers for whom validated achievement measures are not readily available. In these situations, student goal setting provides an approach that quantifies student academic progress in meaningful ways and is an appropriate option for measuring student academic progress.

Figure 4.3: Guidance for Incorporating Multiple Measures of Student Academic Progress into Teacher Performance Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Application of Student Growth Percentiles</th>
<th>Other Student Academic Progress Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of reading and mathematics for whom student growth percentiles are available</td>
<td>20 percent of the total evaluation based on median growth percentile when:  - data from at least 40 students are available, possibly from multiple years;  - data from students are representative of students taught(^\text{17}); and  - data from at least two years are available; three years should be reviewed whenever possible.</td>
<td>20 percent of the total evaluation based on other measures of student academic progress:  - quantitative measures already available in the school that are validated and provide measures of growth (as opposed to absolute achievement) should be given priority.  - student goal setting should incorporate data from valid achievement measures whenever possible (e.g., teachers of Advanced Placement courses could establish a goal of 85 percent of students earning a score of 3 or better on the Advanced Placement exam).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who support instruction in reading and mathematics for whom student growth percentiles are available</td>
<td>When aligned to individual or schoolwide goals, no more than 20 percent of the total evaluation could be based on median growth percentiles at the appropriate level of aggregation, (a specific group of students, grade-level, or school-level) when data from at least 40 students are available; data are representative of students taught; are available for at least two years; and include:  - Decisions about the application of student growth percentiles for support teachers must be</td>
<td>20 or 40 percent of the total evaluation based on measures of student academic progress other than the SGP, depending on the application of student growth percentiles:  - quantitative measures already available in the school that are validated and provide valid measures of student academic growth (as opposed to absolute achievement) should be given priority in evaluation.  - student goal setting or other measures should incorporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Application of Student Growth Percentiles</td>
<td>Other Student Academic Progress Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| made locally.  
- Depending on schoolwide goals, it is possible that all instructional personnel in a school are considered support teachers. | data from validated achievement measures whenever possible (e.g., teachers of Advanced Placement courses could establish a goal of 85 percent of students earning a score of 3 or better on the Advanced Placement exam).  
- To the extent practicable, teachers should have at least two valid measures of student academic progress included in the evaluation. | |
| Teachers who have no direct or indirect role in teaching reading or mathematics in grades where SGPs are available | Not applicable | 40 percent of the total evaluation based on measures of student academic progress other than the SGP:  
- quantitative measures already available in the school that are validated and provide valid measures of growth (as opposed to absolute achievement) should be given priority in evaluation.  
- student goal setting or other measures should incorporate data from validated achievement measures whenever possible (e.g., teachers of Advanced Placement courses could establish a goal of 85 percent of students earning a score of 3 or better on the Advanced Placement exam).  
- To the extent practicable, teachers should have at least two valid measures of student academic progress included in the evaluation. |
Goal Setting for Student Achievement

One approach to linking student achievement to teacher performance involves building the capacity for teachers and their supervisors to interpret and use student achievement data to set target goals for student improvement. Setting goals -- not just any goals, but goals set squarely on student performance -- is a powerful way to enhance professional performance and, in turn, positively impact student achievement. *Student Achievement Goal Setting* is designed to improve student learning.

For many teachers, measures of student performance can be directly documented. A value-added -- or gain score -- approach can be used that documents their influence on student learning. Simply put, a value-added assessment system can be summarized using the equation in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4: Student Achievement Goal Setting Equation**

\[
\text{Student Learning End Result} - \text{Student Learning Beginning Score} \\
\text{Student Gain Score}
\]

Why Student Achievement Goal Setting?

Teachers have a definite and powerful impact on student learning and academic performance.\(^{18}\) The purposes of goal setting include focusing attention on students and on instructional improvement based on a process of determining baseline performance, developing strategies for improvement, and assessing results at the end of the academic year. More specifically, the intent of student achievement goal setting is to:

- make explicit the connection between teaching and learning;
- make instructional decisions based upon student data;
- provide a tool for school improvement;
- increase the effectiveness of instruction via continuous professional growth;
- focus attention on student results; and ultimately
- increase student achievement.\(^ {19}\)

Goal Setting Process

Student achievement goal setting involves several steps, beginning with knowing where students are in relation to what is expected of them. Then, teachers can set specific, measurable goals
based on both the demands of the curriculum and the needs of the students. The next part of the process is recursive in that the teacher creates and implements strategies and monitors progress. As progress is monitored, the teacher makes adjustments to the teaching and learning strategies. Finally, a summative judgment is made regarding student learning for a specific period of time. Figure 4.5 depicts theses steps.

Figure 4.5: Student Achievement Goal Setting Process

Each teacher, using the results of an initial assessment, sets an annual goal for improving student achievement. The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss data from the initial assessment and review the annual goal. A new goal is identified each year. The goal should be customized for the teaching assignment and for the individual learners. The Goal Setting for Student Academic Progress Form (shown on pages 50-51) may be used for developing and assessing the annual goal. Student academic progress goals measure where the students are at the beginning of the year, where they are at mid-year, where they are at the end of the year, and what is the difference.

Appropriate measures of student learning gains differ substantially based on the learners’ grade level, content area, and ability level. The following measurement tools are appropriate for assessing student academic progress:

- criterion-referenced tests;
- norm-referenced tests;
- standardized achievement tests;
- school adopted interim/common/benchmark assessments; and
- authentic measures (e.g., learner portfolio, recitation, performance).

In addition to teacher-generated measures of student performance gains, administrators may conduct schoolwide reviews of test data to identify patterns in the instructional program. Such reports are useful for documenting student gains and for making comparisons.
Developing Goals

Goals are developed early in the school year. The goals describe observable behavior and/or measurable results that would occur when a goal is achieved. The acronym SMART (Figure 4.6) is a useful way to self-assess a goal’s feasibility and worth.

Figure 4.6: Acronym for Developing Goals

| Specific:   | The goal is focused, for example, by content area, by learners’ needs. |
| Measurable: | An appropriate instrument/measure is selected to assess the goal.       |
| Appropriate:| The goal is within the teacher’s control to effect change.             |
| Realistic:  | The goal is feasible for the teacher.                                  |
| Time limited: | The goal is contained within a single school year.                    |

Submission of the Goal Setting for Student Academic Progress Form

Teachers complete a draft of their goals and schedule a meeting with their evaluators to look at the available data from performance measures and discuss the proposed goal. Each year teachers are responsible for submitting their goals to their evaluator within the first month of the school year.

Mid-Year Review of Goal

A mid-year review of progress on the goal is held for all teachers. At the principal’s discretion, this review may be conducted through peer teams, coaching with the evaluator, sharing at a staff meeting or professional day, or in another format that promotes discussion, collegiality, and reflection. The mid-year review should be held prior to March 1. It is the principal’s responsibility to establish the format and select the time of the review.

End-of-Year Review of Goal

By the appropriate date, as determined by the principal, each teacher is responsible for assessing the professional growth made on the goal and for submitting documentation to the principal. A teacher may find it beneficial to draft the next year’s goal as part of the reflection process in the event the goal has to be continued and/or revised. By mutual agreement, administrators and individual teachers may extend the due date for the end-of-year reviews in order to include the current year’s testing data or exam scores.

Goal Setting Form Explanation

The following describes the sections of the Goal Setting for Student Academic Progress Form found on pages 56-57.

1. **Setting:** Describe the population and special circumstances of the goal setting.
II. **Identify the content area:** The area/topic addressed based on learner achievement, learner or program progress, or observational data.

III. **Provide baseline data:** Determine the learners’ baseline data (where they are now) using the following process:

- collect and review data;
- analyze the data;
- interpret the data; and
- determine needs.

IV. **Write goal statement:** What do you want learners to accomplish?

- Select an emphasis for your goal, focusing on the classroom/teacher level.
- Develop an annual goal.

V. **Means for attaining the goal:** Activities used to accomplish the goals including how progress is measured and target dates. Examples of strategies to improve student learning are shown in Figure 4.7.

VI. **Mid-year review:** Accomplishments after the second quarter student interim progress reports are issued, but prior to the end of the semester. If needed, make adjustments to the professional development strategies, etc.

VII. **End-of-year data results:** Accomplishments at the end of the year.

Figure 4.7: *Strategies to Improve Student Learning*  

Learning Strategies include:

- Modified teaching/work arrangement;
- Cooperative planning with master teachers, team members, department members;
- Demonstration lessons/service delivery by colleagues, curriculum specialists, teacher mentors;
- Visits to other classrooms;
- Shared instructional materials;
- Use of instructional strategies (e.g., differentiation, interactive planning);
- Focused classroom observation;
- Development of curricular supplements;
- Completion of workshops, conferences, coursework; and
- Co-leading; collaborative teaching.
SAMPLE Goal Setting for Student Academic Progress Form

Directions: This form is a tool to assist teachers in setting a goal that results in measurable learner progress. NOTE: When applicable, learner achievement/progress should be the focus of the goal. Enter information electronically into the cells.

Teacher’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Subject/Grade ________________________________ School Year ____ - ____

Evaluator’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Initial Goal Submission (due by _____________ to the evaluator)

| I. Setting (Describe the population and special learning circumstances.) |
| II. Content/Subject/Field Area (The area/topic addressed based on learner achievement, data analysis, or observational data) |
| III. Baseline Data (What does the current data show?) |
| □ Data attached |
| IV. Goal Statement (Describe what you want learners/program to accomplish.) |
| V. Means for Attaining Goal (Strategies used to accomplish the goal) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature __________________________ Date ________________

Evaluator’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature __________________________ Date ________________
VI. Mid-Year Review *(Describe goal progress and other relevant data.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-year review conducted on ____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initials: _____ (teacher) _____ (evaluator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Data attached

Teacher’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature _______________________________________ Date _______________

Evaluator’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature ______________________________________ Date _______________

VII. End-of-Year Review

☐ Appropriate Data Received

*Strategies used and data provided demonstrate appropriate Student Growth*  ☐ Yes ☐ No

Teacher’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature _______________________________________ Date _______________

Evaluator’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature ______________________________________ Date _______________
Endnotes

8 Leigh, A. (n.d.), p. 11.
16 At the time that this document was completed, VDOE was developing the capability to calculate student growth percentiles. Information about student growth percentiles will be provided, when available.
17 Teachers and administrators need to determine the applicability of student growth percentiles to the evaluation of teachers who teach disproportionately large numbers of students for whom no student growth percentile is available. Students without a growth percentile will include those who: participated in alternative assessments, transferred into their classroom from out of state or late in the school year, or have earned sufficiently high scores on the SOL test that the student growth percentile was not provided. In situations in which a significant proportion of students taught do not have a growth percentile, the median growth percentile would not be appropriate to apply to evaluations, or would need to be considered and applied to Standard 7 in the context of growth data from other measures, not necessarily as half of the data contributing to Standard 7.
21 The form for Goal Setting for Student Progress incorporates the individual professional development plan as teachers determine an annual goal and identify resources and strategies to address the goal.
22 For additional information regarding how to design student achievement goals and for samples of goals already developed, please refer to: Stronge, J. H. & Grant, L. W. (2009). Student achievement goal setting: Using data to improve teaching and learning. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education. (eyeoneducation.com)
Part 5: Rating Teacher Performance

For an evaluation system to be meaningful, it must provide its users with relevant and timely feedback. To facilitate this, evaluators should conduct both interim and summative evaluations of teachers. While the site administrator has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the evaluation system is executed faithfully and effectively in the school, other administrators, such as assistant principals, may be designated by the evaluator to supervise, monitor, and assist with the multiple data source collection which will be used for these evaluations.

Interim Evaluation

Some teacher evaluation systems include an interim review, especially for probationary teachers, in order to provide systematic feedback prior to the completion of a summative evaluation. The multiple data sources discussed in Part 3 are used to compile a Teacher Interim Performance Report that indicates if a teacher has shown evidence of each of the performance standards. The evaluator should share her/his assessment of the teacher’s performance by a given date (for example, the last school day before winter break each year for Probationary teachers). Please note that the Teacher Interim Performance Report is used to document evidence of meeting the seven standards, but does not include a rating of performance. A sample Teacher Interim Performance Report is provided on pages 54-57.
SAMPLE Teacher Interim Performance Report

**Teacher** ____________________________________  **School Year(s)** __________

**Grade/Subject** ___________________________  **School** __________________________

Directions: Evaluators use this form in the fall to maintain a record of evidence documented for each teacher performance standard. Evidence can be drawn from formal observations, informal observations, portfolio review, and other appropriate sources. This form should be maintained by the evaluator during the course of the evaluation cycle. This report is shared at a meeting with the teacher held within appropriate timelines.

**Strengths:**

**Areas of Improvement:**

Teacher’s Name _________________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature ___________________________  Date ______________

Evaluator’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature ___________________________  Date ______________
1. Professional Knowledge  
*The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

- Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.
- Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.
- Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.
- Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.
- Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.
- Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

*Comments:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Instructional Planning  
*The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

- Uses student learning data to guide planning.
- Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.
- Plans for differentiated instruction.
- Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.
- Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans and adapts plans when needed.

*Comments:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Instructional Delivery  
*The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

- Engages and maintains students in active learning.
- Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
- Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.
- Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
- Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout lessons.
- Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
- Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

*Comments:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. **Assessment of and for Student Learning**

*The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

- Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.
- Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.
- Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.
- Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.
- Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **Learning Environment**

*The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

- Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.
- Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.
- Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.
- Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.
- Promotes cultural sensitivity.
- Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.
- Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.
- Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. Professionalism

The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

- Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
- Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies, and ethical guidelines.
- Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
- Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
- Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.

Comments:

7. Student Academic Progress

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

- Sets acceptable, measurable, and appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data.
- Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.
- Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other multiple measures of student academic progress.
- Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student academic progress and develop interim learning targets.

Comments:
Summative Evaluation

Assessment of performance quality occurs only at the summative evaluation stage, which comes at the end of the evaluation cycle (i.e., one-year for probationary teachers, three years for Continuing Contract teachers). The ratings for each performance standard are based on multiple sources of information and are completed only after pertinent data from all sources are reviewed. The integration of data provides the evidence used to determine the performance ratings for the summative evaluations for all teachers.

There are two major considerations in assessing job performance during summative evaluation: 1) the actual teacher performance standards, and 2) how well they are performed. The performance standards and performance indicators provide a description of well-defined teacher expectations.

Definitions of Ratings

The rating scale provides a description of four levels of how well the standards (i.e., duties) are performed on a continuum from “exemplary” to “unacceptable.” The use of the scale enables evaluators to acknowledge effective performance (i.e., “exemplary” and “proficient”) and provides two levels of feedback for teachers not meeting expectations (i.e., “needs improvement” and “unacceptable”). The definitions in Figure 5.1 offer general descriptions of the ratings. PLEASE NOTE: Ratings are applied to the seven teacher performance standards, not to performance indicators.

Figure 5.1: Definitions of Terms Used in Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Exemplary| The teacher performing at this level maintains performance, accomplishments, and behaviors that consistently and considerably surpass the established standard. This rating is reserved for performance that is truly exemplary and done in a manner that exemplifies the school’s mission and goals. | Exceptional performance:  
• consistently exhibits behaviors that have a strong positive impact on learners and the school climate  
• serves as a role model to others  
• sustains high performance over a period of time |
| Proficient| The teacher meets the standard in a manner that is consistent with the school’s mission and goals. | Effective performance:  
• meets the requirements contained in the job description as expressed in the evaluation criteria  
• demonstrates willingness to learn and apply new skills  
• exhibits behaviors that have a positive impact on learners and the school climate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>The teacher often performs below the established standard or in a manner that is inconsistent with the school’s mission and goals.</td>
<td>Ineffective performance: • requires support in meeting the standards • results in less than quality work performance • leads to areas for teacher improvement being jointly identified and planned between the teacher and evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>The teacher consistently performs below the established standard or in a manner that is inconsistent with the school’s mission and goals.</td>
<td>Poor-quality performance: • does not meet the requirements contained in the job description as expressed in the evaluation criteria • may result in the employee not being recommended for continued employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How a Performance Rubric Works**

Evaluators have two tools to guide their judgments for rating teacher performance for the summative evaluation: 1) the sample performance indicators, and 2) the performance rubric.

**Sample Performance Indicators**

Performance indicators are used in the evaluation system to identify, in observable behaviors, performance of the major job standards. They were introduced in Part 2, and examples are provided again in this section.

**Performance Rubric**

The performance rubric is a behavioral summary scale that describes acceptable performance levels for each of the seven teacher performance standards. It states the measure of performance expected of teachers and provides a general description of what a rating entails. The rating scale is applied for the summative evaluation of all teachers. The performance rubrics guide evaluators in assessing how well a standard is performed. They are provided to increase reliability among evaluators and to help teachers to focus on ways to enhance their teaching practices. *Please note: The rating of “proficient” is the expected level of performance. Additionally, the recommended performance rubrics presented here may be modified at the discretion of school division decision makers.*
**Figure 5.2: Example of a Performance Rubric**

**Instructional Delivery (Performance Standard 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher optimizes students’ opportunities to learn by engaging them in higher order thinking and/or enhanced performance skills.</td>
<td>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses instructional strategies that meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher’s instruction inadequately addresses students’ learning needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.

**Performance Rubrics for Performance Standards**

Teachers are evaluated on the performance standards using the following performance appraisal rubrics:

**Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge**

*The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

**Sample Performance Indicators**

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

1.1 Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.

1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.

1.3 Demonstrates an ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.

1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject matter.

1.5 Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.

1.6 Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.

1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.

1.8 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.
In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher consistently demonstrates extensive knowledge of the subject matter and continually enriches the curriculum.

The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

The teacher inconsistently demonstrates understanding of the curriculum, content, and student development or lacks fluidity in using the knowledge in practice.

The teacher bases instruction on material that is inaccurate or out-of-date and/or inadequately addresses the developmental needs of students.

Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.

### Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning

*The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

#### Sample Performance Indicators

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.
2.5 Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans, and adapts plans when needed.

In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher actively seeks and uses alternative data and resources and consistently differentiates plans to meet the needs of all students.

The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

The teacher inconsistently uses the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data in planning to meet the needs of all students.

The teacher does not plan, or plans without adequately using the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data.

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.*
**Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery**
*The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Sample Performance Indicators**
*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.
3.2 Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
3.4 Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout the lesson.
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
3.6 Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
3.7 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher optimizes students’ opportunity to learn by engaging them in higher order thinking and/or enhanced performance skills.</td>
<td>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses instructional strategies that meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher’s instruction inadequately addresses students’ learning needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.*
Sample Performance Indicators

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

4.1 Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.

4.2 Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.

4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.

4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.

4.5 Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes, and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.

4.6 Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.

4.7 Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher uses a variety of informal and formal assessments based on intended learning outcomes to assess student learning and teaches students how to monitor their own academic progress.</td>
<td>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.</td>
<td>The teacher uses a limited selection of assessment strategies, inconsistently links assessment to intended learning outcomes, and/or does not use assessment to plan/modify instruction.</td>
<td>The teacher uses an inadequate variety of assessment sources, assesses infrequently, does not use baseline or feedback data to make instructional decisions and/or does not report on student academic progress in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.*
Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment

The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

5.1 Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.
5.2 Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.
5.3 Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.
5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.
5.5 Promotes cultural sensitivity.
5.6 Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.
5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.
5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher creates a dynamic learning environment that maximizes learning opportunities and minimizes disruptions within an environment in which students self-monitor behavior.</td>
<td>The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</td>
<td>The teacher is inconsistent in using resources, routines, and procedures and in providing a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately addresses student behavior, displays a harmful attitude with students, and/or ignores safety standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.
6.3 Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
6.5 Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
6.6 Works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, other school personnel, and the community.
6.7 Builds positive and professional relationships with parents/guardians through frequent and effective communication concerning students’ progress.
6.8 Serves as a contributing member of the school’s professional learning community through collaboration with teaching colleagues.
6.9 Demonstrates consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher continually engages in high level personal/professional growth and application of skills, and contributes to the development of others and the well-being of the school.</td>
<td>The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently practices or attends professional growth opportunities with occasional application in the classroom.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates inflexibility, a reluctance and/or disregard toward school policy, and rarely takes advantage of professional growth opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.

Note: Performance Standard 7: If a teacher effectively fulfills all previous standards, it is likely that the results of teaching -- as documented in Standard 7: Student Academic Progress -- would be positive. The Virginia teacher evaluation system includes the documentation of
Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress
The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Sample Performance Indicators
Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

7.1 Sets acceptable, measurable and appropriate achievement goals for student academic progress based on baseline data.
7.2 Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.
7.3 Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other multiple measures of student growth.
7.4 Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student academic progress and develop interim learning targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the work of the teacher results in a high level of student achievement with all populations of learners.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher results in student academic progress that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher does not achieve acceptable student academic progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.

Performance Rubrics and Summative Evaluation

Evaluators make judgments about performance of the seven teacher standards based on all available evidence. After collecting information gathered through observation, goal setting, student performance measures, and other appropriate information sources, the evaluator applies the four-level rating scale to evaluate a teacher’s performance on all teacher expectations for the summative evaluation. Therefore, the summative evaluation represents where the “preponderance of evidence” exists, based on various data sources. A sample Teacher Summative Performance Report is provided on pages 69-72. The results of the evaluation must be discussed with the teacher at a summative evaluation conference.

Summative evaluations should be completed in compliance with the Code of Virginia and school division policy. For teachers with continuing contract status, evaluations take place at the end of the defined evaluation cycle. However, if a teacher with continuing contract status is
not meeting expectations (at any point in the cycle) or is fulfilling a performance improvement plan, the evaluation cycle will vary. Summative evaluation for teachers with continuing contract status is based on all applicable data collected during the evaluation cycle.

Summative ratings should apply the rating for each of the seven performance expectations, with the most significant weight given to Standard 7 - student academic progress. This document suggests that school divisions weight each of the first six standards equally at 10 percent, and that Standard 7 account for 40 percent of the evaluation. In determining the final summative rating, the following approach could be used:

1. Apply numbers 1 (unacceptable) through 4 (exemplary) to the rating scale
   - Exemplary = 4
   - Proficient = 3
   - Developing/Needs Improvement = 2
   - Unacceptable = 1;

2. Calculate the weighted contribution of each standard to the summative evaluation; and

3. Add the weighted contribution to achieve the final summative evaluation.

The following tables provide two examples of how this approach would apply.

**Example of Weighted Calculations for Teacher Performance Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Performance Standard</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Quantified Performance Rating</th>
<th>Percentage contribution to the summative rating</th>
<th>Weighted Contribution= (quantified performance rating * Percentage Contribution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summative Rating (sum of weighted contributions) 3.1
When applying the summary rating from a quantitative perspective, school divisions will need to establish and document, *a priori*, cut-offs for determining final summative ratings after the weighted contribution is calculated. For example, standard rounding rules may be applied (any rating of 2.5 to 3.4 results in a summative rating of proficient), possibly in conjunction with additional criteria. School divisions also may establish and document additional criteria to the summative rating. For example, a school division may decide that no teachers can be given a summary rating of exemplary if they are rated below proficient on any of the seven standards, or that summative criteria should differ for teachers at different points on the career ladder. For example, a school division may decide that regardless of the sum of weighted contributions, teachers with five or more years of experience who do not have an exemplary rating on Standard 7 (Student Academic Progress) may not be given an overall exemplary rating. These decisions, and documentation of such decisions, must be made before the new evaluation system is put in place. As well, it is critical that teachers understand the requirements before the evaluation cycle begins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Performance Standard</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Quantified Performance Rating</th>
<th>Percentage contribution to the summative rating</th>
<th>Weighted Contribution= (quantified performance rating * Percentage Contribution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 7</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summative Rating (sum of weighted contributions) 2.8
SAMPLE Teacher Summative Performance Report

Directions: Evaluators use this form prior to April 15 to provide the teacher with an assessment of performance. The teacher should be given a copy of the form at the end of each evaluation cycle.

Teacher ____________________________________  School Year(s) ___________________

Grade/Subject ___________________  School _______________________________________

Contract Status:  □ Probationary  □ Continuing Contract

1. Professional Knowledge
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

- Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.
- Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.
- Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.
- Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.
- Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.
- Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.
- Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

Comments:

Rating
□ Exemplary  □ Proficient  □ Developing/Needs Improvement  □ Unacceptable

2. Instructional Planning
The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

- Uses student learning data to guide planning.
- Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.
- Plans for differentiated instruction.
- Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.
- Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans and adapts plans when needed

Comments:

Rating
□ Exemplary  □ Proficient  □ Developing/Needs Improvement  □ Unacceptable
### 3. Instructional Delivery

*The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

- Engages and maintains students in active learning.
- Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
- Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
- Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout lessons.
- Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
- Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
- Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 4. Assessment of/for Student Learning

*The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

- Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.
- Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.
- Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.
- Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.
- Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5. Learning Environment

*The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

- Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.
- Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.
- Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.
- Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.
- Promotes cultural sensitivity.
- Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.
- Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.
- Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**6. Professionalism**

*The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

- Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
- Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies, and ethical guidelines.
- Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
- Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
- Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Exemplary □ Proficient □ Developing/Needs □ Improvement □ Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, other school personnel, and the community.
- Builds positive and professional relationships with parents/guardians through frequent and effective communication concerning students’ progress.
- Serves as a contributing member of the school’s professional learning community through collaboration with teaching colleagues.
- Demonstrates consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

**7. Student Academic Progress**

*The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.*

- Sets acceptable, measurable, and appropriate achievement goals for student learning progress based on baseline data.
- Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Exemplary □ Proficient □ Developing/Needs □ Improvement □ Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other multiple measures of student growth.
- Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student academic progress and develop interim learning targets.
Overall Evaluation Summary:
Include comments here

☐ Exemplary
☐ Proficient
☐ Developing/Needs Improvement
☐ Unacceptable
☐ Recommended for placement on a Performance Improvement Plan. (One or more standards are Unacceptable, or two or more standards are Developing/Needs Improvement.)

Commendations:

Areas Noted for Improvement:

Teacher Improvement Goals:

Evaluator’s Name
Evaluator’s Signature
Date
Site Administrator’s Name

Teacher’s Name
Teacher’s Signature (Teacher’s signature denotes receipt of the summative evaluation, not necessarily agreement with the contents of the form.)
Date
Site Administrator’s Signature
Date
Part 6: Improving Teacher Performance

Supporting teachers is essential to the success of schools. Many resources are needed to assist teachers in growing professionally. Sometimes additional support is required to help teachers develop so that they can meet the performance standards for their school.

There are two tools that may be used at the discretion of the evaluator. The first is the Support Dialogue, a school-level discussion between the evaluator and the teacher. It is an optional process to promote conversation about performance in order to address specific needs or desired areas for professional growth. The second is the Performance Improvement Plan which has a more formal structure and is used for notifying a teacher of performance that requires improvement due to less-than-proficient performance.

Both tools may be used for all teachers, regardless of contract status. The tools may be used independently of each other. Figure 6.1 highlights key differences between the two processes.

Figure 6.1: Two Tools to Increase Professional Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support Dialogue</th>
<th>Performance Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>For teachers who could benefit from targeted performance improvement OR who would like to systematically focus on her/his own performance growth.</td>
<td>For teachers whose work is in the “Needs Improvement” or “Unacceptable categories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiates Process</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator or teacher</td>
<td>Evaluator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>Form Provided: None</td>
<td>Form Required: Performance Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memo or other record of the discussion/other forms of documentation at the building/worksite level</td>
<td>Building/Worksite Level Director/Superintendent is notified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Outcomes**           | • Performance improvement is documented with the support dialogue continued at the discretion of the evaluator or the teacher  
                         | • In some instances, little or no progress -- the employee may be moved to an Improvement Plan | • Sufficient improvement -- recommendation to continue employment  
                         |                                                                                  | • Inadequate improvement -- recommendation to continue on Performance Improvement Plan OR non-renew or dismiss the employee |

* The principal is responsible for the overall supervision of personnel in the worksite/department/school and, as such, monitors the Performance Improvement Plan and makes the recommendations to the superintendent or her or his designee about the teacher’s progress. If an assistant principal has been collecting documentation such as observations, the assistant principal and the principal must confer about the Performance Improvement Plan.

Article 2, § 22-1.293 of the Code of Virginia: Teachers, Officers and Employees, states, in part, the following: A principal may submit recommendations to the division superintendent for the appointment, assignment, promotion, transfer and dismissal of all personnel assigned to his supervision. Beginning September 1, 2000, (i) principals must have received training, provided pursuant to §22.1-253.13:5, in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance, which evaluation and documentation shall include, but shall not be limited to, employee skills and knowledge and student academic progress prior to submitting such recommendations; and (ii) assistant principals and other administrative personnel participating in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance must also have received such training in the evaluation and documentation of employee performance.
Support Dialogue

The Support Dialogue is initiated by evaluators or teachers at any point during the school year for use with personnel whose professional practice would benefit from additional support. It is designed to facilitate discussion about the area(s) of concern and ways to address those concerns. The Support Dialogue process should not be construed as applying to poor performing teachers. The option for a Support Dialogue is open to any teacher who desires assistance in a particular area.

During the initial conference, both parties share what each will do to support the teacher’s growth (see sample prompts in Figure 6.2) and decide when to meet again. To facilitate the improvements, they may choose to fill out the optional Support Dialogue Form on p. 75. After the agreed upon time to receive support and implement changes in professional practice has elapsed, the evaluator and teacher meet again to discuss the impact of the changes (see sample follow-up prompts in Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2: Sample Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Prompts for the Initial Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What challenges have you encountered in addressing ________ (tell specific concern)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have you tried to address the concern of ________ (tell specific concern)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support can I or others at the school/worksite provide you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Prompts for the Follow-Up Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last time we met, we talked about ________ (tell specific concern). What has gone well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has not gone as well?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire Support Dialogue process is intended to be completed in a relatively short time period (for example, within a six-week period) as it offers targeted support. If the Support Dialogue was initiated by a teacher seeking self-improvement, the evaluator and the teacher may decide at any time either to conclude the process or to continue the support and allocate additional time or resources.

For teachers for whom the evaluator initiated the Support Dialogue, the desired outcome would be that the teacher’s practice has improved to a proficient level. In the event that improvements in performance are still needed, the evaluator makes a determination either to extend the time of the Support Dialogue because progress has been made, or to allocate additional time or resources. If the necessary improvement is not made, the employee must be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan. Once placed on a Performance Improvement Plan the employee will have a specified time period (for example, 90 calendar days) to demonstrate that the identified deficiencies have been corrected.
SAMPLE: Support Dialogue Form (optional)

Directions: Teachers and evaluators may use this form to facilitate discussion on areas that need additional support. This form is optional and will not become part of a teacher’s permanent record.

What is the area of targeted support?

What are some of the issues in the area that are causing difficulty?

What strategies have you already tried and what was the result?

What new strategies or resources might facilitate improvement in this area?

Teacher’s Name _______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature ____________________________ Date _______________

Evaluator’s Name _____________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature ____________________________ Date _______________
Performance Improvement Plan

If a teacher’s performance does not meet the expectations established by the school, the teacher will be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (see Performance Improvement Plan Form on pages 78-79. A Performance Improvement Plan is designed to support a teacher in addressing areas of concern through targeted supervision and additional resources. It may be used by an evaluator at any point during the year for a teacher whose professional practice would benefit from additional support. Additionally, a Performance Improvement Plan is implemented if one of the following scenarios occurs at the end of any data collection period:

- a teacher receives two or more “Not Evident” ratings at the interim review;
- a rating of “Developing/Needs Improvement” on two or more performance standards; or
- a rating of “Unacceptable” on one or more performance standards or an overall rating of “Unacceptable.”

Implementation of Performance Improvement Plan

When a teacher is placed on a Performance Improvement Plan, the evaluator must:

a) provide written notification to the teacher of the area(s) of concern that need(s) to be addressed;

b) formulate a Performance Improvement Plan in conjunction with the teacher; and

c) review the results of the Performance Improvement Plan with the teacher within established timelines.

Assistance may include:

- assistance from a curriculum or program coordinator;

- support from a professional peer or supervisor;

- conferences, classes, and workshops on specific topics; and/or

- other resources to be identified.

Resolution of Performance Improvement Plan

Prior to the evaluator making a final recommendation, the evaluator meets with the teacher to review progress made on the Performance Improvement Plan, according to the timeline. The options for a final recommendation include:

a) Sufficient improvement has been achieved; the teacher is no longer on a Performance
Improvement Plan and is rated “Proficient.”

b) Partial improvement has been achieved but more improvement is needed; the teacher remains on a Performance Improvement Plan and is rated “Developing/Needs Improvement.”

c) Little or no improvement has been achieved; the teacher is rated “Unacceptable.”

When a teacher is rated “Unacceptable,” the teacher may be recommended for dismissal. If not dismissed, a new Performance Improvement Plan will be implemented. Following completion of the Performance Improvement Plan, if the teacher is rated “Unacceptable” a second time, the teacher will be recommended for dismissal.

When a teacher with continuing contract status is rated “Unacceptable,” a Performance Improvement Plan will be developed and implemented. Following implementation of the Performance Improvement Plan, additional performance data, including observations as applicable, will be collected.

**Request for Review of an “Unacceptable” Rating**

The teacher may request a review of the evidence in relation to an “Unacceptable” rating received on a Summative Evaluation or, as a result of a Performance Improvement Plan, in accordance with the policies and procedures of the school division.
SAMPLE: Performance Improvement Plan Form
(Required for a Teacher Placed on a Remediation Plan of Action)

Teacher ___________________________________________ School __________________________
Grade/Subject ___________________________ School Year __________________________
Evaluator ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard Number</th>
<th>Performance Deficiencies Within the Standard to be Corrected</th>
<th>Resources/Assistance Provided; Activities to be Completed by the Employee</th>
<th>Target Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher’s signature denotes receipt of the form, and acknowledgment that the evaluator has notified the employee of unacceptable performance.

Teacher’s Name ____________________________________________
Teacher’s Signature ______________________ Date Initiated ____________
Evaluator’s Name ____________________________________________
Evaluator’s Signature ______________________ Date Initiated ____________
## Results of Performance Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard Number</th>
<th>Performance Deficiencies Within the Standard to be Corrected</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final recommendation based on outcome of Improvement Plan:**

- [ ] The performance deficiencies have been satisfactorily corrected: The teacher is no longer on a *Performance Improvement Plan*.

- [ ] The deficiencies were not corrected: teacher is recommended for non-renewal/dismissal.

Teacher’s Name ______________________________________________________________

Teacher’s Signature ___________________________ Date Reviewed ______________

Signature denotes the review occurred, not necessarily agreement with the final recommendation.

Evaluator’s Name ____________________________________________________________

Evaluator’s Signature ___________________________ Date Reviewed ______________

---

* These sections are to be completed collaboratively by the evaluator and the teacher. Pages may be added, if needed.
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Part 1: Introduction

The Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers were originally developed as a result of a recommendation from the Committee to Enhance the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia established by the Virginia Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. In 2004, a task force comprised of outstanding teachers representing all grade levels, subject area expertise, and regions within the state drafted the initial Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) then hosted focus group meetings in all eight regions of the state to provide opportunities for Virginia educators at the division, school, and higher education levels to provide feedback on the draft standards. Based on their feedback, the standards were revised and adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2008 as a resource for school divisions in the implementation of the Board of Education’s performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers.

Teaching standards provide a vision for the profession. They define what teachers should know and do. By creating a conceptual model for effective teaching, the standards establish a foundation upon which all aspects of teacher development from teacher education to induction and ongoing profession development can be aligned. The standards also can assist teachers in reflecting on their teaching practice and its impact on student learning. The standards should guide the development of all teachers throughout their careers as they continually seek to improve their practice.

In 2010, in response to a growing state and national emphasis on teacher effectiveness, the Virginia Department of Education convened a task force to revise the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers. The revised Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers reflect a closer alignment in structure between the two documents to assist educators in using the standards to improve the practice and performance of teachers.

The revised Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers document is presented in two sections: Standards for the Professional Practice of All Teachers and Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas. The Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas include standards for teachers of English; history and social science; mathematics; science; career and technical education; English as a Second Language; fine arts; foreign language; health and physical education; and special education. The standards are organized around six interrelated categories of teaching practice.

The Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers (revised 2011) include seven performance standards. The seventh performance standard is student academic progress. Within each of the six standards listed below are key elements that describe the knowledge that teachers possess and actions that they take to advance student learning. Together these six standards and key elements represent the scope and complexity of teaching.

- **Professional Knowledge**

- **Instructional Planning**
• **Instructional Delivery**

• **Assessment of and for Student Learning**

• **Learning Environment**

• **Professionalism**

The Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas follows the same format as the *Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers* and builds on the *Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* and the Virginia Standards of Learning. Standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the various content areas also guided the work of the content-specific task force members.

To further guide teachers as they define and develop their practice around the six standards, two supplemental documents are provided. Supplemental Document A uses an inquiry approach to foster ongoing reflection and insight through questions that encourage teachers to examine key aspects of teaching within each standard. Supplemental Document B provides examples of the knowledge, skills, actions, and attitudes exhibited by teachers who are meeting each standard. These questions address only a sample of important aspects of teaching and are not intended to be used as a check list. Rather, they are intended to guide the development of all teachers throughout their careers as they continually seek to improve their practice.
Part 2:
Standards for the Professional Practice of All Teachers

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

*Teachers demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers understand the central concepts, structures, and processes of the discipline(s) they teach and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful to students.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers address appropriate curriculum standards and establish instructional goals that demonstrate a deep knowledge of their students and subject matter content.

Standard Two: Instructional Planning

*Teachers plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers design coherent instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers use the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in designing instruction that promotes student growth.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers plan instruction to achieve objectives that reflect the *Virginia Standards of Learning* and division curriculum guidelines.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers use student learning data to develop appropriate short- and long-range instructional plans and adjust plans based on student needs and changing circumstances.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers choose appropriate strategies, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of students and develop appropriate sequencing of learning experiences.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers collaborate with colleagues within and across content areas and grade levels to select and create learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, based on school improvement plans, relevant to learners, and based on principles of effective instruction.
Standard Three: Instructional Delivery

*Teachers effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers differentiate instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers implement, evaluate, and adapt multiple delivery methods and instructional strategies to actively engage students in learning and enhance student learning.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers communicate clearly and check regularly for understanding.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers know when and how to access and integrate resources to support student learning (e.g., field and educational experts, exceptional education specialists, language learner specialists, community organizations).

Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning

*Teachers systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work independently and collaboratively to analyze and interpret multiple sources of data to identify student learning needs, to guide planning and instruction, and to assess the effectiveness of instruction.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers communicate specific performance expectations and use a variety of assessment strategies to monitor and document student progress and to provide meaningful feedback to students and parents.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers engage students in understanding, identifying, and assuming responsibility for quality work and provide them with timely, frequent, and effective feedback to guide their progress toward that work.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers set measurable and appropriate goals for students based on baseline data and accept responsibility for providing instruction that will enable students to achieve those goals.
Standard Five: Learning Environment

*Teachers use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers create a safe and positive learning environment.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers manage classroom procedures to maximize academic learning time to ensure continuous student engagement in learning.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers develop and maintain rapport with students.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers create for all students a respectful, supportive learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers collaborate with colleagues to develop consistent policies and procedures that create a school culture conducive to learning.

Standard Six: Professionalism

*Teachers maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, and take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work in partnership with families to promote student learning at home and in the school.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers collaborate with administrators, colleagues, families, and community members to promote and support student success.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers model professional and ethical standards as well as personal integrity in all interactions.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers respect the privacy of students, families, colleagues, and administrators with whom they work, ensuring confidentiality of all sensitive information.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers continually reflect on, evaluate, and seek to improve their practice.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers take responsibility for and participate in a meaningful and continuous process of professional development.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 3: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of English

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of English demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English use information regarding students’ prior knowledge and development to guide instruction and to develop and enhance English skills.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge, skills, and processes of English and use this knowledge to establish instructional goals that address appropriate English curriculum standards.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English use standards, resources, and techniques to maximize student learning in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and research.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of English use a variety of texts, ideas, perspectives and approaches in the study of literature to expand student knowledge of themselves and their world.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of English apply the conventions of standard English in reading, writing, and oral communication.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of English understand the writing process and use a variety of modalities to help students apply knowledge of grammar, usage, and mechanics to the process.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers of English are knowledgeable in a variety of effective reading strategies and help students develop, recognize, and expand the use of these strategies, as well as adjust them to suit the purpose, task, and text.

Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of English plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English select and create materials based on instructional purpose, literary merit, impact of the medium, parameters of the curriculum and students’ developmental needs.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English incorporate real world texts, technology, and written and oral responses to enhance students’ understanding of the importance of language skills beyond the classroom.
**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*Teachers of English effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English facilitate students’ active learning through projects, collaborative work, multi-media, and oral interpretation.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English use a variety of teaching strategies and differentiated instruction to guide students in developing literacy, critical thinking, problem-solving, and writing skills.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English encourage students’ self-directed learning and the creative application of oral language, writing, and reading interpretation.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of English encourage inquiry and require students to provide credible evidence from a variety of sources.

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

*Teachers of English systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

**Key Element:** Teachers of English engage students in a variety of formative and summative assessments to include oral, written, and self-assessments.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

*Teachers of English use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English create and maintain a classroom environment that supports and encourages students to develop and practice communication skills.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English create an intellectual environment that enables students to develop competence in reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English encourage opportunities for students to select texts or issues of personal interest and promote appropriate communication of each student’s viewpoints.
Standard Six: Professionalism

Teachers of English maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, and take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English reflect on what they teach and how they teach. They keep abreast of current research-based practices in English and continually seek to improve their knowledge and practice.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English collaborate with peers and other educational professionals to extend student learning experiences by inviting poets, authors, storytellers, and other literary professionals into the classroom. These learning experiences may include student writing as well as providing opportunities for speeches, presentations, and dramatic interpretation.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 4: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of History and Social Science

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of history and social science demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of history and social science use information regarding student development, prior knowledge, background, interests, and experiences with history and social science to design thoughtful curricula and to provide effective instruction.

Key Element 2: Teachers of history and social science demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge, skills, processes, and democratic values of history and social science.

Key Element 3: Teachers of history and social science understand the concepts, big ideas, essential questions, and essential knowledge from the disciplines of history, geography, economics, and civics included in the Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science.

Key Element 4: Teachers of history and social science integrate knowledge from history, geography, economics, and civics into their courses, and from other academic disciplines as appropriate.

Key Element 5: Teachers of history and social science use content from history, geography, economics, and civics to develop the skills of (1) acquiring, organizing, and interpreting information from primary and secondary sources; (2) historical inquiry; (3) reading and interpreting maps, graphs, charts, and political cartoons; (4) making and defending decisions on public policies; and (5) actively participating in groups.

Key Element 6: Teachers of history and social science understand and appreciate the core values of life, liberty, truth, equality of opportunity, and justice that form the foundation of American democracy and the conflicts that exist among these values.

Key Element 7: Teachers of history and social science understand and appreciate the cultural diversity of American society and of the world and how experiences may be interpreted differently by people from diverse cultural perspectives and frames of reference.

Key Element 8: Teachers of history and social science demonstrate knowledge of significant historical periods, the role of conflict and cooperation, and patterns of continuity and change in United States and world history.
**Key Element 9:** Teachers of history and social science demonstrate knowledge of places and regions of the world, the physical processes that shape the earth, patterns of movement and interconnectedness, and the forces of cooperation and conflict among peoples around the world.

**Key Element 10:** Teachers of history and social science demonstrate knowledge of the purpose and organization of government and know how to promote the active participation of citizens in a democracy.

**Key Element 11:** Teachers of history and social science understand how the market economy and other types of global economies organize for the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services.

**Standard Two: Instructional Planning**

*Teachers of history and social science plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of history and social science use the content and investigative processes of history, geography, economics, and civics to promote the thoughtful investigation of essential questions and understandings in the *Virginia Standards of Learning for History and Social Science.*

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of history and social science organize content from history, geography, economics, and civics into meaningful, coherent, and engaging units of instruction using a variety of instructional strategies, including those that require higher levels of thinking.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of history and social science select and organize content from history, geography, economics, and civics that examines value-based topics and addresses controversial historical and contemporary issues.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of history and social science connect content and activities to personal or real world experiences.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*Teachers of history and social science effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of history and social science model thoughtfulness by asking challenging questions, asking students to explain and provide evidence for conclusions, encouraging students to raise questions and evaluate proposed solutions, and promoting discourse on topics that stimulate higher order thinking.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers of history and social science encourage and model the skills of historical inquiry, interpreting information from primary sources, maps, charts, graphs, and political cartoons, and drawing conclusions on public issues.

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

*Teachers of history and social science systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

**Key Element:** Teachers of history and social science engage students in a variety of written and oral assessment tasks, including essays, research projects, and various forms of discussion.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

*Teachers of history and social science use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of history and social science create a learning environment in which thinking, discourse, and respect for diverse viewpoints are the norms.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of history and social science create a learning environment in which historical thinking, civic competence, questioning, problem-solving, and decision-making are pursued and encouraged.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of history and social science create a learning environment where diverse viewpoints on controversial historical and contemporary issues are explored and respected.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of history and social science create opportunities for students to collaborate, discuss, and seek consensus in small and large groups, while accepting disagreements and conflicting points of view with tolerance, understanding, and sensitivity.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

*Teachers of history and social science maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*
Key Element 1: Teachers of history and social science regularly reflect on what they teach and how they teach.

Key Element 2: Teachers of history and social science continually seek to improve their practice through academic course work, fieldwork, membership in professional organizations, and by attending workshops and conferences.

Key Element 3: Teachers of history and social science take advantage of real-world community opportunities in disciplines they teach (e.g., archaeological digs, museum programs, civic projects).

Key Element 4: Teachers of history and social science utilize community resources through field trips, guest speakers, museum artifacts, newspaper and other media, and computer technology.

Key Element 5: Teachers of history and social science encourage students to participate in community-based service and civic learning projects.

Key Element 6: Teachers of history and social science collaborate with their colleagues, discipline experts, and other educational professionals to expand their knowledge of instructional materials and practices, improve their school’s history/social science program, and advance teacher and student knowledge of history, geography, economics, and civics.

Key Element 7: Teachers of history and social science effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 5: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Mathematics

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of mathematics demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of mathematics interpret and use research on how children learn mathematics as well as information regarding students’ prior knowledge and experiences in mathematics to guide their instruction.

Key Element 2: Teachers of mathematics understand the effect of students’ age, abilities, interests, and experience on learning mathematics to provide all students an opportunity to enhance their mathematical thinking and extend their opportunities in mathematics.

Key Element 3: Teachers of mathematics demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts and procedures, mathematical problem solving, communication of mathematical ideas, mathematical reasoning, connections within the discipline and to its uses in the world around us, and mathematical representations.

Key Element 4: Teachers of mathematics responsible for instruction at all levels (K-12) understand the key concepts of number and operations, number sense, number systems, algebraic structures, algebra, geometry, measurement, probability and statistics, the role of functions and variables, and probabilistic and proportional reasoning.

Key Element 5: Teachers of mathematics demonstrate and foster the disposition to do mathematics; the confidence to learn mathematics independently; the development and application of mathematical language and symbolism; and a view of mathematics as a study of patterns and relationships.

Key Element 6: Teachers of mathematics have a thorough understanding of the mathematics they are teaching as well as a vision of where that mathematics is leading.

Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of mathematics plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Key Element 1: Teachers of mathematics select, adapt, and use instructional materials and research-based pedagogy that engage students in active learning, and promote reflective thought and understanding.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers of mathematics believe that all students can learn to think mathematically. They understand that teaching is a complex process and not reducible to recipes or prescriptions.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*Teachers of mathematics effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of mathematics pose tasks that provide the stimulus for students to think about mathematical concepts and procedures, their connections with other mathematical ideas, and their applications to real-world contexts. These tasks encourage students to reason about mathematical ideas, and to formulate, grapple with, and solve problems.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of mathematics orchestrate discourse that is founded on mathematical ways of knowing and communicating. This interaction, between teacher and students and among students, fosters the development of critical mathematical processes - problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation - and influences student dispositions toward mathematics.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of mathematics understand and are able to demonstrate appropriate use of manipulatives, calculators, graphing utilities and computer software to enhance and support student understanding and provide learning opportunities and environments in which students use these instructional tools to make sense of mathematics.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of mathematics foster writing in the classroom that requires students to communicate using mathematics and to reflect on their own mathematical understanding.

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

*Teachers of mathematics systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

**Key Element:** Teachers of mathematics use a variety of strategies to continuously monitor students’ capacity and inclination to analyze situations, frame and solve problems, and make sense of mathematical concepts and procedures.
**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

*Teachers of mathematics use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of mathematics create an intellectually and emotionally safe environment in which mathematical thinking is the norm.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of mathematics understand that what students learn is fundamentally connected to how they learn it. They create an environment that supports and encourages mathematical reasoning and encourages students to make conjectures, experiment with alternative approaches to solving problems, and construct and respond to the mathematical opinions of others.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

*Teachers of mathematics maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of mathematics regularly reflect on what they teach and how they teach. They keep abreast of research in mathematics and mathematical pedagogy, continually seeking to improve their knowledge and practice.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of mathematics collaborate with peers and other educational professionals to strengthen their school’s mathematics program and advance mathematical knowledge of teachers, students, families, and school communities.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of mathematics effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 6: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Science

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of science demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of science use information regarding students’ prior knowledge and development in science to guide their instruction in order to provide all students an opportunity to enhance their scientific investigation, reasoning, and logic skills and to extend their opportunities in science.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of science understand major scientific concepts, principles, theories, and laws of their disciplines included in the *Virginia Science Standards of Learning*.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of science understand interrelationships among the disciplines of science.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of science use mathematics in the acquisition, analysis, and reporting of data in solving scientific problems.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of science convey the unifying concepts of science including systems, order, and organization; evidence, models, and explanation; change, constancy, and measurement; evolution and equilibrium; and forms and function.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of science understand the philosophical tenets, assumptions, goals, and values that distinguish science from pseudo-science.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers of science use their knowledge of current research to effectively design, conduct, report, and evaluate investigations in science.

Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of science plan using the *Virginia Standards of Learning*, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of science incorporate the nature of science and scientific inquiry into instruction by using the knowledge and significance of science and scientific advances to connect to other disciplines and to daily life.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers of science engage students in studies of the nature of science including, when possible, the critical analysis of false or doubtful assertions made in the name of science.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*Teachers of science effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of science organize and engage students by using different student group-learning strategies.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of science engage students effectively in developmentally appropriate inquiries that lead them to develop concepts and relationships from their observations, data, and inferences in a scientific manner.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of science encourage and model the skills of scientific inquiry as well as the curiosity, openness to new ideas, and skepticism that define science.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of science relate the contributions and significance of science to social and cultural developments.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of science relate the historical development of scientific concepts and scientific reasoning to current understanding.

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

*Teachers of science systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.*

**Key Element:** Teachers of science use multiple strategies to probe for students’ scientific preconceptions and use that information to guide instruction.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

*Teachers of science use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of science employ the knowledge, skills, and processes for teaching laboratory science in a safe environment including the design and management of learning environments that provide students with the time, space, and resources needed for learning science.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers of science require knowledge and respect for safety in the use of organisms, materials, chemicals, and equipment.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of science review and implement general guidelines for safety as well as regulations related to collection and use of living organisms.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of science use science materials and teaching strategies that encourage students with diverse abilities, interests, and backgrounds to actively and safely participate in the learning of science.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of science develop communities of science learners that reflect the intellectual rigor of scientific inquiry and the attitudes and social values conducive to science learning.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of science create and maintain a psychologically and socially safe, supportive learning environment conducive to challenging scientific evidence.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

*Teachers of science maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of science demonstrate the importance of relating science to the community and of involving stakeholders and using community resources to promote the learning of science.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of science engage actively and continuously in updating their knowledge of current developments and new technologies.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of science effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 7: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Career and Technical Education

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of career and technical education demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of career and technical education use information regarding student development, prior knowledge, background, interests, and experiences to provide the opportunity for all students to enhance their critical thinking skills and their intellectual, social, personal, and professional development.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of career and technical education counsel students about their program of studies, postsecondary plans, career options, labor market trends, and personal and career development.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of career and technical education educate their students about opportunities for employment in nontraditional fields.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of career and technical education support and advance the development of life skills that enable students to experience quality growth and maturity and achieve personal goals.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of career and technical education foster student involvement in the appropriate career and technical student organization.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of career and technical education demonstrate a sound approach to career and technical education, which demands the infusion of the core disciplines in the school curriculum. Teachers not only have to understand these disciplines, they must also know how to select from among the concepts and skills related to their disciplines.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers of career and technical education are knowledgeable about the subject matter in their field, including new developments, findings, technology, and industry certifications. They explore their subject areas thoroughly to establish and maintain a firm understanding of the content in their field.

**Key Element 8:** Teachers of career and technical education incorporate workplace readiness skills, all aspects of industry, and internet safety into the curriculum.

**Key Element 9:** Teachers of career and technical education integrate the appropriate activities and learning opportunities of the career and technical student organization into the
curriculum to foster application of learning, to develop leadership skills, and to promote professional development.

**Key Element 10:** Teachers of career and technical education include all essential competencies in each course in the appropriate discipline(s).

**Standard Two: Instructional Planning**

*Teachers of career and technical education plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of career and technical education design coherent instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of career and technical education use materials, technology, and resources that promote the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of career and technical education select, evaluate, and adapt multiple methods and instructional strategies to engage students and enhance student learning.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of career and technical education differentiate instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of career and technical education relate content and activities to personal or real-world experiences and interests.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of career and technical education facilitate students’ active learning through projects, collaborative work, multimedia, oral interpretation and presentation, work-based learning experiences, and assessment where appropriate.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of career and technical education use appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster positive interactions in the classroom.
**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Key Element:** Teachers of career and technical education communicate specific performance expectations and use a variety of assessment strategies to plan and deliver instruction, to monitor and document student progress, and to use the data to plan and modify instruction and assessment as necessary.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

Teachers of career and technical education use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of career and technical education create a safe and positive environment for students both in the classroom, and where applicable, on work-based learning sites.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of career and technical education document the classroom and career experiences relevant to safety training and workplace preparation skills.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of career and technical education manage classroom procedures to ensure continuous student engagement through maximized learning time.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of career and technical education create a supportive learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation for all students.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

Teachers of career and technical education maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning throughout the school year.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of career and technical education work in partnership with families to promote student learning at home and in school.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of career and technical education collaborate with administrators, colleagues, families, and community members to promote and support student success.
**Key Element 3:** Teachers of career and technical education reinforce a collaborative effort with business and industry through the use of advisory committees where necessary.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of career and technical education reinforce, through recruitment efforts, the benefits of career and technical education in collaboration with appropriate school personnel (i.e., administrators, guidance counselors, etc.).

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of career and technical education collaborate with core academic teachers to develop and utilize integrated lesson plans with real-world examples and applications.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of career and technical education collaborate with teachers of special education to meet the learning needs of all students.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers of career and technical education model professional and ethical standards as well as exhibit personal integrity in all interactions.

**Key Element 8:** Teachers of career and technical education continually reflect on, evaluate, and seek to improve their profession and update their knowledge and skills based on new business and industry trends and technology and educational pedagogy.

**Key Element 9:** Teachers of career and technical education take responsibility for and participate in meaningful and continuous processes of professional development including membership and participation in appropriate professional and community organizations.

**Key Element 10:** Teachers of career and technical education affiliate with and maintain appropriate student organizations as a means of promoting student professionalism.

**Key Element 11:** Teachers of career and technical education effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 8: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of English as a Second Language

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of English as a Second Language use information regarding students’ cultures, English and home language proficiency levels, developmental levels, educational backgrounds, prior knowledge, and experiences to guide instruction and develop English skills.

Key Element 2: Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate that they understand the knowledge, skills, and processes of learning English as a new language.

Key Element 3: Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate knowledge of multiple second language acquisition teaching strategies and techniques to expand student knowledge.

Key Element 4: Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate knowledge of English linguistics including morphology, phonology, semantics, and syntax and can apply those principles to instruction.

Key Element 5: Teachers of English as a Second Language have post-secondary (or equivalent) experience in learning a second language.

Key Element 6: Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in English.

Key Element 7: Teachers of English as a Second Language understand the role of culture and home language in English language development and academic achievement.

Key Element 8: Teachers of English as a Second Language have knowledge of U.S. culture and how to help students make appropriate cultural transitions.

Key Element 9: Teachers of English as a Second Language demonstrate that they understand Virginia’s accountability system as it applies to limited English proficient students.
Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of English as a Second Language plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Key Element 1: Teachers of English as a Second Language plan, deliver, and assess instruction effectively to assist limited English proficient students in English language acquisition.

Key Element 2: Teachers of English as a Second Language use state standards and local curriculum to deliver a coherent curriculum to limited English proficient students through effective long-range, standards-based planning.

Standard Three: Instructional Delivery

Teachers of English as a Second Language effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

Key Element 1: Teachers of English as a Second Language teach the conventions of the English language required for social situations and also teach skills, vocabulary, and concepts that support student learning in academic areas.

Key Element 2: Teachers of English as a Second Language effectively use a variety of materials, texts, ideas, perspectives, and approaches to deliver instruction.

Key Element 3: Teachers of English as a Second Language use scientifically-based strategies that reflect best current practices in teaching that promote higher order thinking skills.

Key Element 4: Teachers of English as a Second Language teach the standards by identifying, choosing, and adapting a wide range of materials, resources, and technologies in English as a Second Language content instruction.

Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning

Teachers of English as a Second Language systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

Key Element 1: Teachers of English as a Second Language prepare students for participation in Virginia’s Standards of Learning including ELP standards and assessments as they apply to limited English proficient students.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English as a Second Language engage students in a variety of ongoing formative and summative assessments to include performance-based assessments appropriate to their English proficiency levels.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

*Teachers of English as a Second Language use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English as a Second Language foster a classroom environment that encourages students to develop and practice communication skills.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English as a Second Language value diversity and diverse perspectives by integrating students’ cultures into the classroom.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English as a Second Language encourage students to know, value, and respect themselves and others in the classroom, school, and larger community.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

*Teachers of English as a Second Language maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of English as a Second Language collaborate with families, administrators, colleagues and community members to value and support limited English proficient students.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of English as a Second Language involve families in the educational process and facilitate parental involvement by accessing resources to make interactions comprehensible to the families.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of English as a Second Language promote cross-cultural communication and partnerships among students, families, communities, and schools.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of English as a Second Language serve as resources and models for school staff for providing instruction to limited English proficient students.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of English as a Second Language reflect on what they teach and how they teach. They continually seek to improve their knowledge and practice.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of English as a Second Language stay current on research, trends, policies, and legal mandates affecting English as a Second Language students and programs through reading and professional development opportunities.
Key Element 7: Teachers of English as a Second Language model a disposition of cultural sensitivity.

Key Element 8: Teachers of English as a Second Language effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 9: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of the Fine Arts

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of the fine arts design curricula based on their understanding of student development, knowledge, interests, experiences, and abilities.

Key Element 2: Teachers of the fine arts understand cognitive, psychomotor, artistic, and emotional stages of student development.

Key Element 3: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge of diverse student learning styles and their implications for education in the arts.

Key Element 4: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate understanding of central concepts, structures, and processes of their art discipline.

Key Element 5: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge of the Virginia Standards of Learning in their discipline.

Key Element 6: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge of cultural and historical context as it applies to their discipline.

Key Element 7: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a variety of aesthetic frameworks and/or philosophies as they apply to their discipline.

Key Element 8: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge of instructional methods necessary to develop performance skills.

Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of the fine arts plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Key Element 1: Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate knowledge and ability to plan, deliver, and assess learning in the arts.
Key Element 2: Teachers of the fine arts use a variety of instructional materials, ideas, perspectives, and strategies to expand student understanding of the arts and the relevance of the arts to themselves in a culturally diverse and ever-changing world.

Standard Three: Instructional Delivery

Teachers of the fine arts effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

Key Element 1: Teachers of the fine arts use a variety of instructional strategies, resources, and technology to promote development of critical thinking, creative problem solving, and competency in performance skills.

Key Element 2: Teachers of the fine arts offer students opportunities to present their work in a variety of venues and formats.

Key Element 3: Teachers of the fine arts provide opportunities that engage students in a structured analysis of works created and/or performed by themselves and others.

Key Element 4: Teachers of the fine arts provide opportunities for students to conceptualize, improvise, and create.

Key Element 5: Teachers of the fine arts provide opportunities for student awareness of careers in the arts and related job skills.

Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning

Teachers of the fine arts systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

Key Element 1: Teachers of the fine arts engage students in a variety of summative, formative, and performance-based assessments.

Key Element 2: Teachers of the fine arts provide opportunities for students to demonstrate knowledge of relationships between the fine arts and other disciplines.

Standard Five: Learning Environment

Teachers of the fine arts use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.
**Key Element 1:** Teachers of the fine arts establish and maintain a safe and disciplined environment conducive to learning and performing in the arts.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of the fine arts create a safe learning environment for the exploration and discussion of diverse artistic issues.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate, promote, and plan for safe use of materials and equipment.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of the fine arts are proactive in seeking information and advocating on behalf of a safe learning and performing environment.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of the fine arts demonstrate and promote copyright and royalty requirements when exhibiting, producing, or otherwise using the works of others.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of the fine arts use materials, methods, information, and technology in an ethical manner.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

*Teachers of the fine arts maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of the fine arts establish partnerships and collaborate with families, administrators, colleagues, and community resources to support programs and promote student success in the arts.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of the fine arts reflect on what they teach and how they teach, continually seeking to improve their expertise through performance, research, study, and service.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of the fine arts effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 10: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Foreign Languages

**Standard One: Professional Knowledge**

*Teachers of foreign languages demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of foreign languages consider students’ prior knowledge and experiences to guide their instruction and to provide all students an opportunity to achieve proficiency in languages other than English.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of foreign languages demonstrate knowledge, skills, and linguistic structures of the target language and create learning experiences that make these aspects of the subject matter meaningful to students.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of foreign languages demonstrate proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in the target language and understand the concepts and content included in the *Virginia Foreign Language Standards of Learning*.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of foreign languages demonstrate a broad understanding of the K-12 foreign language curriculum continuum.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of foreign languages understand and appreciate cultural diversity and how experiences may be interpreted differently.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of foreign languages understand interrelationships among other academic disciplines.

**Key Element 7:** Teachers of foreign languages integrate knowledge from other academic disciplines.

**Key Element 8:** Teachers of foreign languages use a variety of resources and approaches to maximize all aspects of language learning.

**Key Element 9:** Teachers of foreign languages help students apply knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and mechanics for communication within the cultural context of the target language.

**Key Element 10:** Teachers of foreign languages use technology to provide students increased access to information around the world.
**Standard Two: Instructional Planning**

Teachers of foreign languages plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of foreign languages demonstrate the ability to plan, deliver, and assess instruction designed to enable students to communicate effectively.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of foreign languages plan instruction to achieve objectives that reflect the *Virginia Foreign Language Standards of Learning* and division curriculum guidelines.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

Teachers of foreign languages effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of foreign languages incorporate a variety of instructional strategies and techniques that address student learning styles and abilities.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of foreign languages provide opportunities for students to understand and appreciate cultures other than their own.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of foreign languages use the target language as the primary language of instruction and provide extensive opportunities for its use by students.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of foreign languages provide a rich and stimulating learning environment that incorporates authentic resources, including interaction with or exposure to native speakers.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of foreign languages select, evaluate, and adapt multiple methods and strategies to actively engage students and enhance communication skills.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of foreign languages use a variety of strategies to guide students in developing critical thinking skills.
**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

Teachers of foreign languages systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Key Element:** Teachers of foreign languages consistently monitor and assess student progress in a manner that reflects all aspects of language learning.

**Standard Five: Learning Environment**

Teachers of foreign languages use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of foreign languages create a learning environment in which diverse cultural viewpoints are explored and respected.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of foreign languages create a rapport with students that encourages social interaction, risk-taking, and active engagement in learning.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

Teachers of foreign languages maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of foreign languages work collaboratively with colleagues and the global community to expand their knowledge, provide opportunities for their students, and promote foreign language learning.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of foreign languages stay informed of current practices in language instruction and regularly seek to improve their knowledge and methodology. They interact in an ethical and professional manner with administrators, colleagues, parents, students, and the community.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of foreign languages effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 11: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Health Education and Physical Education

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of health education and physical education demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of health education and physical education use information regarding students’ growth and development, prior knowledge, background, interests, and experiences to guide instruction and to provide opportunity for all students to enhance their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional skills.

Key Element 2: Teachers of health education and physical education demonstrate an understanding of concepts, skills, and processes of health education, physical education, and driver education.

Key Element 3: Teachers of health education and physical education convey the fact that physical activity and a health-enhancing level of fitness are important to the health and well-being of individuals.

Key Element 4: Teachers of health education and physical education have knowledge of how to adjust content for different approaches to learning and to design instructional strategies using learners’ strengths as the basis for growth in the physical, cognitive, social, and emotional domains.

Key Element 5: Teachers of health education and physical education use interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow students to integrate content knowledge, skills, and methods of inquiry from health education, physical education, driver education, and other subject areas.

Key Element 6: Teachers of physical education apply motor learning concepts and principles to help students learn the skills necessary to perform a variety of physical activities.

Key Element 7: Teachers of health education and physical education provide the knowledge, processes, and skills needed to help students avoid health-risk behaviors.

Key Element 8: Teachers of health education and physical education promote a safe and healthy community by focusing on health concepts and skills needed to facilitate the formation of healthy behaviors and practices.

Key Element 9: Teachers of health education and physical education identify methods of accessing, evaluating and using health information, products, and services to enhance the health of self and others.
Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers of health education and physical education plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Key Element 1: Teachers of health education and physical education demonstrate knowledge and expertise in using a variety of strategies to plan, deliver, monitor, and assess effective instruction.

Key Element 2: Teachers of health education and physical education plan instruction to achieve objectives that reflect the Virginia Standards of Learning and division curriculum guidelines.

Key Element 3: Teachers of health education and physical education use short- and long-term planning to reach curricular goals.

Standard Three: Instructional Delivery

Teachers of health education and physical education effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

Key Element 1: Teachers of health education and physical education plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to promote healthy decisions that improve or sustain personal, family, and community health.

Key Element 2: Teachers of health education and physical education design and implement learning experiences that are safe, appropriate, realistic, and relevant based on principles of effective instruction (e.g., that activate students’ knowledge, anticipate pre-conceptions, encourage exploration and problem solving, and build on skills and experiences).

Key Element 3: Teachers of health education and physical education use formal and informal assessment strategies to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of learners (e.g., criterion-referenced and norm-referenced testing, formative and summative evaluations, motor performance and physical fitness profiles, portfolio, and authentic assessments).
Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning

Teachers of health education and physical education systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of health education and physical education use and interpret student data to guide instruction.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of health education and physical education maintain records of student performance and communicate progress based on appropriate indicators.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of health education and physical education use ongoing assessment to identify student needs.

Standard Five: Learning Environment

Teachers of health education and physical education use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of health education and physical education use different approaches to learning and create appropriate instruction for diverse learners (IEP, medical notes, etc.).

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of health education and physical education use principles of effective management and a variety of strategies to promote equitable and meaningful learning.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers of health education and physical education organize, allocate, and manage resources (e.g., time, space, equipment, activities, and supervision) to provide safe, active, and equitable learning experiences.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers of health education and physical education use managerial and instructional practices to create effective learning experiences and environments.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers of health education and physical education use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages active engagement in learning, self-motivation, and positive interaction.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers of health education and physical education provide opportunities for student input that increase the student’s commitment to learning.
Standard Six:  Professionalism

Teachers of health education and physical education maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Key Element 1: Teachers of health education and physical education foster relationships and effective communication with students, colleagues, families, and community members to expand their knowledge, provide opportunities for their students, and promote safe and healthy communities.

Key Element 2: Teachers of health education and physical education use a variety of methods to communicate with colleagues, families, and community (e.g., electronic communications, bulletin boards, music, task cards, posters, video, faculty meetings, open houses, newsletters, and conferences).

Key Element 3: Teachers of health education and physical education respect student privacy and the confidentiality of information.

Key Element 4: Teachers of health education and physical education demonstrate sensitivity to ethnic, cultural, economic, ability, gender, and environmental differences.

Key Element 5: Teachers of health education and physical education establish positive relationships with family members to support student growth and well-being.

Key Element 6: Teachers of health education and physical education participate in collegial activities to make the school community a productive and healthy learning environment.

Key Element 7: Teachers of health education and physical education regularly seek to improve their knowledge and practice, and to stay informed of current research-based practices and new technologies. They interact in an ethical and professional manner with administrators, parents, students, and the community.

Key Element 8: Teachers of health education and physical education effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.
Part 12: Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers in Specific Disciplines and Specialized Areas: Teachers of Special Education

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers of special education demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers of special education understand how students learn and develop, and provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

Key Element 2: Teachers of special education review data, assessments, and diagnostic information to develop and modify appropriate Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students.

Key Element 3: Teachers of special education encourage social and emotional growth by acknowledging the effect of peers and peer groups on the students’ social and emotional development and their diverse needs (e.g., low ego strength, social perception, how it affects the individual student).

Key Element 4: Teachers of special education communicate the knowledge they obtain about a student with a disability to other appropriate staff members, community, and families within the guidelines of confidentiality.

Key Element 5: Teachers of special education identify and assess the assistive technology needs of each student and develop and modify appropriate Individualized Education Programs for the student.

Key Element 6: Teachers of special education understand typical and atypical human growth and development.

Key Element 7: Teachers of special education understand the educational implication of characteristics of various exceptionalities and support students in the development of self-determination skills by teaching them to understand their disability and the modifications or accommodations they may need to be successful in the various settings.

Key Element 8: Teachers of special education know the characteristics and effects of the cultural and environmental milieu of the individual with exceptional learning needs and the family.

Key Element 9: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding family systems and the role of families in supporting development.
**Key Element 10:** Teachers of special education understand the similarities and differences among individuals with exceptional learning needs.

**Key Element 11:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding the effects of various medications on individuals with exceptional learning needs.

**Key Element 12:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding laws, regulations and policies governing special education.

**Key Element 13:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding the general or aligned curriculum framework, Virginia Standards of Learning, and assessment at all levels.

**Key Element 14:** Teachers of special education understand interrelationships across disciplines.

**Key Element 15:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding research-based, promising practices in learning strategies, basic literacy, numeracy, content enhancements, social/behavioral skills, transition, advocacy, curriculum-based assessment, and response to intervention.

**Key Element 16:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding access and integration of related services.

**Key Element 17:** Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding historical points of view and contribution of culturally diverse groups and the potential impact of differences in values, languages, and customs that can exist between home and school.

**Standard Two: Instructional Planning**

*Teachers of special education plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers of special education take into consideration cultural, linguistic, and gender differences when designing coherent instruction and materials based upon knowledge of instructional purpose, the Individualized Education Program, and developmental needs.

**Key Element 2:** Teachers of special education collaborate with colleagues, the individual, and the family in setting instructional and transitional goals and in monitoring progress.
Standard Three: Instructional Delivery

Teachers of special education effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

Key Element 1: Teachers of special education differentiate, modify, and adapt instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students in various educational settings.

Key Element 2: Teachers of special education use appropriate verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster positive interactions in the classroom.

Key Element 3: Teachers of special education use a variety of materials, technology, and assistive technology and resources that promote the development of independent thinking, self-determination, problem solving, and performance skills to relate classroom-based instruction to real world experiences.

Key Element 4: Teachers of special education use instructional time effectively.

Key Element 5: Teachers of special education communicate the effects of cultural and linguistic differences on student growth and development.

Key Element 6: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding behavior and communication among cultures that can lead to misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

Key Element 7: Teachers of special education use strategies to support and enhance communication skills of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

Key Element 8: Teachers of special education use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of subject matter for students whose primary language is not the dominant language and for students who are nonverbal.

Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning

Teachers of special education systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

Key Element 1: Teachers of special education communicate specific performance expectations and use a variety of assessment strategies to plan instruction and to monitor and document student progress toward successful achievement of the Virginia Standards of Learning.
Key Element 2: Teachers of special education use functional assessments to plan instruction and to monitor and document student progress toward successful achievement of their goals.

Key Element 3: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable in the use of data as a reflective and instructional decision-making tool when evaluating instruction and monitoring progress of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

Key Element 4: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding legal provisions and ethical principles of assessment of individuals.

Key Element 5: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding the terminology, use, and limitations of assessment instruments, including cultural bias, and effectively communicate the results to all stakeholders.

Key Element 6: Teachers of special education develop or modify individualized assessment strategies.

Key Element 7: Teachers of special education use assessment information in making eligibility, program, and placement decisions for individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally or linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Key Element 8: Teachers of special education collaborate with families and others in assessment of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

Standard Five: Learning Environment

Teachers of special education use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Key Element 1: Teachers of special education create a learning environment with clear expectations in which students learn self-discipline and self-determination.

Key Element 2: Teachers of special education use positive behavioral support strategies that encourage students with diverse abilities, interests, and backgrounds to participate actively and safely in learning the general curriculum.

Key Element 3: Teachers of special education establish and maintain rapport with students based on mutual respect, understanding of individual student differences, and open communication.

Key Element 4: Teachers of special education organize, design, and sustain a psychologically and socially safe, supportive environment conducive to learning challenging academic content.

Key Element 5: Teachers of special education demonstrate effective management of teaching and learning.
Key Element 6: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding the creation of learning environments that allow individuals to retain and appreciate their own and each other’s respective language and cultural heritage.

Key Element 7: Teachers of special education identify realistic expectations for personal and social behavior in various settings.

Key Element 8: Teachers of special education identify supports needed for integration into various program placements for students.

Key Element 9: Teachers of special education use the appropriate behavior management strategies consistent with the needs of the individual with exceptional learning needs.

Standard Six: Professionalism

Teachers of special education maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Key Element 1: Teachers of special education encourage effective collaboration and communication with team members to plan transition at all levels that encourages participation with communities, schools, administrators, general educators, parents, and other service providers.

Key Element 2: Teachers of special education maintain confidential communication about individuals with exceptional learning needs.

Key Element 3: Teachers of special education communicate effectively and in a timely manner with families of individuals with exceptional learning needs from diverse backgrounds when discussing instructional and functional goals and student progress.

Key Element 4: Teachers of special education collaborate with team members to plan transition at all levels that encourages full school and community participation.

Key Element 5: Teachers of special education are knowledgeable regarding concerns of families of individuals with exceptional learning needs and promote strategies to help address these concerns.

Key Element 6: Teachers of special education foster respectful and beneficial relationships between families and professionals and assist individuals with exceptional learning needs and their families in becoming active participants in the educational team.

Key Element 7: Teachers of special education reflect on what they teach, how they teach, and whom they teach. They keep abreast of current research-based practices in special education and continually seek to improve and enhance their knowledge and practice.
Key Element 8: Teachers of special education model professional and ethical standards as well as personal integrity in all interactions.

Key Element 9: Teachers of special education continually reflect on, evaluate, and seek to improve their practice.

Key Element 10: Teachers of special education take responsibility for and participate in meaningful and continuous professional development.

Key Element 11: Teachers of special education act ethically in advocating for appropriate services.

Key Element 12: Teachers of special education conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies.

Key Element 13: Teachers of special education demonstrate commitment to developing the highest education and quality-of-life potential of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

Key Element 14: Teachers of special education demonstrate sensitivity for individual differences.

Key Element 15: Teachers of special education obtain assistance as needed.

Key Element 16: Teachers of special education use verbal, nonverbal, and written language effectively.

Key Element 17: Teachers of special education engage in professional activities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs and their families, as well as educational colleagues.

Key Element 18: Teachers of special education effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications.

Standard One: Professional Knowledge

Teachers demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Key Element 1: Teachers understand how students learn and develop and provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. As I establish appropriate learning goals for my students, how can I consistently convey my belief in their ability to be successful learners?

B. How does my knowledge of the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of my students influence my plans for instruction?

C. What efforts have I made to accommodate my students’ differences in development and their diverse abilities and talents?

D. How do I acknowledge the language, values, and cultural traditions of my students’ families and communities in ways that build understanding and respect for others?

E. What evidence do I see that my students are actively engaged in learning and are making progress in taking responsibility for their own learning?

F. What do I do to help my students reflect the attitudes and behaviors of good citizenship at school and in the community?

Key Element 2: Teachers understand the central concepts, structures, and processes of the discipline(s) they teach and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful to all students.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How am I using national, state, and local standards within my content area(s)?

B. What new resources and techniques in my content area(s) am I using?

C. How do I stay abreast of current research, diverse perspectives, and new strategies within my discipline(s)?
D. How do I create learning experiences that allow students to integrate the knowledge, skills, and methods of inquiry used in the discipline and link them to prior learning?

**Key Element 3:** Teachers address appropriate curriculum standards and establish instructional goals that demonstrate a deep knowledge of their students and subject matter content.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do my instructional plans align with the Virginia Standards of Learning and my division’s curriculum scope and sequence?

B. What are relevant characteristics of my class that I need to consider when establishing my instructional goals?

C. How have I addressed the needs of individual students in my class in establishing my long- and short-term instructional goals?

D. What unique aspects of my discipline should I consider when determining the most effective ways of addressing curriculum standards?

**Standard Two: Instructional Planning**

*Teachers plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers design coherent instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. Have I aligned my instruction with the curriculum scope and sequence?

B. How have I encouraged my students to develop skills and understand concepts in addition to mastering facts?

C. When selecting resources and literature, how do I decide if they are relevant, appropriate, and sufficiently current to meet the needs of all of my students?

D. What connects this lesson to my students’ prior learning?

E. How do my lessons reflect the goals and needs of the school and community?
F. How do I link my students’ learning to their community beyond the school?

G. How do I make my lessons relevant to my students’ lives and experiences?

**Key Element 2: Teachers use the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in designing instruction that promotes student growth.**

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How have I sought the insight of parents in identifying their child’s strengths and needs that will help me plan instruction that is responsive to these strengths and needs?

B. What resources within my school and community have I tapped to support student learning?

C. What additional expertise might I seek to plan instruction that meets the needs of all of my students?

**Key Element 3: Teachers plan instruction to achieve objectives that reflect the Virginia Standards of Learning and division curriculum guidelines.**

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I ensure that my instruction aligns with division guidelines and the *Virginia Standards of Learning*?

B. How do the learning activities that I select or design connect to my stated instructional goals and objectives?

**Key Element 4: Teachers use student learning data to develop appropriate short- and long-range instructional plans and adjust plans based on student needs and changing circumstances.**

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What student learning data have I used to inform my short- and long-term instructional goals?

B. How do I adjust my instruction based on my current assessment of students’ mastery and understanding?

C. What do I know about my students’ strengths and needs that will help me choose appropriate instructional goals and strategies?
D. How do I use data about the achievement of my students to make instructional decisions?

**Key Element 5:** Teachers choose appropriate strategies, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of students and develop appropriate sequencing of learning experiences.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How have the developmental level and needs of my students influenced my plans for instruction?

B. What criteria do I use to select appropriate and challenging materials and media that are closely aligned with my instructional goals?

C. How do I ensure that my lessons are clear, logical, and sequential?

**Key Element 6:** Teachers collaborate with colleagues within and across content areas and grade levels to select and create learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, based on school improvement plans, relevant to learners, and based on principles of effective instruction.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How often do I meet with my content area/grade level colleagues to discuss my instructional plans?

B. How might I collaborate with colleagues within and across content areas/grade levels to ensure my instructional plans are appropriate for the curriculum goals of my subject and grade level and the school and division?

C. How am I sharing my instructional plans with others?

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

*Teachers effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*

**Key Element 1:** Teachers differentiate instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.
As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What sort of teaching strategies do I use to accommodate the diverse learning needs of my students?

B. What opportunities have I provided for students to explore concepts in varying degrees of depth, breadth, and complexity?

C. How do I build on my students’ strengths while developing all areas of competence?

D. What adaptations have I made to provide individuals with additional support while addressing the pacing of instruction for my students as a whole?

E. How have I collaborated with resource teachers to provide materials, resources, and activities to match the abilities of my students with special learning needs?

Key Element 2: Teachers implement, evaluate, and adapt multiple delivery methods and instructional strategies to actively engage students in learning and enhance student learning.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What kind of opportunities do I provide for students to interact with ideas, materials, teachers, and one another?

B. How do I vary my role in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to content and purposes of instruction and the needs of students?

C. How do I effectively structure questions to solicit comments, questions, examples, and feedback from students throughout my lessons?

D. What kind of activities do I use to provide guided and independent practice?

E. What do I do to encourage my students to ask questions and actively participate in class?

F. What do I do to encourage students to reflect on and assume responsibility for learning?

G. How do the materials and activities I select promote independent thinking and develop problem-solving skills among my students?

H. How do I foster academic curiosity and critical thinking in my students?

I. How do I use new and emerging technologies to support and promote student learning?

J. What do I do to foster student expression in speaking, writing, and other media?
**Key Element 3:** Teachers communicate clearly and regularly check for understanding.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How does my use of standard English, including correct vocabulary and grammar, positively impact my students’ learning?

B. How can I determine that I am communicating clear and concise learning goals, explanations, and directions to my students?

C. What techniques do I use to model effective communication as I convey ideas and information?

D. What do I do to monitor student understanding on an ongoing basis?

**Key Element 4:** Teachers know when and how to access and integrate resources to support student learning (e.g., field and educational experts, exceptional education specialists, language learner specialists, community organizations).

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What school and community resources are available to help support student learning?

B. Which of my students need additional support to be successful and where might I seek this support?

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

Teachers systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work independently and collaboratively to analyze and interpret multiple sources of data to identify student learning needs, to guide planning and instruction, and to assess the effectiveness of instruction.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do my instructional goals reflect individual student and school data available to me?

B. How do I design, adapt, or select appropriate assessments to address specific learning goals and individual differences?
C. What additional data do I need to effectively differentiate instruction in my classroom and how might I get these data?

D. What does the data tell me about the effectiveness of my instruction?

**Key Element 2:** Teachers communicate specific performance expectations and use a variety of assessment strategies to monitor and document student progress and to provide meaningful feedback to students and parents.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I ensure that my expectations for learning are communicated clearly to students and parents?

B. How do I ensure that my students, parents, and colleagues understand how I assess and report student progress?

C. What strategies do I use to prepare my students for the Virginia Standards of Learning tests and other standardized testing?

D. How do I determine if I am using a variety of assessments that align with the concepts and skills I have taught?

E. What criteria do I use to determine how I will assess my students’ work?

**Key Element 3:** Teachers engage students in understanding, identifying, and assuming responsibility for quality work and provide them with timely, frequent, and effective feedback to guide their progress toward that work.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What value does my feedback have in helping students improve and progress?

B. How do I model processes that guide students in assessing their own learning as well as the performance of others?

C. How quickly and frequently am I providing feedback to my students?
Key Element 4: Teachers set measurable and appropriate learning goals for students based on baseline data and accept responsibility for students achieving those goals.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I use the results of student assessments to evaluate and adjust my teaching?
B. How well am I preparing my students for the demands of various assessment formats?
C. What modifications of assessment formats and testing conditions do I make for English language learners, students with disabilities, and students who are above grade level?
D. How do I know if I am an effective teacher?

Standard Five: Learning Environment

Teachers use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Key Element 1: Teachers create a safe and positive learning environment.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How have I engaged students in developing and monitoring shared expectations for respectful interactions, thoughtful academic discussions, and individual and group responsibility for the learning environment in our classroom?
B. How do I ensure that my expectations for student behavior are communicated clearly to students, parents, and the community?
C. How do I ensure fairness and consistency in implementing disciplinary procedures?
D. What do I do to promote self-discipline and conflict resolution skills among my students?
E. How do I recognize and celebrate the achievements of my students?
Key Element 2: Teachers manage classroom procedures to maximize academic learning time to ensure continuous student engagement in learning.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How does my organization of my classroom support learning and safety and minimize disruptions?

B. How do classroom rules and procedures maximize efficient use of my students’ and my own time and effort?

C. How can I determine that I have engaged students’ attention? What strategies do I use to recapture or refocus students’ attention?

Key Element 3: Teachers develop and maintain rapport with students.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What steps do I take to ensure that my interactions with students are respectful?

B. How do I convey my personal enthusiasm for learning?

C. How do I model caring, fairness, a sense of humor, courtesy, respect, and active listening for my students?

D. How do I demonstrate concern for students’ emotional and physical well-being?

E. How do I incorporate information about students’ interests and opinions in my interactions with students?

Key Element 4: Teachers create for all students a respectful, supportive learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I encourage students to respect themselves and others?

B. How do I clearly communicate my expectations for appropriate interactions among students?

C. What do I do to encourage students to take pride in their work?

D. How do I enhance my students’ feelings of self-worth?
E. How do I know that my treatment of students is fair and equitable?

F. How do I promote multicultural awareness, gender sensitivity, and the appreciation for diversity among my students?

**Key Element 5:** Teachers collaborate with colleagues to develop consistent policies and procedures that create a school culture conducive to learning.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I work with my colleagues to ensure that the policies and practices in our classrooms contribute to a consistent and positive school culture that is conducive to learning?

B. How are we demonstrating to students that the adults in the building share a common vision and goals for their behavior and their learning?

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

Teachers maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, and take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work in partnership with families to promote student learning at home and in the school.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What forms of communication do I use to initiate and maintain effective communication with parents or guardians?

B. What do I do to encourage parents to participate in their child’s learning in and out of the classroom?

C. How do I share major instructional goals and report student progress and problems in a timely manner?

D. What strategies have I offered parents to enable them to assist in their children’s education?
**Key Element 2:** Teachers collaborate with administrators, colleagues, families, and community members to promote and support student success.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I encourage and support parental and community involvement in school activities?

B. How has my collaboration with administrators and colleagues led to better coordination and integration of learning goals and standards across classrooms and grade levels?

C. What do I do to support community partnerships that enhance learning?

D. How can I foster understanding and cooperation between school and community?

E. How do I work with administrators and colleagues in all subject areas to reinforce literacy skills and processes across the curriculum?

**Key Element 3:** Teachers model professional and ethical standards as well as personal integrity in all interactions.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How do I relate to administrators, colleagues, parents, and others in a manner that is clearly ethical and professional?

B. How do I attempt to resolve concerns and problems in a principled and constructive manner?

C. How do I represent the school/program in a responsible and productive manner within the community?

D. How will my personal appearance and demeanor reflect on me and my profession?

E. How do I work with others in the best interest of students, schools, and community?
**Key Element 4:** Teachers respect the privacy of students, families, colleagues, and administrators with whom they work, ensuring confidentiality of all sensitive information.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What information about my students and their families do I need to keep confidential to ensure their privacy?

B. How do I build an atmosphere of trust, mutual respect, and openness with colleagues?

C. How do I model discretion in all interactions with students, parents, colleagues, and administrators?

**Key Element 5:** Teachers continually reflect on, evaluate, and seek to improve their practice.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. What self-assessment and problem-solving strategies do I use to reflect on my practice?

B. How do I learn about new research on teaching and resources that are available for my professional learning?

C. What am I doing to develop and refine my teaching practices to meet the needs of my students?

D. How do I demonstrate that I am a self-directed learner who values critical thinking?

E. How do I incorporate reflection, self-assessment, and learning as part of my ongoing process of professional growth?

F. How can classroom observation, student information, and research help me assess and revise my practice?

G. How often do I engage in reflection, problem solving, and sharing new ideas and experiences with professional colleagues within the school and other professional arenas?
**Key Element 6:** Teachers take responsibility for and participate in a meaningful and continuous process of professional development.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following questions:

A. How will my participation in professional development activities benefit student learning?

B. How can I identify my strengths and weaknesses in order to set appropriate goals for my professional growth?

C. How do I learn about new developments and techniques, including technology, in my content area(s)?

**Key Element 7:** Teachers demonstrate consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

As teachers reflect on this key element, they may ask themselves the following question:

Do I effectively use standard oral and written English in all communications?
Part 14: The Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers: Supplemental Document B - Exemplar Format

**Standard One: Professional Knowledge**

Teachers demonstrate an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers understand how students learn and develop and provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. believe all children can be successful learners and are persistent in helping them reach appropriate learning goals.

B. incorporate knowledge and understanding of students’ physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development when making instructional decisions.

C. respect individual differences in development and encourage students’ diverse abilities and talents.

D. understand how family and community values, language, and culture influence learning and create a learning environment in which individual differences are respected and encouraged.

E. promote active involvement as students demonstrate, communicate, evaluate, and accept increasing responsibility for their own learning.

F. encourage students to develop the attitudes and behaviors of responsible citizenship at school and in the community.
**Key Element 2:** Teachers understands the central concepts, structures, and processes of the discipline(s) they teach and create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful to students.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. understand and use national, state, and local standards within content area(s).

B. use current, appropriate technology to access and deliver information within content area(s).

C. keep abreast of current research, diverse perspectives, and new strategies within their discipline(s).

D. create learning experiences that allow students to integrate the knowledge, skills, and methods of inquiry used in the discipline and link them to prior learning.

E. demonstrate accurate knowledge and skills relevant to the subject matter taught.

**Key Element 3:** Teachers address appropriate curriculum standards and established instructional goals that demonstrate a deep knowledge of their students and subject matter content.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. integrate key content elements when addressing appropriate curriculum standards.

B. use multiple representations and explanations of concepts that capture key ideas in the curriculum standards of the discipline.

C. base instruction on goals that reflect high expectations of their students and a thorough understanding of subject matter content and the Virginia Standards of Learning.
Standard Two: Instructional Planning

Teachers plan using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Key Element 1: Teachers design coherent instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. align instruction with curriculum scope and sequence.

B. select instructional goals that reflect high expectations and encourage mastery of facts, development of skills, and understanding of underlying concepts.

C. select and use appropriate literature, current and relevant resources, and materials that match the learning styles of individual students.

D. connect instruction to prior student learning.

E. reflect the goals and needs of the school and community in planning.

F. link student learning to the community.

G. make topics relevant to students’ lives and experiences.

H. adjust instruction based on current assessment of students’ mastery and understanding.

Key Element 2: Teachers use the input and contributions of families, colleagues, and other professionals in designing instruction that promotes student growth.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. seek the insight of parents in identifying their child’s strengths and needs in order to plan instruction that is responsive to these strengths and needs.

B. use resources within their school and community to support student learning.

C. seek expertise to plan instruction that meets the needs of all of their students.
**Key Element 3:** Teachers plan instruction to achieve objectives that reflect the Virginia Standards of Learning and division curriculum guidelines.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. align instruction with division guidelines and the Virginia Standards of Learning.

B. select or design learning activities that are clearly connected to instructional goals and objectives.

C. plan lessons that are clear, logical, and sequential.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers use student learning data to develop appropriate short- and long-range instructional plans and adjust plans based on student needs and changing circumstances.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. use data about the performance of individual students from ongoing assessments to make instructional decisions.

B. use knowledge of students to plan the allocation of time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.

C. choose appropriate instructional goals and strategies based on students’ strengths and needs.

D. adjust instructional plans based on student responses and other contingencies.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers choose appropriate strategies, resources, and materials to differentiate instruction for individuals and groups of students and develop appropriate sequencing of learning experiences.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. select appropriate and challenging materials and media that are closely aligned with instructional goals.
B. know a range of evidence-based instructional strategies, resources, and technological tools and how to use them effectively to plan instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners.

C. sequence learning experiences based on students’ prior knowledge, link new concepts to familiar concepts, and make connections to students’ experiences.

**Key Element 6: Teachers collaborate with colleagues within and across content areas and grade levels to select and create learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, based on school improvement plans, are relevant to learners, and based on principles of effective instruction.**

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. meet regularly with content area/grade level colleagues to discuss instructional plan.

B. collaborate with colleagues within and across content areas/grade levels to ensure instructional plans are appropriate for the curriculum goals of their subject and grade level and the school and division.

C. share their instructional plans with others.

**Standard Three: Instructional Delivery**

Teachers effectively engage students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

**Key Element 1: Teachers differentiate instruction to accommodate the learning needs of all students.**

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. plan instruction based on the developmental level and needs of all students.

B. use a variety of teaching strategies to meet the diverse learning needs of students.
C. provide students the opportunity to explore concepts in varying degrees of depth, breadth, and complexity.

D. build on students’ strengths while developing all areas of competence.

E. pace instruction to accommodate learning needs of the group while addressing individual needs with additional support.

F. collaborate with resource teachers to provide materials, resources, and activities to match the abilities of students with special learning needs.

**Key Element 2:** *Teachers implement, evaluate, and adapt multiple delivery methods and instructional strategies to actively engage students in learning and enhance student learning.*

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. provide opportunities for students to interact with ideas, materials, teachers, and one another.

B. encourage students to reflect on and assume responsibility for learning.

C. incorporate activities that promote independent thinking and develop problem-solving skills among students.

D. foster academic curiosity and critical thinking in students.

E. vary learning experiences by utilizing media and technology resources.

F. use questions effectively to solicit comments, questions, examples, and feedback from students throughout lessons.

G. provide guided and independent practice.

H. respond positively to student questions and active participation.
**Key Element 3:** Teachers communicate clearly and regularly check for understanding.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. use standard language, including correct vocabulary and grammar, and acceptable forms of oral and written expression.

B. provide clear and concise learning goals, explanations, and directions.

C. model effective communication when conveying ideas and information.

D. foster student expression in speaking, writing, and other media.

E. monitor student understanding on an ongoing basis.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers know when and how to access and integrate resources to support student learning (e.g., field and educational experts, exceptional education specialists, language learner specialists, community organizations).

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. access, as needed, school and community resources to help support student learning.

B. identify students who need additional support to be successful and seek that support within the school and community in a timely manner.

**Standard Four: Assessment of and for Student Learning**

Teachers systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work independently and collaboratively to analyze and interpret multiple sources of data to identify student learning needs, to guide planning and instruction, and to assess the effectiveness of instruction.
Exemplars:

Teachers

A. use individual student and school data to develop instructional goals.

B. design, adapt, or select appropriate assessments to address specific learning goals and individual differences.

C. use pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.

D. work with colleagues to analyze multiple sources of data to address the learning needs of individual students and the school.

E. use student achievement data to assess the effectiveness of instruction.

Key Element 2: Teachers communicate specific performance expectations and use a variety of assessment strategies to monitor and document student progress and to provide meaningful feedback to students and parents.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. communicate clear expectations for learning to students and parents.

B. monitor student understanding on an ongoing basis and adjust teaching when necessary.

C. use a variety of assessments that align with concepts and skills taught.

D. provide prompt and meaningful feedback to students.

E. assess and report student progress in a manner that is understandable to students, parents, and colleagues.

F. incorporate strategies to prepare students for the Virginia Standards of Learning and other standardized testing.

Key Element 3: Teachers engage students in understanding, identifying, and assuming responsibility for quality work and provide them with timely, frequent, and effective feedback to guide their progress toward that work.
Exemplars:

Teachers

A. model processes that guide students in assessing their own learning as well as the performance of others.

B. give constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

C. use assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes and explain the purpose and process of each.

Key Element 4: Teachers set measurable and appropriate learning goals for students based on baseline data and accept responsibility for students achieving those goals.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. take responsibility for aligning learning goals with instruction and assessment.

B. use the results of student assessments to evaluate and adjust teaching.

C. make modifications of assessment formats and testing conditions for English language learners, students with disabilities, and students who are above grade level.

D. accept responsibility for students’ growth.

Standard Five: Learning Environment

Teachers use resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Key Element 1: Teachers create a safe and positive learning environment.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. communicate clear expectations about behavior to students, parents, and community.
B. engage students in developing and monitoring shared expectations for respectful interactions, thoughtful academic discussions, and individual and group responsibility for the learning environment in the classroom.

C. implement disciplinary procedures with fairness and consistency.

D. encourage students to develop self-discipline and conflict resolution skills.

E. engage students’ attention and recapture or refocus as necessary.

F. recognize and celebrate the achievements of students.

**Key Element 2: Teachers manage classroom procedures to maximize academic learning time to ensure continuous student engagement in learning.**

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. organize the physical setting to minimize disruptions and promote learning and safety.

B. establish classroom rules and procedures that maximize efficient use of student and teacher time and effort.

**Key Element 3: Teachers develop and maintain rapport with students.**

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. treat students with respect.

B. communicate personal enthusiasm for learning.

C. model caring, fairness, a sense of humor, courtesy, respect, and active listening.

D. demonstrate concern for students’ emotional and physical well-being.

E. incorporate information about students’ interests and opinions.
**Key Element 4:** Teachers create for all students a respectful, supportive learning environment that encourages social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. encourage students to respect themselves and others.

B. communicate clear expectations for appropriate interactions among students.

C. encourage students to take pride in their work.

D. enhance students’ feelings of self-worth.

E. treat students fairly and equitably.

F. promote multicultural awareness, gender sensitivity, and appreciation for diversity.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers collaborate with colleagues to develop consistent policies and procedures that create a school culture conducive to learning.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. work with colleagues to develop consistent policies and practices in their classrooms that contribute to a positive school culture that is conducive to learning.

B. articulate a common vision and goals for student behavior and learning.

**Standard Six: Professionalism**

Teachers maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

**Key Element 1:** Teachers work in partnership with families to promote student learning at home and in the school.
Exemplars:

Teachers

A. initiate and maintain effective communications with parents or guardians using a variety of communication tools.

B. encourage parent participation in learning in and out of the classroom.

C. share major instructional goals and report student progress and problems in a timely manner.

D. offer strategies for parents to assist in their children’s education.

Key Element 2: Teachers collaborate with administrators, colleagues, families, and community members to promote and support student success.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. encourage and support parental and community involvement in school activities.

B. collaborate with administrators and colleagues to coordinate and integrate learning goals and standards across classrooms and grade levels.

C. support community partnerships that enhance learning.

D. foster understanding and cooperation between school and community.

E. work with administrators and colleagues in all subject areas to reinforce literacy skills and processes across the curriculum.

Key Element 3: Teachers model professional and ethical standards as well as personal integrity in all interactions.

Exemplars:

Teachers

A. relate to administrators, colleagues, parents, and others in an ethical and professional manner.
B. address concerns and problems in a principled and constructive manner.

C. represent the school/program in a responsible and productive manner.

D. maintain a professional demeanor and appearance.

E. work in the best interest of students, school, and community.

**Key Element 4:** Teachers respect the privacy of students, families, colleagues, and administrators with whom they work, ensuring confidentiality of all sensitive information.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. respect the privacy of families and treat information with the appropriate level of confidentiality.

B. shall disclose confidential information about individuals only when a compelling professional purpose is served or when required by law.

C. build an atmosphere of trust, mutual respect, and openness with colleagues.

D. handle information with integrity and honesty.

**Key Element 5:** Teachers continually reflect on, evaluate, and seek to improve their practice.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. use a variety of self-assessment and problem-solving strategies for reflecting on their practices.

B. remain current on major areas of research on teaching and on resources available for professional learning.

C. pursue, develop, and continually refine practices that address the individual needs of students.

D. value critical thinking and self-directed learning.

E. commit to reflection, self-assessment, and learning as an ongoing process.
F. use classroom observation, student information, and research as sources for assessing and revising practice.

G. engage in reflection, problem solving, and sharing new ideas and experiences with professional colleagues within the school and other professional arenas.

**Key Element 6:** Teachers take responsibility for and participate in a meaningful and continuous process of professional development.

**Exemplars:**

Teachers

A. participate in professional growth activities to enhance student learning.

B. identify strengths and weaknesses in professional skills and practice and set goals for improvement.

C. remain current regarding new developments and techniques, including technology, in their endorsed content area.

*The Virginia Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, religion, age, political affiliation, veteran status, or against otherwise qualified persons with disabilities in its programs and activities.*
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to provide the research base for the performance standards set forth in the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers. The Board of Education is required to establish performance standards and evaluation criteria for teachers, principals, and superintendents to serve as guidelines for school divisions to use in implementing educator evaluation systems. The Code of Virginia requires (1) that teacher evaluations be consistent with the performance objectives (standards) set forth in the Board of Education’s Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents and (2) that school boards’ procedures for evaluating instructional personnel address student academic progress.

Section 22.1-253.13:5 (Standard 5. Quality of classroom instruction and educational leadership) of the Code of Virginia states, in part, the following:

…B. Consistent with the finding that leadership is essential for the advancement of public education in the Commonwealth, teacher, administrator, and superintendent evaluations shall be consistent with the performance objectives included in the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Administrators, and Superintendents. Teacher evaluations shall include regular observation and evidence that instruction is aligned with the school's curriculum. Evaluations shall include identification of areas of individual strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for appropriate professional activities….

Section 22.1-295 (Employment of teachers) states, in part, the following:

…C. School boards shall develop a procedure for use by division superintendents and principals in evaluating instructional personnel that is appropriate to the tasks performed and addresses, among other things, student academic progress [emphasis added] and the skills and knowledge of instructional personnel, including, but not limited to, instructional methodology, classroom management, and subject matter knowledge.


The performance standards are used to collect and present data to document performance that is based on well-defined job expectations. The guidelines provide a balance between structure and flexibility and define common purposes and expectations, thereby guiding effective instructional practice. The performance standards also provide flexibility, encouraging creativity and individual teacher initiative. The goal is to support the continuous growth and development of each teacher by monitoring, analyzing, and applying pertinent data compiled within a system of meaningful feedback.
Purposes

The primary purposes of the teacher performance standards in the *Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Performance Criteria for Teachers* are to:

- optimize student learning and growth;
- improve the quality of instruction by ensuring accountability for classroom performance and teacher effectiveness;
- contribute to the successful achievement of the goals and objectives defined in the vision, mission, and goals of Virginia schools;
- provide a basis for instructional improvement through productive teacher performance appraisal and professional growth;
- implement a performance evaluation system that promotes collaboration between the teacher and the evaluator; and
- promote self-growth, instructional effectiveness, and improvement of overall job performance.

The performance standards for teachers include the following distinguishing characteristics:

- a focus on the relationship between professional performance and improved learner academic achievement;
- sample performance indicators for each of the teacher performance standards;
- a system for documenting teacher performance based on multiple data sources; and
- a procedure for conducting performance reviews that stresses accountability, promotes professional improvement, and increases the involvement of teachers in the evaluation process.
Defining Teacher Performance Standards

Clearly defined professional responsibilities constitute the foundation of the uniform performance standards for teachers. A fair and comprehensive evaluation system provides sufficient detail and accuracy so that both teachers and evaluators (i.e., principal, supervisor) reasonably understand the job expectations.

The term site administrator will be used for principals and supervisors. Additionally, a site administrator may designate an administrator to collect information on employee job performance. The site administrator remains informed of the assessment process and is responsible for the summative evaluation of the teachers.

The expectations for professional performance are defined using a two-tiered approach.

### Performance Standards

#### Performance Standards

Performance standards refer to the major duties performed by the teacher. For all teachers, there are seven performance standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Standard 6: Professionalism
The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress
The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators included in this document were developed to provide examples of observable, tangible behaviors (see Part 2). That is, the performance indicators are examples of the types of performance that will occur if a teaching standard is being met successfully. The list of performance indicators is not exhaustive. Further, all teachers are not expected to demonstrate each performance indicator.

Both teachers and evaluators should consult the sample performance indicators for clarification of what constitutes a specific performance standard. As an illustration, performance indicators for the Instructional Delivery standard are listed in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Sample of Performance Standard and Indicators

Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery
The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.

Sample Performance Indicators
Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.
3.2 Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
3.4 Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout lessons.
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
3.6 Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
3.7 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

The performance indicators are provided to help teachers and their evaluators clarify job expectations. As mentioned previously, all performance indicators may not be applicable to a particular work assignment. Performance ratings are NOT made at the performance indicator level, but at the performance standard level.
PART 1: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Teachers are evaluated on the performance standards using the performance appraisal rubrics at the bottom of each page in this section. The performance indicators are provided as samples of activities that address each standard.

Teachers are evaluated on the performance standards using the following performance appraisal rubrics:

Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

1.1 Effectively addresses appropriate curriculum standards.
1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students’ use of higher level thinking skills in instruction.
1.3 Demonstrates an ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.
1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject matter.
1.5 Demonstrates skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught.
1.6 Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations and an understanding of the subject.
1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.
1.8 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher consistently demonstrates extensive knowledge of the subject matter and continually enriches the curriculum.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates understanding of the curriculum, content, and student development or lacks fluidity in using the knowledge in practice.</td>
<td>The teacher bases instruction on material that is inaccurate or out-of-date and/or inadequately addresses the developmental needs of students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning

The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school’s curriculum and student learning needs.
2.5 Develops appropriate long- and short-range plans, and adapts plans when needed.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher actively seeks and uses alternative data and resources and consistently differentiates plans to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data in planning to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>The teacher does not plan, or plans without adequately using the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.
3.2 Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students’ needs.
3.4 Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout the lesson.
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies and resources.
3.6 Uses instructional technology to enhance student learning.
3.7 Communicates clearly and checks for understanding.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher optimizes students’ opportunity to learn by engaging them in higher order thinking and/or enhanced performance skills.</td>
<td>The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses instructional strategies that meet individual learning needs.</td>
<td>The teacher’s instruction inadequately addresses students’ learning needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

4.1 Uses pre-assessment data to develop expectations for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.

4.2 Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.

4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and for the student population.

4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and benchmarks.

4.5 Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes, and uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.

4.6 Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust students’ learning.

4.7 Gives constructive and frequent feedback to students on their learning.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher uses a variety of informal and formal assessments based on intended learning outcomes to assess student learning and teaches students how to monitor their own academic progress.</td>
<td>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.</td>
<td>The teacher uses a limited selection of assessment strategies, inconsistently links assessment to intended learning outcomes, and/or does not use assessment to plan/modify instruction.</td>
<td>The teacher uses an inadequate variety of assessment sources, assesses infrequently, does not use baseline or feedback data to make instructional decisions and/or does not report on student academic progress in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
**Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment**

*The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.*

**Sample Performance Indicators**

*Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:*

5.1 Arranges the classroom to maximize learning while providing a safe environment.

5.2 Establishes clear expectations, with student input, for classroom rules and procedures early in the school year, and enforces them consistently and fairly.

5.3 Maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions.

5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.

5.5 Promotes cultural sensitivity.

5.6 Respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.

5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students’ needs and responses.

5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.

**Performance Appraisal Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher creates a dynamic learning environment that maximizes learning opportunities and minimizes disruptions within an environment in which students self-monitor behavior.</td>
<td>The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</td>
<td>The teacher is inconsistent in using resources, routines, and procedures and in providing a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately addresses student behavior, displays a harmful attitude with students, and/or ignores safety standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.*
Performance Standard 6: Professionalism

The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students’ well-being and success.
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.
6.3 Incorporates learning from professional growth opportunities into instructional practice.
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills.
6.5 Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
6.6 Works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, other school personnel, and the community.
6.7 Builds positive and professional relationships with parents/guardians through frequent and effective communication concerning students’ progress.
6.8 Serves as a contributing member of the school’s professional learning community through collaboration with teaching colleagues.
6.9 Demonstrates consistent mastery of standard oral and written English in all communication.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher continually engages in high level personal/professional growth and application of skills, and contributes to the development of others and the well-being of the school.</td>
<td>The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently practices or attends professional growth opportunities with occasional application in the classroom.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates inflexibility, a reluctance and/or disregard toward school policy, and rarely takes advantage of professional growth opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
Note: Performance Standard 7-Student Academic Progress: If a teacher effectively fulfills all previous standards, it is likely that the results of teaching -- as documented in Standard 7 -- would be positive. The Virginia teacher evaluation system includes the documentation of student academic growth as indicated within Standard 7 and recommends that the evidence of progress be reviewed and considered throughout the year.

Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress
The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Sample Performance Indicators

Examples of teacher work conducted in the performance of the standard may include, but are not limited to:

7.1 Sets acceptable, measurable and appropriate achievement goals for student academic progress based on baseline data.

7.2 Documents the progress of each student throughout the year.

7.3 Provides evidence that achievement goals have been met, including the state-provided growth measure when available as well as other multiple measures of student growth.

7.4 Uses available performance outcome data to continually document and communicate student academic progress and develop interim learning targets.

Performance Appraisal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing/Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the standard, the work of the teacher results in a high level of student achievement with all populations of learners.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher results in student academic progress that does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher.</td>
<td>The work of the teacher does not achieve acceptable student academic progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers who are exemplary often serve as role models and/or teacher leaders.
PART 2: RESEARCH BASE FOR PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Performance Standards and Professional Organizations

The revised *Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers* are aligned with professional organization standards for teacher performance and evaluation. Although there is a high degree of alignment of the uniform performance standards for teachers with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)\(^1\) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) standards, INTASC and NBPTS do not include measures of student academic progress in their standards/core propositions.

Research Base for Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge

*The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.*

Classroom teaching is a complex activity that is cognitively demanding. Essential teacher knowledge includes content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, curricular knowledge, knowledge of learners, and knowledge of culture and educational purposes at large.

Content knowledge, the disciplinary understanding of the subject taught, exerts a significant influence on a teacher’s classroom behavior. Various studies suggest that teachers with stronger content knowledge are more likely to use practices that can help students construct and internalize knowledge, such as:

- Asking higher-level questions;
- Encouraging students to explore alternative explanations;
- Involving students in more inquiry-based learning;
- Allowing more student-directed activities; and
- Engaging students in the lessons.\(^2\)

Effective teaching resides not simply in the knowledge a teacher has accrued, but also in how this knowledge is translated into student learning in classrooms.\(^3\) For instance, teachers highly proficient in mathematics or writing will help others learn mathematics or writing only if they are able to use their own knowledge to enact learning activities that are appropriate to students. Therefore, a teacher’s subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge are complementary and interdependent. These two knowledge categories were synthesized by what Shulman called “pedagogical content knowledge,” which he defined as “the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction.”\(^4\)
Studies that examined the effects of teachers’ subject matter knowledge and/or pedagogical knowledge on students’ academic achievement often used simple survey questions, teachers’ college course-taking, and majors to measure teacher knowledge. Figure 2 provides a brief summary of selected key studies that examine the association between teacher knowledge and student learning.

**Figure 2. Key references for effects of teacher subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Knowledge Base Examined</th>
<th>Measured By</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Rowan, &amp; Ball&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Teachers’ mathematical knowledge significantly contributes to student mathematics learning, after controlling for other key student- and teacher-related characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan, Chiang &amp; Miller&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td>Survey and college major</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Students whose teachers answered the mathematics quiz item correctly achieved more in mathematics than did those whose teachers answered the question wrong. Students whose teachers majored in mathematics at the undergraduate and/or graduate level achieved more than those whose teachers did not, although the effect was quite small, SD=.015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhaber &amp; Brewer&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Content knowledge</td>
<td>College major</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Students learn more from teachers with majors in mathematics than students whose teachers had majors in nonmathematics subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td>College coursework</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Mathematics and science</td>
<td>The amount of college-level mathematics or science courses taken by teachers had a positive effect on student learning gains. The effects of pedagogical coursework are more stable over time than the effects of subject matter preparation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A research synthesis by Rice concluded that coursework in both pedagogy and content area has a positive impact on student achievement in middle and high school education, primarily for mathematics.<sup>9</sup> Pedagogical coursework seems to contribute to teacher effectiveness at both elementary and secondary levels, but the importance of content coursework appears to be more
salient at the secondary level. More fine-grained instruments need to be developed to measure teacher job-related knowledge and its effects on student achievement.10

The professional knowledge of effective teachers reaches beyond merely the knowledge of subject matter (content knowledge) and instructional strategies (pedagogical knowledge); indeed, professional knowledge also encompasses an understanding of students and environmental contexts.11 Effective teachers often use their knowledge of their students -- for instance, knowledge of students’ learning ability, prior achievement, cultural background, and personal interests -- to decide what and how to teach. Based on this expansive knowledge, teachers can anticipate the conceptions, misconceptions, and possible difficulties their students are likely to encounter while learning particular content.

**Research Base for Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning**

_The teacher plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school’s curriculum, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students._

**The Process of Planning**

**What Should Be Taught?** Effective student learning requires a progressive and coherent set of learning objectives. State/national standards and school district/division curricula can point out the generic domains of subject content to be covered. However, it is the teacher’s responsibility in virtually every classroom to delineate the intended outcomes of each lesson and to describe the skills that students should be able to perform after participating in the learning activities.

In deciding what should be taught, expert teachers often utilize prescribed textbooks, but they hardly ever follow traditional plans. In fact, they frequently have a blueprint in their minds that has been formed and re-formed over time. Perhaps because of their expertise gained over time through a constant process of planning-reflection-refining, these expert teachers are much less prone to rely on written, formalized lessons than on their well-formed and fluid mental planning model.12

Additionally, as effective teachers consider what to teach, they typically reach beyond prepared materials. For instance, while planning for a lesson in social science, effective teachers use historical fiction, biography, information on the Internet and in magazines, and other nontraditional content sources. Leinhardt found that expert teachers and novice teachers have a different “agenda” for their daily instruction.13 Agenda is defined as an operational plan that is concise, focused, and descriptive of the intended goals and actions in which the teacher seeks to engage the students during the instructional time. Particularly, Leinhardt noticed that expert teachers conceive a lesson along two dimensions simultaneously:

1) the teacher’s own actions, thoughts, and habits; and

2) the students’ thinking and understanding of the content.

Thus, effective teachers not only plan what to teach, but more importantly, they plan for whom they are going to teach. They exert effort to reach beyond their comfort zone of disciplinary thinking and actions to incorporate their students’ learning preferences and readiness levels.
**How Should It Be Taught?** Once the learning objectives are developed, evidence suggests that expert teachers are more competent in translating their instructional plans into actions than non-expert teachers. Additionally, effective teachers follow the predefined plan while remaining open to changes and continuously adjusting their instruction based on student needs. Further, expert teachers anticipate the difficulties students might encounter while learning the content of the lesson. They consider students’ thinking in order to assess the success of the lesson plan and then modify their instruction promptly.

Having a lesson plan cannot ensure that the actual lesson will be implemented as what is prescribed. Human behavior, either of the teachers or of the students in the classroom, cannot be predicted accurately as a phenomenon in the hard sciences. As any effective teacher or administrator knows, the classroom is full of ebbs and flows. Consequently, teachers need to tap into their pedagogical and content resources in a fluid and flexible manner in order to proceed smoothly -- and successfully.

**How Should Instruction and Student Learning Be Assessed?** When the learning objectives are set up, in addition to aligning activities to them, teachers also need to link the assessment plan to the learning objective. Alignment of curriculum, learning activities, and assessment is integral to any instructional design. (This type of alignment is referred to as “Opportunity to Learn.”) Before the actual instruction begins, teachers need to decide upon valid and reliable assessment techniques that are available to solicit student learning data and to judge the success of the instructional plan. Additionally, teachers should communicate to their students about what they are expected to achieve and inform them about how they will be assessed after participating in the learning activities.

**Pacing Guides as a Planning Tool.** Teachers must consider a variety of factors when planning instruction, including how to pace the actual delivery in the classroom. The feasibility of a particular lesson largely depends on student ability and variation, content goals and mandated objectives, time and material resources, and so forth. Many of these factors present teachers with constraints that are beyond their immediate control. For example, there is a prescribed, fixed amount of time each day in which formal instruction may occur. Typically, hours of the day are chunked into units that are dedicated to the study of a certain subject or discipline as determined by a legislative body, school board, or a school administrator. Within those chunks of time, however, teachers traditionally have enjoyed a great deal of flexibility and autonomy. That is, what they did with class time was largely up to them. Over the past decade that flexibility has begun to wane -- a by-product of high-stakes testing. Teachers report a narrowing of the curriculum that focuses on tested items and breadth of content while sacrificing depth.

Many school districts/divisions require teachers to follow strict pacing guides which prescribe how much time to spend on certain lessons or concepts. Pacing guides are intended to be instruments that teachers use to measure the amount of instructional time devoted to certain topics in light of the total content that must be taught. Properly used, pacing guides are tools to steer daily instructional decisions within the context of the entire curriculum. Used improperly, however, pacing guides unduly restrict the proper ebb and flow of the classroom and restrict the instructional pace regardless of student ability. On this topic, one writer stated:

Pacing guides are not an inherently bad idea. Their effects depend on their design and how district and school leaders use them. The best pacing guides emphasize curriculum guidance
instead of prescriptive pacing; these guides focus on central ideas and provide links to exemplary curriculum material, lessons, and instructional strategies.¹⁷

Thus, pacing, if used wisely, can be an important component of instructional planning. It allows teachers to see the curriculum in its entirety and to avoid the trap of overemphasizing one area of content at the expense of others. Because instructional time with students is fixed, teachers must value class time; pacing can help with this important planning consideration.

**Data-driven Aspects of Planning.** All of the attributes of instructional planning require the use of data, either implicitly or explicitly. However, in terms of using data in planning, a central concern to consider is the proper use of proper data.¹⁸ Simply claiming “data-based” does not improve practice. Rather, we must:

- gather pertinent data (i.e., quantitative and qualitative information);
- distill the real meaning of these data (i.e., What does the information tell us about teaching and learning?);
- aptly apply the information to improve and sustain good practice; and then
- improve results.

“Data-driven decision-making does not simply require good data; it also requires good decisions.”¹⁹

**Research Base for Performance Standard 3: Instructional Delivery**

_The teacher effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs_

Students arrive at school with a variety of backgrounds, interests, and abilities. This means that a one-size-fits-all approach to instruction is ineffective, probably counterproductive, and perhaps even unethical. If the goal of instruction is to provide an opportunity for all students to learn, then the instructional practices that teachers choose to employ in the classroom matter -- and matter greatly.²⁰ In an analysis of educational productivity in the United States and other countries, teacher classroom instruction was identified as one of the most significant variables that has great effect on student affective, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes.²¹ Good quality instruction positively and directly affects student achievement. For instance, the instructional practice of reinforcement has a magnitude of 1.17 standard deviations on educational outcomes. And the effect of cues, engagement, and corrective feedback, each, is approximately one standard deviation. Personalized and adaptive instruction, tutoring, and diagnostic-prescriptive methods also have strong effects on student learning, with effect sizes of .57, .45, .40, and .33, respectively.²²
Student Engagement

Instead of using uniform strategies for all students, effective teachers design instruction that motivates each student and they communicate content in such a way that students are able to comprehend based on their individual prior learning and ability. Because students learn in a variety of ways and at a variety of rates, teachers should deliver their lessons with appropriate variety in order to maximize student engagement. One tool that can be helpful in sustaining high levels of student engagement is to connect to the ways individual students learn. A meta-analysis of the extant research suggests that instruction based on learning styles is positively related to student attitudes and achievement. Dunn, et al., extended this finding to at-risk students, reporting that mean achievement increased nearly one standard deviation (i.e., approximately 84th percentile versus 50th percentile) when teachers accommodated for learning styles.

Implementing a variety of classroom techniques and strategies also enhances student motivation and decreases discipline problems. Furthermore, differentiated instruction enables teachers to adjust their curriculum, materials, learning activities, and assessment techniques to ensure that all students in a mixed-ability classroom can have different avenues to process new knowledge and develop skills, while having equal access to high-quality learning.

Another essential aspect of effective instruction that helps build and sustain student engagement is relevance of the instruction. Making instruction relevant to real-world problems is among the most powerful instructional practices a teacher can use to increase student learning. This kind of instruction allows students to explore, inquire, and meaningfully construct knowledge of real problems that are relevant to their lives. Moreover, students are motivated and engaged when their learning is authentic, especially when the real-world tasks performed have personalized results.

Questioning can be another highly effective instructional tool when used properly. In particular, the types of questions asked, wait time, and types of responses play a role in the propitious use of questioning. Unfortunately, there are substantial differences in the adept use of questioning between effective teachers and ineffective teachers. On the negative side, in a study of mathematics classrooms Craig and Cairo found that teachers ask more than 99 percent of the questions. They also found that teachers tended to provide little wait time, asked recall and use questions, and designated a particular student to answer a question. On the positive side, in one case study the researchers found that teachers deemed effective asked approximately seven times higher cognitive-level questions than those considered ineffective. Selected instructional practices exhibited by effective teachers are noted in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Selected Instructional Practices Employed by Effective Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The effective teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• stays involved with the lesson at all stages so that adjustments can be made based on feedback from the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• uses a variety of instructional strategies, as no one strategy is universally superior with all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• uses research-based strategies to enhance the time students spend with teachers by making instruction student-centered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effective teacher: (continued)

- involves students in appropriate and challenging learning activities, such as cooperative learning, to enhance higher order thinking skills.\(^{33}\)
- knows that instructional strategies that use students’ prior knowledge in an inquiry-based, hands-on format facilitate student learning.\(^{34}\)
- uses remediation, skills-based instruction, and differentiated instruction to meet individual student’s learning needs.\(^{35}\)
- uses multiple levels of questioning aligned with students’ cognitive abilities with appropriate techniques.\(^{36}\)

There is no single classroom practice that is necessarily effective with all subject matter and all grade levels.\(^{37}\) Effective instruction involves a dynamic interplay among content to be learned, pedagogical methods applied, characteristics of individual learners, and the context in which the learning is to occur.\(^{38}\) Ultimately, subject matter knowledge, pedagogical skills, and an inspiration for instructional innovation and development can liberate individual teachers to explore the diversification and richness of daily practice.

Research Base for Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning

The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the school year.

High quality assessment can produce valid information about students’ learning outcomes and provide insight into the effectiveness of teachers’ instruction. Research has indicated that teachers who introduce formative assessment into their classroom practice can affect substantial achievement gains. In their 1998 research review, Black and Wiliam examined a multitude of empirical studies to determine whether improvement in classroom assessments can lead to improvement in learning.\(^{39}\) They found that formative assessment has substantial positive effects on student achievement, with effect size ranging from 0.3 to 0.7 standard deviations. Particularly, they found that formative assessment is more effective for low achievers than for other students, thus, reducing an achievement gap while raising achievement overall at the same time.\(^{40}\)

Assessments are more likely to have a positive influence on student learning when they exhibit the characteristics noted in Figure 4.

---

**Figure 4. Assessment Characteristics that Positively Influence Student Learning**

Assessments are more likely to influence student learning when they:

- are aligned with the framework of learning targets and instruction.
- are of sufficient validity and reliability to produce an accurate representation of student learning.
- are accompanied with frequent informative feedback, rather than infrequent judgmental feedback.
Assessments are more likely to influence student learning when they: (continued)

- involve students deeply in classroom review and monitoring.
- emphasize testing processes and results.
- communicate in a timely and effective manner.
- are documented through proper record keeping of learning results.

Students as well as teachers have strong beliefs about the importance of feedback. Students report that informative feedback makes them aware of their mistakes, highlights ways to make corrections, and informs them of teacher expectations. Teachers report that providing feedback can be arduous and painstaking, but also they feel that it is an important part of instruction.

As noted earlier, there are multiple methods for assessing student learning. Guskey found that teachers and administrators believed student portfolios were the most important type of assessment tool used to measure student learning, while division, state, and national assessments ranked the lowest. Interestingly, homework ranked in the middle of Guskey’s analysis of assessment types. Regardless of the type of assessment used, the more important issue is the practical value of the assessment in use. Tomlinson suggested that teachers must find a proper fit between students and the method being used to assess their learning. Assessment, she posited, is a form of communication. Teachers must allow students to communicate their learning in a manner best suited to their needs.

Given the prevalence of standardized assessments at the state, regional, and national levels, in the United States and in numerous countries around the globe, a brief comment on this particular type of assessment seems in order. The extant literature has documented both positive and negative impacts of standardized assessments on teachers’ instruction and assessment at the classroom level. The positive evidence indicates that standardized tests motivate teachers to:

- align their instruction to standards;
- maximize instructional time;
- work harder to cover more material in a given amount of instructional time; and
- adopt a better curriculum or more effective pedagogical methods.

However, other research reveals that high-stakes assessments encourage teachers to:

- narrow the curriculum;
- focus on memorization, drills, and worksheets;
- allocate less time to higher-order skills; and
- restrict their teaching to formulated approaches of instruction.

Teachers should maintain a balance between state/national level assessments and classroom level assessments to optimize student learning.
Research Base for Performance Standard 5: Learning Environment

The teacher uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.

Effective teachers must be proficient in creating a positive classroom environment for learning, otherwise learning -- at least the intended learning -- will not occur. A review of research connecting learning environment and student achievement emphasizes a number of key dimensions, including classroom management and structure, positive classroom climate, and classroom talk.

Classroom Management and Structure

Teachers who emphasize structure in the classroom are more effective than those who do not. In general, structure means “an aggregate of elements of an entity in their relationships to each other.” For our purposes in education, specifically, structure involves physically orienting the classroom for instruction, preparing and organizing materials, and framing lessons in a coherent and logical manner.

Effective teachers implement good classroom management to establish order, maintain safety, engage students, and elicit student cooperation with an ultimate purpose to establish and maintain an environment conducive to instruction and learning. The extant research is fairly clear that good classroom management has a positive influence on students’ motivational development.

A study conducted by one team of researchers found that students’ perception of rule clarity and teacher monitoring are positively related to their development of academic interest in secondary school mathematics classes. Another empirical study revealed that the top quartile teachers (i.e., the most effective teachers as identified by the high academic achievement of the students they taught) were more organized with efficient routines and procedures for daily tasks, and they communicated higher behavioral expectations to students than ineffective teachers. The top teachers also were found to have less disruptive student behaviors (on average, once every two hours) than do the less effective teachers (on average, once every 12 minutes). Another research team noted that teachers who spend more time establishing instructional routines at the beginning of the school year did not need to exert as much effort on similar tasks later in the year. The investment in initial organizational strategies yielded significant gains in reading scores throughout the year. In comparison, achievement gains were lower among students whose teachers did not demonstrate similar organization skills.

Positive Classroom Climate

Effective teachers build a classroom climate where error (i.e., risk taking) is welcomed, where student questioning is high, where engagement is the norm, and where students can gain reputations as effective learners. Wang, Haertel, and Walberg analyzed a knowledge base representing 11,000 statistical findings about student achievement in order to answer the question, What helps students learn? They found classroom instruction and climate was the second most influential factor among six identified types of influence, second only to, but nearly
as prominent as, student aptitude. Based on this research synthesis, classroom climate refers to the socio-psychological dimensions of classroom life.55

Teachers who make the effort to engage in positive interactions with students make a difference in the academic and social development of their students. A constructive interaction with students is a motivator for students to act in accordance with the expectation of their teacher. Studies by Ladd and by Furrer and Skinner confirmed that low student achievement can result from stressful student-adult relationships, while positive relationships can lead to higher levels of student participation and engagement.56 Teacher interactions with students have been found to have effects at all grade levels. Hamre and Pianta found that first grade teachers who engaged in positive interactions with at-risk students reduced the probability of those students experiencing failure in the early grades.57 Barney found that middle school students developed a more positive attitude toward course content when their teachers took the time to interact with them.58 Pressley, Raphael, Gallagher, and DiBella found that secondary teachers who got to know their students personally were able to work with them to develop and achieve goals.59

Classroom Talk

The interaction between teacher and students, and among students, is another significant indicator of learning environment. Authority is more distributed than centralized through the communication that happens in a positive classroom environment. Additionally, the talk between teacher and student is personalized. Exemplary teachers have been found to use authentic conversation to learn about students and encourage students to engage their peer’s ideas.60

In summary, key features for these three attributes are detailed in Figure 5.

*Figure 5: Summary of Selected Features of Positive Learning Environment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Learning Environment Attributes</th>
<th>Features of Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management and structure</td>
<td>• identifying and communicating desirable behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistently applying rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• monitoring student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• taking preventive rather than reactive management actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pacing class activities and transitioning between tasks smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• maximizing instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• keeping students on tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• making learning meaningful61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive classroom climate</td>
<td>• cooperation among teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• common interest and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pursuit of common goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a clear academic focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• well-organized and well-planned lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• explicit learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate level of task difficulty for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate instructional pace62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Teachers’ daily practice is grounded in the beliefs, values, and attitudes they hold toward the profession, the students, the schools, and themselves. To illustrate, caring about students is one of the most widely documented personal qualities of effective teachers. Effective teachers often are described as warm, friendly, and caring; conversely, ineffective teachers often are said to create a tense classroom and are described as cold, abusive, and uncaring. When students perceive that their teachers care about them, they respond by “optimizing their commitment to learning and putting forth greater efforts to reach their potential.”

Additional examples of how teachers impact school success -- and their own success -- through their professional demeanor and ethical treatment of others might include a personal quality as simple as attitude. In particular, enthusiasm and motivation are two essential attitudes that impact teacher effectiveness and, ultimately, student achievement. Even teachers’ enthusiasm for the teaching profession has positive effects on their instructional behaviors. Teachers who are more enthusiastic about teaching exhibit higher quality instructional behavior, such as monitoring student learning, providing students with more cognitive autonomy support, offering more social support to students, and using higher levels of cognitive challenge. Teacher motivation also is expressed in a range of teacher behaviors that are perceived to be conducive to student learning, such as enthusiasm in content area taught, interest about students’ personal and developmental needs, participation in content-related activities outside of class time, and the display of value and emotion for students.

Teachers who demonstrate care and concern toward their students are perceived more positively and, in fact, are more effective and, as with the personal quality of caring, other qualities such as fairness and respect have a positive impact on the teacher’s bearing and effectiveness within the school community.

Clearly, an ethic of care and, more broadly, an ethic of working within the context of ethical, legal, and professional standards of conduct, is a key component of professionalism. Additionally, teachers are held to a high standard of personal and professional conduct, due largely to the fact that they are viewed as exemplars of behavior for the students they teach. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has stated that a “teacher serves as a role model for ... students, exerting a subtle but important influence over their perceptions and values.” Consequently, a teacher’s behavior that jeopardizes student welfare can be justification for dismissal. More to the point, if a nexus exists between a teacher’s personal and professional life that harms students or a school’s ability to operate effectively and efficiently, then that teacher has violated the ethical principles of teaching to the extent that dismissal often is justified. Guidelines for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Learning Environment Attributes</th>
<th>Features of Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom talk</td>
<td>• respectful, supportive, and productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• modeled by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• practiced with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Base for Performance Standard 6: Professionalism

The teacher maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.

Teachers’ daily practice is grounded in the beliefs, values, and attitudes they hold toward the profession, the students, the schools, and themselves. To illustrate, caring about students is one of the most widely documented personal qualities of effective teachers. Effective teachers often are described as warm, friendly, and caring; conversely, ineffective teachers often are said to create a tense classroom and are described as cold, abusive, and uncaring. When students perceive that their teachers care about them, they respond by “optimizing their commitment to learning and putting forth greater efforts to reach their potential.”

Additional examples of how teachers impact school success -- and their own success -- through their professional demeanor and ethical treatment of others might include a personal quality as simple as attitude. In particular, enthusiasm and motivation are two essential attitudes that impact teacher effectiveness and, ultimately, student achievement. Even teachers’ enthusiasm for the teaching profession has positive effects on their instructional behaviors. Teachers who are more enthusiastic about teaching exhibit higher quality instructional behavior, such as monitoring student learning, providing students with more cognitive autonomy support, offering more social support to students, and using higher levels of cognitive challenge. Teacher motivation also is expressed in a range of teacher behaviors that are perceived to be conducive to student learning, such as enthusiasm in content area taught, interest about students’ personal and developmental needs, participation in content-related activities outside of class time, and the display of value and emotion for students.

Teachers who demonstrate care and concern toward their students are perceived more positively and, in fact, are more effective and, as with the personal quality of caring, other qualities such as fairness and respect have a positive impact on the teacher’s bearing and effectiveness within the school community.

Clearly, an ethic of care and, more broadly, an ethic of working within the context of ethical, legal, and professional standards of conduct, is a key component of professionalism. Additionally, teachers are held to a high standard of personal and professional conduct, due largely to the fact that they are viewed as exemplars of behavior for the students they teach. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has stated that a “teacher serves as a role model for ... students, exerting a subtle but important influence over their perceptions and values.” Consequently, a teacher’s behavior that jeopardizes student welfare can be justification for dismissal. More to the point, if a nexus exists between a teacher’s personal and professional life that harms students or a school’s ability to operate effectively and efficiently, then that teacher has violated the ethical principles of teaching to the extent that dismissal often is justified. Guidelines for
determining adverse impact on students includes such factors as the age and maturity of the students, the proximity of the teacher’s conduct, the teacher’s motivation, extenuating or aggravating circumstances, and the likelihood of the conduct being repeated.71

**Professionalism and Professional Growth**

Another key attribute of professionalism is a commitment to continuous improvement and perpetual learning. Interestingly, effective teachers monitor and strengthen the connection between their own development and students’ development.72 Evidence indicates that teachers who receive substantial professional development can help students achieve more. For example, based on the findings of one meta-analysis, teachers who received substantial professional development (in this instance, 49 hours) boosted their students’ achievement about 21 percentile points, and this effect size is fairly consistent across content areas.73

**Professionalism and Contributing to the Learning Community**

Effective teachers act individually and collectively to advance the teaching profession, and act as shapers, promoters, and well-informed critics of educational policies, instructional innovations, and internal changes that impact on student learning.74 A teacher can contribute to the teaching profession by engaging in various types of study, inquiry, and even experimentation to develop personal best practices. Individually, teachers are powerful resources to enrich the professional knowledge base about academic standards, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment by reflecting and sharing experiences of “what works” and “what does not work.” Collectively, teachers can network with professional associations and collaborate with social/business agencies to advance overall school improvement.75 Ultimately, effective teachers contribute substantially to fostering, supporting, and sustaining a learning community in which all members of the school -- including students and teachers -- are actively engaged in ongoing learning.

Figure 6 summarizes selected research findings regarding the importance of professionalism for teacher effectiveness.

*Figure 6. Teacher Effectiveness and Professional Behaviors and Dispositions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional behaviors of effective teachers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage linking professional growth goals to professional development opportunities.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empower teachers to make changes to enhance learning experiences, resulting in better student retention, attendance, and academic success.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasize selecting professional development offerings that relate to the content area or population of students taught, resulting in higher levels of student academic success.78 For example, science teachers with professional development in laboratory skills have students who outperform their peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage cognizance of the legal issues associated with educational records, and respect and maintain confidentiality.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Base for Performance Standard 7: Student Academic Progress

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable, and appropriate student academic progress.

Numerous studies conducted in the United States and in other countries have documented the fact that effective teachers have a significant impact on student achievement. The research consistently has concluded that students in effective teachers’ classrooms make academic growth that is larger than what is projected based on longitudinal data. Figure 7 provides a summary of selected key findings drawn from relevant empirical studies.

Figure 7. Summary Findings of the Relationship between Student Progress and Teacher Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Highly effective teachers generally were effective in helping all students make progress, regardless of their prior achievement levels, while ineffective teachers were found to be ineffective with all students. Teachers with average effectiveness facilitated achievement gains with lower achieving students, but not with higher student achievers.  

  - Teacher effects on student academic gains are cumulative and residual.

  - Variations in teacher quality account for at least 7.5 percent of the total variation in measured achievement gains.

  - Teachers contributed to 3 percent to 10 percent of the variability in student gain score, while controlling for student prior achievement and background characteristics.

  - Teachers who were highly effective in producing higher-than-expected student achievement gains (top quartile) in one end-of-course content test (reading, mathematics, science, social studies) tended to produce top quartile residual gain scores in all four content areas. Teachers who were ineffective (bottom quartile) in one content area tended to be ineffective in all four content areas. |

At a macro level, effective teachers help their students achieve greater than what is predicted for them on summative, standardized assessments. At a micro level, effective teachers provide instruction and support that leads to quality learning opportunities on a day-to-day basis. For example, based on a large-scale research review, Hattie found that compared to their ineffective colleagues, effective teachers are adept at monitoring student problems and assessing their level of understanding and progress, and they provide much more relevant, useful feedback. The research also shows that effective teachers are more adept at developing and testing hypotheses about learning difficulties or instructional strategies. Additionally, an experimental study reached the following conclusions for teachers who monitored their students’ growth on a regular basis:

- They effected greater student achievement than those who used conventional monitoring methods.
- They had more improvement in their instructional structure.
• Their pedagogical decisions reflected greater realism and responsiveness to student progress.

• Their students were more knowledgeable about their own learning and more conscious of learning goals and progress.86

Student progress monitoring is a technique that can provide teachers with data on students’ performance to evaluate the effectiveness of their instruction and make adjustments in their pedagogical behavior. Progress monitoring also can help teachers set meaningful student achievement goals to tap into greater student learning potential. Teachers who use progress monitoring also are better informed of the strengths and weaknesses in student learning and can better decide on what instructional modifications are necessary. Stecker, Fuchs, and Fuchs noted that teachers effected significant growth in student learning with progress monitoring only when they modified instruction based on progress monitoring data; however, frequent progress monitoring alone did not boost student achievement.87
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Background Information:

The Board of Education’s authority for approving textbooks and other instructional materials is prescribed in the Virginia Constitution and in the Code of Virginia.

Virginia Constitution, Article VIII, § 5 (d)
It [the Board of Education] shall have authority to approve textbooks and instructional aids and materials for use in courses in the public schools of the Commonwealth.

Code of Virginia, § 22.1-238
A. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks suitable for use in the public schools and shall have authority to approve instructional aids and materials for use in the public schools. The Board shall publish a list of all approved textbooks on its website and shall list the publisher and the current lowest wholesale price of such textbooks.
B. Any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board.
C. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "textbooks" means print or electronic media for student use that serve as the primary curriculum basis for a grade-level subject or course.
The Board of Education’s current textbook regulations specify the types of materials that may be approved.

*Regulations Governing Textbook Adoption, 8 VAC 20-220-30*

Only those materials which are designed to provide basic support for the instructional program of a particular content area at an appropriate level will be adopted.

On September 23, 2010, the Board took final action to approve revised regulations regarding textbooks that will supersede those currently in effect. The revised regulations are currently undergoing the provisions of the Administrative Process Act (APA) and will become effective at the conclusion of that process. The proposed regulations were approved by the Attorney General’s office on November 23, 2010, and by the Department of Planning and Budget on December 6, 2010. They are currently under review by the Secretary of Education’s office, and will need to be reviewed by the Governor’s Office. When the new regulations go into effect, they will state:

*Regulations Governing Local School Boards and School Divisions, 8 VAC 20-720 et seq.*

8 VAC 20-720-179. Textbooks

A. Textbook approval

1. The Board of Education shall have the authority to approve textbooks for use in the public schools of Virginia.

2. In approving basal textbooks for reading in kindergarten and first grade, the Board shall report to local school boards those textbooks with a minimum decodability standard based on words that students can correctly read by properly attaching speech sounds to each letter to formulate the word at 70 percent or above for such textbooks, in accordance with § 22.1-239 of the *Code of Virginia*.

3. Any local school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with this chapter.

4. Contracts and purchase orders with publishers of textbooks approved by the Board for use in grades 6-12 shall allow for the purchase of printed textbooks, printed textbooks with electronic files, or electronic textbooks separate and apart from printed versions of the same textbook. Each school board shall have the authority to purchase an assortment of textbooks in any of the three forms listed above.

At its March 24, 2011, meeting, the Board of Education was presented with the final review of Virginia’s proposed revised textbook approval process. If approved by the Board, the K-12 English/Language Arts and K-12 Science textbook approvals would follow the revised process.
Summary of Major Elements:

The Board of Education approved the current list of state-approved English/Language Arts textbooks following revisions to the English Standards of Learning in 2002 and to the English Curriculum Framework in 2003. The current list of science textbooks was approved by the Board in 2004, following revisions to the Science Standards of Learning and the Science Curriculum Framework.

The Board’s 2007-2012 Comprehensive Plan indicated as priorities, revisions to the standards and curriculum frameworks, as well as review of textbooks. On January 10, 2008, the Board approved a schedule to continue this work through 2015. As such, the English Standards of Learning and the Science Standards of Learning were revised in 2010, followed by revisions to the English Curriculum Framework and the Science Curriculum Framework in the same year.

The Department of Education requests permission to begin the process of textbook review for K-12 English/Language Arts in April 2011, using the timeline indicated in Attachment A. The textbook review for K-12 Science would follow, beginning in September 2011, using the timeline in Attachment B, with the proposed state criteria for both outlined in Attachment C. The Department of Education proposes to use the newly revised state review process and criteria to administer the textbook review process for both content areas.

Local school boards may approve textbooks that are not on the Board-approved list. In accordance with the Code of Virginia, §22.1-238, any school board may use textbooks not approved by the Board provided the school board selects such books in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Board. Local school boards that choose to approve textbooks that are not on the Board-approved list will be encouraged to engage in a process similar to the Board’s new process, where they request certifications of accuracy from publishers.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education waive first review and grant approval for the Department of Education to proceed with the review of K-12 English/Language Arts textbooks beginning in April 2011, and with the review of K-12 Science textbooks beginning in September 2011.

Impact on Resources:

The agency’s existing resources can absorb this responsibility at this time. School divisions would have the option of approving K-12 English/Language Arts and K-12 Science textbooks for students, but would not be required to do so.

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

The Department will proceed using the timelines in Attachments A and B.
2011 Proposed Approval Process for K-12 English/Language Arts Textbooks

March 2011
The Board of Education (Board) approves the textbook schedule for the approval of K-12 English/Language Arts textbooks.

April 2011
The Department of Education (DOE) invites publishers to submit textbooks for review.

DOE seeks nominations for qualified educators and content experts to serve on the textbook review committees.

Publishers indicate their intent to submit textbooks on completed certification and agreement forms that are required by the Board in its state approval process.

May 2011
Review committees of K-12 educators and content experts with advanced degrees in the field are determined.

DOE reviews the certifications and agreements and works with publishers to address concerns. Incomplete forms may result in the textbook being removed for consideration for review.

June 2011
DOE notifies the publishers of the evaluation committee members for the purpose of sending all the textbooks under consideration for approval to these reviewers.

July 2011
Committee members use the evaluation criteria to review the textbooks independently for Standards of Learning (SOL) correlations, content, bias, and design for instructional planning and support.

August 2011
Members of the review committee submit their individual textbook analyses to DOE staff for aggregation.

September 2011
The full evaluation committee convenes to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted textbooks.

October 2011
The consensus evaluations are shared with publishers.

November 2011
Publishers are given an opportunity to respond to the committee’s reviews and recommendations.

January 2012
The Board receives the proposed list of textbooks for first review, along with information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements.

February 2012
During a 30-day public comment period, the public is invited to review copies of the books that have been placed around the state and to provide comment to the Board.
| **April 2012** | The Board reviews all public comment, considers the list, and approves the textbooks.  
DOE posts a list of approved textbooks with prices and information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements on the DOE’s Web site. |
| **Ongoing** | The public may provide ongoing feedback regarding inaccuracies in approved textbooks. |
2011 Proposed Approval Process for K-12 Science Textbooks

**September 2011**  
The Department of Education (DOE) invites publishers to submit textbooks for review.

DOE seeks nominations for qualified educators and content experts to serve on the textbook review committees.

Publishers indicate their intent to submit textbooks on completed certification and agreement forms that are required by the Board in its state approval process.

**October 2011**  
Review committees of K-12 educators and content experts with advanced degrees in the field are determined.

DOE reviews the certifications and agreements and works with publishers to address concerns. Incomplete forms may result in the textbook being removed for consideration for review.

**November 2011**  
DOE notifies the publishers of the evaluation committee members for the purpose of sending all the textbooks under consideration for approval to these reviewers.

**December 2012**  
Committee members use the evaluation criteria to review the textbooks independently for Standards of Learning (SOL) correlations, content, bias, and design for instructional planning and support.

**February 2012**  
Members of the review committee submit their individual textbook analyses to DOE staff for aggregation.

**March 2012**  
The full evaluation committee convenes to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted textbooks.

**April 2012**  
The consensus evaluations are shared with publishers.

**May 2012**  
Publishers are given an opportunity to respond to the committee’s reviews and recommendations.

**July 2012**  
The Board receives the proposed list of textbooks for first review, along with information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements.

**August 2012**  
During a 30-day public comment period, the public is invited to review copies of the books that have been placed around the state and to provide comment to the Board.
**September 2012**  
The Board reviews all public comment, considers the list, and approves the textbooks.

DOE posts a list of approved textbooks with prices and information from the textbook publishers’ certifications and agreements on the DOE’s Web site.

**Ongoing**  
The public may provide ongoing feedback regarding inaccuracies in approved textbooks.
### Evaluation Criteria Used by Textbook Review Committee

**Section I: Correlation with the Standards of Learning**

Determine the degree to which content found in these textbooks is correlated with the Standards of Learning and the Curriculum Framework for this subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate A</th>
<th>Limited L (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
<th>No Evidence N (Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessons are aligned with the standards.</td>
<td>Limited connections between the standards and the lessons are noted.</td>
<td>No correlation between the standards and the lessons are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content appears accurate, clear, and in sequential order.</td>
<td>Content appears to contain some inaccuracies or is not always clear.</td>
<td>A logical sequence of content cannot be identified and/or there appear to be significant content inaccuracies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the essential understandings, knowledge, and skills are supported.</td>
<td>Essential understandings, knowledge, or skills are not sufficiently addressed.</td>
<td>Essential understandings, knowledge, or skills are not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many opportunities are provided for students to practice essential skills.</td>
<td>There is limited opportunity for students to practice essential skills.</td>
<td>Opportunities to practice essential skills are not included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments or concerns related to content accuracy, bias, or editing:
## Evaluation Criteria Used by Textbook Review Committee

### Section II: Rubric for Instructional Design and Support
(Reported and may be used in correlation and approval considerations.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</td>
<td>(Note: Provide examples to support this rating.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion 1 - Textbook is presented in an organized, logical manner and is appropriate for the age, grade, and maturity of the students.

- Textbook is logically organized and grade/age appropriate for students.
- Textbook lacks consistency in organization and appropriateness for the grade/age of students.
- Textbook is not reasonably organized and is inappropriate for the grade/age of the students.

### Criterion 2 - Textbook is organized appropriately within and among units of study.

- Scope and sequence is easy to read and understand.
- Scope and sequence is confusing and not easy to understand.
- Scope and sequence is difficult to read and understand.

### Criterion 3 - Format design includes titles, subheadings, and appropriate cross-referencing for ease of use.

- Organizational properties of the textbook assist in understanding and processing content.
- Organizational properties of the textbook offer limited assistance in understanding and processing content.
- Organizational properties of the textbook do not assist in understanding and processing content.

### Criterion 4 - Writing style, syntax, and vocabulary are appropriate.

- Readability is appropriate for the grade level. Writing style and syntax are varied and appropriate to enhance student understanding. Vocabulary consists of both familiar and challenging words.
- Readability may be appropriate but is inconsistent throughout the text. Writing style and syntax may be inappropriate or lack variety, offering limited support for student understanding. Vocabulary may be too challenging or too familiar.
- Readability is not appropriate for the grade level. Writing style and syntax are often inappropriate and lack variety to enhance student understanding. Vocabulary is too challenging or unfamiliar.

### Criterion 5 - Graphics and illustrations are appropriate.

- Visuals are accurate, support the text, and enhance student understanding.
- Visuals are somewhat unclear and offer limited support for the text and student understanding.
- Visuals are inaccurate, do not support the text, and do not enhance student understanding.

### Criterion 6 - Sufficient instructional strategies are provided to promote depth of understanding.

- Materials provide students with opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.
- Materials provide students with limited opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.
- Materials provide students with no opportunities to integrate skills and concepts.

Note: Any subject area criteria that are required in state statute will be included as part of the state review. The Department of Education may establish criteria indicators that are subject-area specific.
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Background Information: Department staff tracked all budget and legislative actions affecting K-12 education during the 2011 General Assembly. The attachments summarize actions taken by the General Assembly that impact K-12 education.

Summary of Major Elements: Attachment A is a summary of budget actions taken by the General Assembly affecting the 2010-2012 budget. Attachment B is a summary of bills and resolutions passed by the General Assembly. If the Governor vetoes or recommends amendments to any of the bills, or to the budget, the General Assembly will take action during the April 6, 2011, veto session. Unless otherwise noted, all bills passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor become law on July 1, 2011. The amended budget becomes effective upon passage, pursuant to §1-214, Code of Virginia.

Superintendent's Recommendation: The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education accept this report.
Impact on Resources: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A
Amended 2010-2012 Budget Adopted by the 2011 General Assembly
K-12 Public Education Highlights

• The 2011 General Assembly acted on amendments to the 2010-2012 budget introduced by Governor McDonnell (HB1500/SB800) in December. Budget changes adopted by the General Assembly will go to the Governor for action, and the General Assembly will reconvene on April 6th to consider any amendments or vetoes proposed by the Governor. The final amended budget will replace the current 2010-2012 budget adopted at the 2010 Session (Chapter 874).

• The General Assembly budget actions impacting public education focused on the Virginia Retirement System (VRS), additional funding for divisions through a one-time Supplement Support account in FY12, and restoring the Composite Index Hold Harmless funding in FY12.

• The current (Chapter 874) VRS employer rate for teachers in FY12 is 5.16%, and the Governor’s proposed FY12 rate was 7.16%. The General Assembly adopted an employer rate of 6.33% for FY12, which reduces the state share of funding for VRS contributions by $22.3 million compared to the rate proposed in the introduced budget. The General Assembly budget also removes proposed language allowing divisions to charge the 5% employee share to employees if a 3% pay increase is provided, as well as language mandating school employees hired after July 1, 2011, to pay the 5% employee share.

• Provides $87.7 million in FY12 for a one-time Supplemental Support for School Operating Costs account. This funding is provided based on the state share of approx. $130 per pupil. A local match is required. This is one-time funding in FY12 only and must be used by divisions for operational costs such as salaries (no capital costs). This funding will not continue into the 2012-2014 budget.

• Combined with the above funding, provides $16.6 million for the remaining amounts needed to restore the Composite Index Hold Harmless funding to affected divisions in FY12. This is one-time funding to the affected divisions in FY12 only and will not continue into the 2012-2014 budget.

• Reduces GF support for Textbooks by $5.9 million in FY12. Textbook funding will be rebenchmarked for 2012-2014 according to the per pupil prevailing cost formula.

• Adopts the Governor's recommended $3.0 million in FY12 for the Performance Pay Incentives pilot in hard-to-staff schools. Division applications to participate in the program are due to DOE by June 15.

• Provides approx. $66,000 in FY12 for increasing the enrollment cap in an academic year Governor’s School by 50 students (to 1,650). Reduces funding for Project Discovery by 10% (approx. 69,000) in FY12.
• Did not adopt any reductions to SOQ funding.

• The net state funding impact to divisions in FY12, compared to the introduced budget, is an increase of $76.1 million. Projected FY12 state appropriations by account are shown in the attached table.

• To help mitigate reduced state and local funding and recognize depleting federal stimulus funds, allows divisions to carry over state fund balances from FY11 to FY12 and from FY12 to FY13, if divisions have met required local effort on the SOQ.

• Adopted language governing funding for virtual school programs that:
  1) for FY11 only, provides state funding for out-of-division students enrolled full-time in the Carroll County virtual school program based on the Carroll County composite index;
  2) requires – in FY12 – state funding to be provided for out-of-division students enrolled full-time in virtual school programs based on the composite index of the students’ resident division, and that funding will be provided for SOQ accounts only (not Lottery and other accounts). Required local effort for out-of-division virtual students will be based on the composite index of the enrolling/operating division.

• Did not approve a legislative study be conducted of virtual school funding issues.
## Attachment A - Appropriation Detail of Direct Aid to Public Education Accounts
### 2011 General Assembly Adopted Amended Budget for 2010-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards of Quality (17801)</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Aid (Excluding federal SFSF)</td>
<td>$2,746,726,975</td>
<td>$2,868,003,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Aid (federal SFSF)</td>
<td>$122,941,314</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Basic Aid</td>
<td>$2,869,668,289</td>
<td>$2,868,003,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$1,123,100,000</td>
<td>$1,162,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks (from General funds)</td>
<td>$10,610,395</td>
<td>$547,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>$65,975,053</td>
<td>$65,987,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>$361,744,703</td>
<td>$362,561,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>$69,458,001</td>
<td>$69,431,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS Retirement</td>
<td>$104,031,534</td>
<td>$159,588,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>$175,616,146</td>
<td>$176,117,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life</td>
<td>$6,458,766</td>
<td>$6,478,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total including SFSF</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,817,607,211</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,902,074,654</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - 17801 (excludes SFSF)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,694,665,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,902,074,654</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive Programs (17802)</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Schools</td>
<td>$13,753,589</td>
<td>$14,711,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>$318,750</td>
<td>$318,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Switcher Mentoring Grants</td>
<td>$279,983</td>
<td>$279,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Endorsement Program</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Vocational Education</td>
<td>$200,089</td>
<td>$200,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Index Hold Harmless</td>
<td>$88,349,513</td>
<td>$14,560,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Pay Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Support for School Operating Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$87,693,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103,501,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121,365,168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical Programs (17803)</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>$1,051,800</td>
<td>$1,051,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>$2,645,375</td>
<td>$2,645,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Virginia</td>
<td>$2,356,908</td>
<td>$2,356,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Treaty Commitment</td>
<td>$62,012</td>
<td>$66,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lunch</td>
<td>$5,801,932</td>
<td>$5,801,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Homebound</td>
<td>$5,028,591</td>
<td>$5,311,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Jails</td>
<td>$3,698,491</td>
<td>$4,065,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - State Operated Programs</td>
<td>$29,959,061</td>
<td>$32,784,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,604,170</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,083,954</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lottery (17805)</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>$10,379,960</td>
<td>$11,280,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Index Hold Harmless (Lottery)</td>
<td>$19,772,510</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Risk</td>
<td>$63,963,698</td>
<td>$63,942,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Preschool Initiative</td>
<td>$60,482,416</td>
<td>$65,104,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Reading Intervention</td>
<td>$13,375,413</td>
<td>$13,409,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Teacher</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3 Primary Class Size Reduction</td>
<td>$72,710,288</td>
<td>$74,777,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Breakfast</td>
<td>$2,497,421</td>
<td>$2,935,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL Algebra Readiness</td>
<td>$9,074,317</td>
<td>$9,062,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Education</td>
<td>$6,715,412</td>
<td>$6,953,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAEP</td>
<td>$2,247,581</td>
<td>$2,247,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education - Regional Tuition</td>
<td>$70,989,340</td>
<td>$76,011,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education - Categorical</td>
<td>$10,400,829</td>
<td>$10,400,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB/EFAL</td>
<td>$4,749,675</td>
<td>$4,749,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Graduation</td>
<td>$2,774,478</td>
<td>$2,774,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Basic Aid</td>
<td>$906,692</td>
<td>$869,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>$37,514,278</td>
<td>$39,960,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Summer School</td>
<td>$20,823,833</td>
<td>$21,496,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks (Lottery)</td>
<td>$24,821,855</td>
<td>$26,892,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$435,199,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>$435,869,999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standards of Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1792</td>
<td>Tata</td>
<td><strong>Standards of Quality.</strong> Codifies in the Standards of Quality the flexibility to use funds provided in the appropriation act for data coordinators, reading specialists, mathematics specialists, instructional staff serving English language learners, and assistant principals. The bill also amends the definition of &quot;support services positions&quot; and specifies the positions that would be considered in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1270</td>
<td>Houck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Standards of Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1435</td>
<td>Bell, D.</td>
<td><strong>American Sign Language.</strong> Provides that if a local school board offers an elective course in American Sign Language, it must grant academic credit for course completion on the same basis as the successful completion of a foreign language course and count course completion in American Sign Language toward the fulfillment of any foreign language requirement for graduation. It also requires public institutions of higher education to count academic credit received for successful completion of American Sign Language courses in a secondary school or higher education institution toward satisfaction of the foreign language entrance requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1554</td>
<td>Wilt</td>
<td><strong>Delayed implementation of the new graduation requirements.</strong> Delays until July 1, 2011, the implementation of the regulations for the accreditation of schools that were not already in effect on June 30, 2008, with the exception of the Graduation and Completion Index (effective 2010-2011 for accreditation ratings awarded for the 2011-2012 school year), and the new graduation requirements for the Standard and Advanced Studies Diplomas, including the requirement for a standard credit in economics and personal finance (effective with the ninth-grade class of 2011-2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 910</td>
<td>Obenshain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1793</td>
<td>Tata</td>
<td><strong>Diploma seals.</strong> Allows local school boards to award diploma seals for all Board of Education-approved diplomas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 2494</td>
<td>Scott, E.</td>
<td><strong>Alternative Accreditation Plan.</strong> Provides that any school board, on behalf of one or more of its schools, may request from the Board of Education releases from state regulations and approval of an Individual School Accreditation Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CTE and STEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1493</td>
<td>Greason</td>
<td><strong>Career and technical education industry certifications.</strong> Provides that where there is a national industry certification for career and technical education instructional personnel or programs for automotive technology, the Board of Education must make such certification a mandatory part of the career and technical education program. This would become effective July 1, 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Family Life Education

| SB 906 (Deeds) | **Dating violence.** Provides that any family life education curriculum offered by a local school division shall require the Standards of Learning objectives related to dating violence and the characteristics of abusive relationships to be taught at least once during middle school and at least twice during high school. |

### Home Schooling

| HB 2439 (Sickles) | **Driver education in Planning District 8.** Requires school boards in Planning District 8 to make the 90-minute parent/student driver education component available to all students and their parents or guardians who are in compliance with the compulsory school attendance statute. |

### Labor Day

| HB 1483 (Cleaveland) | **Opening school prior to Labor Day.** Adds to the "good cause" circumstances for which school divisions may be granted a waiver from the post-Labor Day school opening schedule a school division that 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. |

### Local School Divisions

| HB 2243 (Torian) | **Electronic records and signatures.** Authorizes local school boards to adopt and implement policies to permit electronic records and electronic signatures to be accepted from any parent, guardian, or other person having control or charge of a child enrolled in the relevant school division. |

| SB 1038 (Barker) | **School placement for a child in foster care.** Allows a child placed in foster care to remain at his original school, if it is determined to be in his best interests. It requires the determination to be made in writing by the placing social services agency and the local school division together, and adds the school placement to the foster care plan. |

### Physical Education and Health

| SB 966 (Northam) | **Physical Education.** Requires at least 150 minutes of physical education per week on average during the regular school year for grades K-8, with a similar goal for high school students. This requirement would not apply to any half-day kindergarten. This would become effective in the 2014-2015 school year. |
### SB 1094 (Hanger)

**Youth health risk survey.** Requires the Department of Health to develop and administer a random survey of students in public middle and high schools to facilitate planning and implementation of effective programs for substance abuse prevention through collection of information identifying trends in alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and the assessment of risk and protective factors among youth of the Commonwealth.

### Pupil Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1911 (Miller, J.)</td>
<td><strong>Video-monitoring system.</strong> Authorizes localities to adopt ordinances to allow local school divisions to install and operate video-monitoring systems on school buses in order to detect drivers passing stopped school buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 946 (Howell)</td>
<td><strong>Failing to stop for a school bus.</strong> Provides that a person driving a motor vehicle shall stop his vehicle when approaching, from any direction, any school bus that is stopped on any highway, private road, or school driveway for the purpose of taking on or discharging children, and remain stopped until all the persons are clear of the highway, private road, or school driveway and the bus is put in motion. Failure to do so is reckless driving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teachers and Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 2077 (Landes)</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion of students from mandatory testing.</strong> Adds the act of excluding students from testing who are required to be assessed to the conditions under which the Board of Education may: (i) Bring a cause of action, (ii) Suspend or revoke an administrative or teaching license, (iii) Initiate or cause to be initiated a review or investigation of any alleged break in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative/Regulatory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1885 (Bell, D.)</td>
<td><strong>Repeals outdated sections of the Code.</strong> Deletes references to educational programs that have not been funded and do not exist, and updates language in other sections to conform to current practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1939 (Pollard)</td>
<td><strong>Regulations mandated by statute.</strong> When a statutory change necessitates a regulatory change, the regulation must be filed with the Registrar of Regulations within 90 days of the law's effective date (for an exempt action) or the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) must be filed within 120 days of a law's effective date (for a non-exempt action).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2319 (Byron)</td>
<td><strong>State mandates on localities.</strong> Requires that the assessment of mandates imposed on local governments currently required of state agencies (in coordination with the Commission on Local Governments) include an estimate of the fiscal impact of such mandates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commissions and Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1976 (Greason)</td>
<td><strong>Virginia Council on the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children.</strong> Adds a fifth citizen member to the council, who must be a representative from a military installation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1054</td>
<td><strong>Commission on Civics Education.</strong> Clarifies that the Commission on Civics Education will continue until July 1, 2012, if the Commission is funded by a separate appropriation in the general appropriation act or funded with nongeneral funds or donations to sustain its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1269</td>
<td><strong>Autism Advisory Council.</strong> Creates an advisory council in the legislative branch of state government to promote coordination of services and resources among agencies involved in the delivery of services to Virginians with autism spectrum disorders and to increase public awareness of such services and resources. The Council will expire July 1, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ 625</td>
<td><strong>Study of local school divisions' antibullying policies.</strong> Requests the Department of Education to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Review and compare antibullying measures in the student codes of conduct from each school division,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Compare existing policies with the Department's model policy for codes of student conduct,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Determine if improvements to existing policies are warranted to combat bullying more effectively in Virginia's public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ 646</td>
<td><strong>Study of year-round schools.</strong> Requests JLARC to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Review the Board of Education's procedure for approving year-round schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Evaluate school divisions’ experience with this alternative;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Conduct a comprehensive analysis of each year-round school, including scheduling format, offerings of instructional and extracurricular programs, and the enrollment in the year-round school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Consider the minimum number of required teaching days or hours that should constitute the length of a school term;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Identify and review year-round schools in other states and countries, noting advantages and disadvantages;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Ascertain the essential factors that must be considered before implementing year-round schools statewide, including, but not limited to, instructional costs, transportation and special education services, and the need for additional classroom teachers, staff, and support services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Evaluate the impact of changing the scheduling format on school functions, length of terms, and school breaks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(viii) Consider other issues and matters related to year-round schools as may be deemed necessary to provide feasible and appropriate recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 308</td>
<td><strong>Engineering program of study.</strong> Requests the Department of Education to establish shared goals for an engineering program of study, and assign a shared responsibility for this program between the existing science, mathematics, and technology disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>