

# MINUTES

## Fairfax County School Board Burkholder Administrative Center

Work Session No. 56/**Instruction, Special Services & Youth Development** June 13, 2005

### MEETING OPENING

#### 56.01 Call to Order

Instruction, Special Services, and Youth Development Committee Chairman Catherine A. Belter convened the meeting in public session at 11:02 a.m. with the following Board members present:

Catherine Belter (Springfield)  
Brad Center (Lee arr 11:20)  
Stuart Gibson (Hunter Mill absent)  
Stephen M. Hunt (At Large)  
Kaye Kory (Mason arr 11:10)  
Ilryong Moon (At Large)

Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner (Providence)  
Janet S. Oleszek (At Large arr 2:50)  
Kathy Smith (Sully)  
Daniel G. Storck (Mount Vernon)  
Jane Strauss (Dranesville absent)  
Tessie Wilson (Braddock)

Also present were Division Superintendent Jack Dale; Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger; Deputy Clerk Linda Sabo; Administrative Assistant Darlene Chamberlain; Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services Ann Monday; Chief Information Officer Maribeth Luftglass; Assistant Superintendent of Special Services Alice Farling; FECEP/Head Start Parent Susan Guerrero; FECEP/Head Start Parent Kimberly Alam; Title I Coordinator Sue Fidelman; Title I District Advisory Council Chairperson Thelma Pemburton-Abbott; Family Involvement Resource Teacher Deborah Swietlik; and certain other individuals. Student Representative to the School Board Ian Hurdle was absent.

### DISCUSSION

The following points were made:

#### 56.02 FCPS Curriculum and Assessment Resources (Exhibit A)

- Staff recommendation to provide assessment programs and tools that provided the capability for teachers to monitor how and what they teach and how to track students to see whether what they have been taught was learned; recommendation to extend use of the current assessment programs while designing and building on enhancements to the current assessment tool and structure;
- current curriculum was based on teaching to the Standards of Learning (SOL) at the request of principals; recommended assessments would be predictor tests showing where the student was relative to the SOL and indicating whether more diagnosis was needed, showing teachers what they need to and don't need to spend time on, how students would perform before being tested, giving higher scoring schools the capability to expand to higher levels and lower scoring schools the capability to use lower grade level tools; staff could foresee the possibility of an on-line curriculum and freeing up teacher time if teachers were provided with good assessment tools;

## Fairfax County School Board

Work Session No. 56/Instruction, Special Services & Youth Development

June 13, 2005

2

- question whether the term “formative assessment” was still part of the instructional jargon; affirmative response;
- question on the timeline for integration of the existing Princeton and Abacus tools; response that there was a two to three year timeline with a year-end funding request to expand to all grade levels and build the FCPS teacher portal expansion;
- question on the difference between Princeton and TestPac; response that Princeton had easier reporting tools and better test items and that TestPac was not district-wide and did not provide support; question whether Princeton satisfied the assessment needs of the elementary and middle schools; affirmative response;
- question about testing third graders four times a year; response that only Math and English would be tested with proposal for one window to be mandated and the other three windows used as practice tests; elementary school tests to be given in mid-September to early October, November, January or February, and March; principals in lower performing schools were asking for more tests (as many as six); two windows of testing for middle school; and high schools would make testing decisions by department;
- question whether the three-year development of the FCPS assessment tool would cost approximately \$10 million; affirmative response on development with aggregate costs and on-going maintenance costing about \$2.4 million per year;
- question on the gap in the number of teachers using the available technology; response that mandatory use of assessment technology would close the gap with every teacher given a Blackboard site;
- request to see the available data report on how schools were doing; and
- suggestion to use an assessment tool for International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP) courses; response that coordinators were organizing the data to access materials by student and teacher.

Recessed at 12:42 p.m.; reconvened at 2:30 p.m.

### 56.03 FECEP/Head Start Annual Report (Exhibit B)

- Question what were current demands; response that there were 360 students on wait list requested for 50 sites; question what the difference was between a full day and two half-days; response that full day had two-thirds of the day of high intensity with a rest period, and one-third day of full intensity;
- program was for fathers and families with more male involvement encouraged;

## Fairfax County School Board

Work Session No. 56/Instruction, Special Services & Youth Development

June 13, 2005

3

- question whether program was 100% federal funded and whether it mattered if home or base school; response that it was 100% federal funded and it did not matter whether home or base school; and
- question what percentage of students were going out of area; staff to provide response.

### **56.04 Title 1 Annual Report (Exhibit C)**

- Program had an increase in funding and more positions would be created; question would that level out; response that distribution was slightly different in compliance with federal regulations; and
- questions about faculty formula; response that living within boundaries also must include children not attending FCPS.

### **56.05 School Health Advisory Committee (SHAC) Annual Report (Exhibit D)**

- Question about the status of recommendations of countywide food allergies protocol; response that health department was reviewing several states and the recommendation and committee would respond by the end of the month;
- question whether SHAC could give recommendations or any specific guidance of concerns/issues regarding life threatening allergies; response that committee would be involved;
- question whether there were any changes of obesity issues at a young age; response that food services was making some new initiatives from the food pyramid based on the wellness policy;
- question about notifying parents of change of menu; response ingredient that list was on website and in brochure; and
- question how principals and assistant principals knew about the protocol and mandatory training for staff; response that it was mandatory for certain staff members to be trained at the school.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.