

MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board Burkholder Administrative Center

Work Session No. 9/**Instruction, Special Services & Youth Development**

Sept. 12, 2005

MEETING OPENING

9.01 Call to Order

Instruction, Special Services, and Youth Development Committee Chairman Kathy Smith convened the meeting in public session at 2:45 p.m. with the following Board members present:

Catherine Belter (Springfield)

Brad Center (Lee)

Stuart Gibson (Hunter Mill absent)

Stephen M. Hunt (At Large absent)

Kaye Kory (Mason)

Ilryong Moon (At Large)

Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner (Providence)

Janet S. Oleszek (At Large)

Kathy Smith (Sully)

Daniel G. Storck (Mount Vernon)

Jane Strauss (Dranesville)

Tessie Wilson (Braddock)

Also present were student representative to the School Board Samantha Kunkel; Division Superintendent Jack Dale; Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger; Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Pam Goddard; Administrative Assistant Darlene Chamberlain; Assistant Superintendent of Accountability Patrick Murphy; Office of Student Testing Director Ray Diroll; Internal Auditor Kevin Deckard; and certain other individuals.

DISCUSSION

The following points were made:

9.02 No Child Left Behind Update (Exhibit A)

- Discussion regarding implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law and the need to convince the Federal Government that NCLB, due to mandated testing for every child twice a year, was having a severe financial and instructional impact on states and localities;
- question whether the Federal allocation for NCLB was approximately \$10 per student; response that there were no categorical line items in the law so the amount per student was not determinable; question whether the increased Federal U.S. Department of Education Title I educational funds could be used for NCLB items; response that Title I funds increased but could not be used just for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) testing and that a portion must go to preventative programs for disadvantaged students;
- question about the cost to administer Limited English Proficiency (LEP) assessment tests; response that staff was not convinced that testing, even with a new vehicle, would be less expensive but was looking for improvement of implemental and lateral test scores;

Fairfax County School Board

Work Session No. 9/Instruction, Special Services & Youth Development September 12, 2005

2

- question about the number of school divisions in Virginia and request to see how FCPS ranked against the 11 larger school districts; response that there were 132 divisions and that there was no standardization so a comparison could not be provided;
- comments by principals and teachers from Mount Vernon High School, Hybla Valley and Hollin Meadows Elementary Schools about reaching Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO); schools that made successful achievement had knowledgeable and creative principals with high expectations and common assessments, had provided time for staff development, and had teachers working together to meet the needs of all students;
- comments from teachers and principals about success having an impact on student morale, the high expectations for the lowest and highest performing students, the importance of support from staff and community, the instructional resources and creative scheduling to allow time for meetings during the school day between Special Education, Gifted and Talented, and regular classroom teachers to discuss available tools and strategies and to assess curriculum for all students;
- question whether staff was systematically going to look at other successful school districts for ideas; comment that staff had looked at Richmond schools and that some districts achieved overwhelming success in certain categories by focusing on particular assessment groups or ways of teaching and took a no-excuses strategy for certain subgroups;
- request to provide the number of instructional assessment coaches placed this year; staff to provide response; comment that all instructional assessment coaches had received intense training during the summer;
- question about restrictions on after-school tutoring; response that principals sanctioned hourly arrangements for teachers working beyond the school day and that conflicts arose when teachers received financial remuneration for tutoring their own students; and
- question whether a student could be in more than one assessment group; affirmative response; request for an assessment of a new program's (instructional coach program) success for future consideration of funding; response that the same standard did not apply to all schools due to staffing formulas for Limited English Proficient (LEP) and high socioeconomic schools; response that site-based summer school was an unchallengeable success.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.