

MINUTES

Fairfax County School Board Luther Jackson Middle School

Regular Meeting No. 15

March 9, 2006

1. **CLOSED MEETING**

Chairman Ilryong Moon convened the Board in public session at 6:00 p.m. with a quorum of members present:

Catherine A. Belter (Springfield)	Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner (Providence)
Brad Center (Lee)	Janet S. Oleszek (At Large)
Stuart D. Gibson (Hunter Mill; dep. 10:15)	Kathy L. Smith (Sully)
Stephen M. Hunt (At Large)	Daniel G. Storck (Mt. Vernon)
Kaye Kory (Mason)	Jane K. Strauss (Dranesville)
Ilryong Moon (At Large)	Tessie Wilson (Braddock)

Mrs. Kory moved, and Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner seconded, that the Board go into closed session: 1) to discuss and consider disciplinary matters concerning students pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(2); 2) to discuss and consider the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(3); 3) to consult with legal counsel regarding actual litigation pending against the School Board and regarding a specific legal matter involving bond referenda requiring the provision of legal advice by counsel pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(7); and 4) to discuss and consider the employment, appointment, and performance of specific public employees pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1). The motion **passed 11-0**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mr. Gibson away from the table.

Chairman Moon thanked Yun Jung, a member of the Virginia All-State Chorus from Oakton High School, for her performance of the National Anthem.

2. **MEETING OPENING**

2.01 Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance/Moment of Silence/National Anthem

Chairman Moon convened the meeting at 7:20 p.m. with a quorum of Board members present:

Also present were Division Superintendent Jack D. Dale; Deputy Superintendent Brad Draeger; Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Pamela Goddard; Deputy Clerk Linda Sabo; and certain other members of staff. Student Representative to the School Board Samantha Kunkel was present (arr. 7:52).

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

2

March 9, 2006

2.02 Certification of Closed Meeting Compliance (Exhibit A)

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mrs. Strauss seconded, that since the Fairfax County School Board convened a closed session meeting on March 9, 2006, pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and since Section 2.1-344(D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the School Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law, the Fairfax County School Board hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, 1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered. The motion **passed unanimously.**

2.03 Announcements (Exhibit B)

Mr. Center announced that March was Purchasing Month and thanked the public purchasing and management professionals in Fairfax County Public Schools.

2.04 Recognition of National Athletic Training Month (Exhibit C)

Mrs. Wilson recognized the athletic trainers who were in attendance at the meeting, and invited them to join the Board for photographs.

2.05 Recognition of National Social Worker Month (Exhibit D)

Mrs. Kory recognized the social workers who were in attendance at the meeting, and invited them to join the Board for photographs.

2.06 Recognition of Lillian Lowery (Exhibit E)

Mrs. Smith offered the following resolution:

RESOLUTION HONORING LILLIAN M. LOWERY

WHEREAS, Lillian Lowery served with distinction and dignity as a teacher, an administrator, and, most recently, a cluster superintendent in Fairfax County Public Schools for 16 years, completing a total of 28 years in the field of education; and

WHEREAS, her keen insight and educational leadership inspired administrators to strive for excellence in preparing students for the 21st century, to continue their pursuit of educational opportunities, to close the gap between minority and majority students, and to provide challenging programs for all students and acceleration for those who need them; and

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

3

March 9, 2006

WHEREAS, having a strong appreciation for involving parents and community members in the quest for a quality education for future citizens, she served on community boards and committees—always exhibiting great poise, intellect, and cooperation as she related to the citizens. She fostered a great partnership with Fairfax City schools and was just and kind in serving the parents and students within all of Cluster VII, always governing by the policies and regulations established; and

WHEREAS, she was dedicated to staff members and to community members, showing mutual respect, compassion, and understanding when dealing with challenging situations that required fair and honest judgment. She was committed to seeing all students succeed and to seeing their rights respected as she supported administrators with their daily interactions with parents and students. Her integrity, high expectations of herself and others, and positive spirit gained her the respect of many and the admiration of the people she encountered;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fairfax County School Board extends its highest commendation and deepest appreciation to Lillian Lowery for her outstanding service to Fairfax County Public Schools and to the students and citizens of this great community.

Mrs. Smith moved, and Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner seconded, to adopt the Resolution Honoring Lillian Lowery. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Moon invited Ms. Lowery to join the Board for photographs and for a Leadership Team presentation. The Board members congratulated Ms. Lowery on her new position and extended their best wishes.

3. **PRESENTATIONS TO SCHOOL BOARD**

TAPE REFERENCE: 1-1500

3.01 **Citizen Participation -- (Exhibit F)**

One speaker addressed the Board in the time reserved for public comment. Phyllis Payne addressed Agenda Item No. 4.01, Award of Contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc.

3.02 **2004-2005 Strategic Targets - Target 2, All schools will meet Virginia accreditation and *No Child Left Behind* Adequate Yearly Progress standards; Target 8, the reading and mathematics Standards of Learning (SOL) scores for all grade eight students will increase (SB; Exhibit G)**

Superintendent Dale introduced the target presentations by noting that the Board had previously received target reports for Goals 1 and 2; that Goal 1 stated that all students would meet academic performance standards at benchmark grade levels; that Goal 2 stated that students would demonstrate exceptional performance via completion of advanced coursework; that tonight there would be two target reports under Goal 1; that the two targets are related because Target

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

4

March 9, 2006

2 (All schools will meet Virginia accreditation and *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards.) was based on the state Standards of Learning (SOL) scores, and Target 8 (The reading and mathematics Standards of Learning scores for all grade eight students will increase.) addressed SOLs specifically; that these were being presented together because they are the basis for Virginia's accreditation standards, AYP standards, and the Board's standards for grade 8; that Ellen Schoetzau and Betsy Fenske would present Target 2 and Pat Murphy would follow with Target 8; and that both reports would be presented together before entertaining Board comments and questions.

Target 2, All schools will meet Virginia accreditation and *No Child Left Behind* Adequate Yearly Progress standards.

Mrs. Schoetzau introduced staff who had been instrumental in assisting schools to meet Target 2 expectations: Ulysses Cox, director, Cluster II; Judy Matlock, director, Cluster V; Ray Diroll, director, student testing; Maryann Ryan, director, elementary instruction; Linda Whitfield, middle school instruction; Jan Leslie, high school instruction; Jane Dreyfuss, coordinator, high school SOLs; Mary Helman, coordinator, elementary SOLs; Christine Johnston, director, secondary special education; Sue Fidelman, coordinator, Title I programs; Teddi Predaris, director, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL); and Ted Davis, information technology. She prefaced the video presentation by introducing the staff in the tape who were in attendance at the meeting: Sharon Eisenberg, principal, Key Middle School, Lee District, Cluster V; Key Middle School staff members Marcie Dietrich, Carol Bailey, Amy Conlin, Patricia Edwards, Mary Frances Vivarelli, Victor Garcia, Pam Ellison, Shane Rigsby, Nicole Bradshaw. The video was shown.

Ms. Fenske and Mrs. Schoetzau presented the Target 2 measures and outcomes by saying that schools focus instruction to match SOL objectives, targeted goals, and expectations of Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS), with the result that more and more schools had met Virginia Department of Education accreditation requirements and the *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) mandates; that all measures established for Target 2 in 2005 had been met; that these results were due to strong leadership, committed teachers, conscientious students, involved parents, and dedicated support from FCPS departments; that the Standards of Accreditation (SOA) were the criteria used by the Virginia Department of Education to evaluate the educational performance of public schools in accordance with established regulations; that 100 percent of the 184 general education schools in FCPS met the SOA requirements, exceeding the school system's goal of 95 percent; that there had been a four percent increase from 2002-2003 to 2003-2004, and another impressive gain of three percent from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005; that this measure had been met or exceeded for each of the past three years; factors contributing to success included implementing specific intervention strategies—adequate yearly progress (AYP) support

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

5

March 9, 2006

funding, demonstration sites, BART/Abacus assessment programs, community-based summer schools, instructional walk-throughs and audits, and expanded access to the Education Decision Support Library (EDSL), among others; that AYP referred to the progress schools are required to make in English and mathematics in each identified subgroup, based on prescribed performance, participation, attendance, and graduation rates; that in Virginia the identified subgroups for AYP are all students, Black, Hispanic, white, limited English proficient (LEP), economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities; that 88 percent of non-Title I schools met AYP in 2004-2005; that in order to do this there were three requirements—at least 95 percent of each subgroup was required to participate in the assessment, each school had to achieve a pass rate of at least 65 percent for English in each subgroup and at least 63 percent for mathematics, and that elementary and middle schools had to meet at least a 94 percent attendance rate and high schools had to achieve at least a 57 percent graduation rate; that NCLB required all districts and schools receiving Title I funds to meet state AYP goals for their total student population and for specified demographic subgroups; that schools had significantly exceeded the target in measure 2.3 by 33 percent, with 83 percent of Title I schools meeting AYP; that in addition to the interventions mentioned previously, school staff analyzed SOL results, developed strategies tailored to address AYP, and identified trends or patterns from previous years' data to determine instructional adjustments needed for SOL reporting categories; that through staff development efforts, teachers implemented research-based strategies to address individual student needs; that the final measure for Target 2 expanded access and training in EDSL use to 2,000 teachers and staff; that EDSL was continually enhanced to facilitate collaboration among teachers and staff regarding student performance, formulating instructional decisions based on data, developing school improvement plans, and reporting on division goals and strategic targets; that during the 2004-2005 school year, cluster directors and Information Technology (IT) staff conducted EDSL training for school-based technology specialists, who then provided training to school staff; that the goal of attaining 2,000 trained teachers and staff for the 2004-2005 school year was exceeded by 968 school personnel, an increase of nearly 50 percent over the target measure; and that while they were very pleased at meeting the measures for Target 2, staff anticipated increased challenges as students in additional grades are tested and the stakes are being raised by NCLB. They concluded by noting the following staff recommendations: continue implementation of best instructional practices; expand the instructional coach initiative; enhance BART and Abacus; continue support for development and use of common assessments; utilize assessment data to develop school improvement plans and to address accreditation and AYP concerns; support teacher leadership development efforts; expand EDSL to provide access to additional teachers and staff; support the EDSL infrastructure as the school system increases the user group and dependence on this data warehouse; and add assessment coaches at the elementary and middle school level to work collaboratively with instructional coaches and to address the

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

6

March 9, 2006

additional grades being tested. Ms. Fenske introduced Dr. Pat Murphy to make the presentation on Target 8.

Dr. Murphy noted that Target 8 also came under Strategic Goal 1; that tonight he would present results of eighth grade reading and math SOL test results; that there were four target measures—two for reading and two for math; that the measures looked at six subgroups, as defined by NCLB, and their performance in relationship to the average percentage pass rate for FCPS; that the achievement in reading was notable, however, the target measure was not met in math; that the first measure was related to subgroups falling below the average percent pass rate and sought a two percent increase—that there was a range of improvement from two percent for LEP students to over 10 percent for Black students; that the second measure—all subgroup reading scores above the FCPS average SOL reading score would increase by one percent—had increased by over two percent; that plans for action in eighth grade reading included three main categories that were proven based on the results obtained—course offerings, instruction, and teacher training; that the plans were to continue Power Literacy and Read 180 courses, to use formative assessment, and to train teachers for differentiated instruction and a common instructional model; that the first mathematics measure was that all subgroup mathematics scores below the FCPS average score would increase by two percent, and it had not been met; that there had been a slight decline in the Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, and students with disabilities subgroups—from less than one percentage point in one subgroup to three percentage points in four subgroups—and an increase of 1.6 percent in the Black subgroup; that the last measure was that all subgroup mathematics scores above the FCPS average SOL mathematics score would increase by one percent; that in the first reporting year, 2004-2005 the 95 percent pass rate declined slightly by less than one percentage point; that staff was very concerned about the eighth grade math SOL scores and whether the right programs were in place to help students; that this was a snapshot of one year's data, that staff had looked at math trends over the past five years, and for all subgroups, the trend lines were moving upward; that they had then looked at the third and fifth grade math SOLs and found the trend lines moving in a positive direction; that this helped staff to look at whether the 2004-2005 results were an aberration, were the programs working, and what other information needed to be considered; that staff had then reviewed the state averages for the last two years and found that they were flat—a 78 percent pass rate across the last two years in eighth grade SOL mathematics; that in looking at subgroups for the last two years, staff found a slight fluctuation, plus or minus one percent; that this indicated that programs needed to be reviewed and some areas enhanced and expanded; that the school system would focus on data, instruction, programs, and teacher training; that these areas included the enhancement and expansion of formative assessments, the enhancement of math content skills focused on student needs, coupled with K-8 math articulation, the expansion of the Algebra Readiness Initiative (a state program) into the elementary level, the enhancement and expansion of the Power Mathematics

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

7

March 9, 2006

program at the middle school level, and the provision of teacher training for differentiated instruction and content development; that he had continually heard about the importance of formative assessment to guide instruction and of planning with the end in mind; and that this was a critical element for providing real-time data for teacher use on a daily basis.

Questions and comments included the following: compliments and appreciation for an excellent and informative presentation (Gibson, Wilson, Niedzielski-Eichner, Strauss, Hunt); that he had appreciated Mrs. Strauss's request for the list of which schools and which subgroups had not made AYP under the federal law; that he was very familiar with McNair Elementary School which had missed AYP last year in the Hispanic subgroup in reading; that if two more Hispanic students at the school had passed the test, McNair would have made AYP; that the previous year McNair had made AYP for Hispanic students, but had missed making AYP by six students in poverty; that as a result, 222 children were being bused out of that school at an annual cost to taxpayers of \$100,000 that Congress had appropriated to teach poor children how to read; the follow-up request to Mrs. Strauss's, that staff include the delta by which more students would have had to pass to allow each Title I school to make AYP (for all subgroups); that in the school system's efforts to help all children achieve at an appropriate level, we also need to point out the misuse of the term failing school for those that did not make AYP (Gibson); that although she was familiar with Read 180, the request that staff briefly explain Power Literacy and Power Mathematics (Wilson); that Power Mathematics was part of the student accountability plan, which addressed the needs of students who go to summer school with a D or D+, not meeting the current benchmarks but conditionally promoted to the next grade level; that the class size was 15:1 and focused on the areas in which students are deficient (VanFleet); the request for clarification that this was a class rather than a program (Wilson); an affirmative response (VanFleet); the request for confirmation that the scores for students who took Algebra I in eighth grade were not counted in the eighth grade math SOL scores (Wilson); an affirmative response (Murphy); the question whether there had been an increase in the number of students taking Algebra I in the two years shown, as that might somewhat skew the results (Wilson); that as a former middle school principal and having reviewed the data, typically those students taking Algebra I in eighth grade have also had to take the eighth grade math SOL test, up until this year, and typically those taking Algebra I have passed the eighth grade math test (Murphy); the request for confirmation that this year those students taking Algebra I in the eighth grade will not have to take the eighth grade SOL math test, so that next year we might see some changes in the scores (Wilson); and affirmative response; that coupled with that, the metric would change because there would be testing at sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, and they would be annual tests, as opposed to a cumulative test in eighth grade mathematics (Murphy); that it would be very difficult to see trend lines in that case; the question if there was any way to tell if there was a correlation between those teachers who have had staff development in these areas and student

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

8

March 9, 2006

achievement (Wilson); that although that was not part of the discussion for this presentation, he had pointed out on the last slide that there would be a focus on teacher training because the system recognized that some skills were so specific they would be looking at staff development content for teachers at both the elementary and middle school levels (Murphy); that we needed to strengthen teachers' knowledge beyond just the grade level at which they are teaching; that they would look at the different math strands and provide support so that teachers can comfortably differentiate instruction in the classroom and look beyond the textbook (VanFleet); that her question had been whether student achievement was higher in classes where the teacher has participated in staff development for those particular courses; that she did not know whether that data existed, but it would be interesting to see if it made a difference (Wilson); that student achievement was the first goal, and what they had seen was a very optimistic view of students' current accomplishment, but that there were some problems; the question whether the problems were primarily with LEP and African American students or whether it was across the board (Oleszek); that as seen in the data, there were subgroups that scored below average in certain areas; that in looking at math over the past five years, the trend line was moving up; that staff recognized that there was work to do in this area and that it was a priority (Murphy); that she understood that staff was working on it and that it would be difficult in light of the fact that two more grades would be added next year; that once the subgroups were identified, the question what had been done to remedy the situation (Oleszek); that the formative assessment allowed every child to be looked at individually; that while the data presented this evening was by subgroup, it was important to find out where each child was functioning and to move each one forward; that he had emphasized the formative assessment data in his presentation because they were looking at each child; that they also needed to do a better job of articulating curriculum K-12 because the ultimate goal was for students to take higher level classes in high school and graduation (Murphy); that the formative assessment was measuring what was missing and articulation was plugging the information in where necessary; that what she was not hearing was "what" was being used; the question where have resources been guided to fixing the "what" (Oleszek); that looking at the data and trend lines, over time the subgroup populations were increasing; that over the last five years, the African American subgroup passing rate had increased over 13 percent; that the passing rate for students with disabilities had increased over 18 percent over the last five years; that while they were concerned over the dip in scores this year, they were looking at where to better address student needs, but that they were still seeing growth over a five year period; that as one example of addressing needs, a common instructional delivery model had been initiated in K-8 classrooms (Van Fleet); that in language arts they had been looking to ensure that teachers of students with disabilities and LEP students are partnering to ensure there are clear understandings of expectation levels for SOL tests and that there is very strong content knowledge of the disciplines being taught to students; that in addition to extending teacher training, the question what effort had been made toward school-based summer schools that would immediately

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

9

March 9, 2006

address the needs of LEP students and continue the amount of education available to students failing in all categories; that it seemed to her that expansion of community-based summer schools should have been in the recommendations unless staff did not think that would work (Oleszek); that additional community based summer school originally had been included in the recommendations, but that there were also other best practices and instructional strategies that had been proven to work for some of the subgroups, and that these had been provided to schools by the Instructional Services Department; that there were good early results due to the instructional coaches' work with teachers; that over the years the system had marked certain schools that had been successful as demonstration sites for other administrators and teachers to visit (Schoetzau); that the cluster assistant superintendents spend a great deal of time annually reviewing school improvement plans—looking at data and reviewing plans to ensure they reflect what the data has indicated; that they met with each school plan team to talk about the data; that consultants had been brought in to work with schools in analyzing and using data to drive instructional decisions; that, in addition, data was shared among schools as an opportunity to see how others were achieving and to share ideas (Fenske).

Discussion included the following: the request that staff explain how instructional and assessment coaches work with teachers (Niedzielski-Eichner); that the instructional coaches actually worked in the classrooms with teachers, modeling lessons, co-teaching; that they also worked with teachers outside of the classroom, planning lessons, analyzing data, and planning instructional strategies; that they also provided staff development for the entire faculty in best practices; that instructional coaches were also receiving staff development this year (Fenske); the request for confirmation that staff was really sold on the concept of instructional coaches (Niedzielski-Eichner); an affirmative response; that they were seeing very good early results and receiving a lot of positive feedback from the teachers in those schools (Schoetzau); the request for confirmation that the focus on Education Decision Support Library (EDSL) information and access was to help inform and analyze the impact of instruction in order to make necessary adjustments (Niedzielski-Eichner); that it was not only access to the data, but the ability to analyze and use the data to drive instructional decisions and plan instruction (Fenske); the request for an example of how that might work (Niedzielski-Eichner); the response that EDSL data allowed a teacher to drill down into a math strand to see exactly what students had difficulty with—computation, problem solving, statistics; they can also look at the objectives with which students had difficulty and then plan instruction to address those objectives (Fenske); that this concept was what they had been sharing in the video shown earlier; that the teachers themselves had explained how critical that planning and collaboration time was to them; they were working together as teams using data to make informed decisions (Fenske); the request that Dr. Murphy elaborate on the formative assessment as focusing on individual students (Niedzielski-Eichner); that once they became familiar with data analysis, teachers were able to predict the pass rates of their students; that this was not

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

10

March 9, 2006

only true for SOL tests, but also for higher level tests such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) (Murphy); that formative assessment tells us how we can help students learn (Schoetzau); that he appreciated the clarification; the question what “teacher training for a common instructional delivery model” meant (Niedzielski-Eichner); that a common instructional delivery model was how to structure classroom time, looking at key components of good teaching practices across all disciplines, and linking learning to prior knowledge (Van Fleet); that teams had been sent to Richmond and Norfolk to see what those districts were doing to close the minority student achievement gap; that feedback from those visits was that the district had a common instructional program across a lot of different schools, a systemwide curriculum and that they were rigorous about sticking to it; that FCPS had resisted that idea because we valued the idea of a distributed program that allowed the principals to have some flexibility to design the curriculum specific to the needs of their schools; that when he saw “common instructional delivery model” he had tried to relate it applying a Richmond approach (Niedzielski-Eichner); that they were not convinced that there was any one program that was a magic bullet; that they were more interested in teachers using best practices, differentiating instruction, forming flexible groups in the classroom (Fenske); the question how that relates to common instructional delivery model (Niedzielski-Eichner); that she thought one of the things to which Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner was referring was the pacing and delivery of content being made common; that common instructional delivery model was different and referred to the fact that there would be research based strategies that the teacher would use to deliver instruction, regardless of the lesson taught, and would be common to a science lesson, math lesson, etc.; that a common instructional delivery model was not so much the constant common pacing of what skill is being taught on a given day, but how the information is being delivered across the different content areas; that she was also pleased to see the African-American scores improving by ten points; that she has heard anecdotally from schools that the assessment coaches were extremely successful, that having the ability to focus on individual student need was tremendous; that in some situations where schools thought they were doing a wonderful job, this has allowed them to focus on areas where they needed more work to help individual students; that this year there would be SOL test administration at grade level three through eight, and eighth grade students taking and testing in Algebra I would not take the eighth grade math SOL; the question what the multi-year trends are in eighth grade Math SOL results for all sub-groups (Strauss); that she congratulated staff on the reading success; that she was sorry there was any decline, however small, in math scores; that it was important to recognize the teacher in the classroom as the core resource; that she had not seen anything in the recommendations about increasing remediation; the question whether Power Math was a remediation program, because it had not sounded that way (Kory); that staff was approaching the problem in two ways—intervention and remediation; that for students who were one or two years behind in math skills there was Algebra Readiness, a state-funded program for second-semester eighth grade students, that

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

11

March 9, 2006

longitudinal studies showed that students in that program were doing well, scoring above subgroups not in the program; that there was a 10:1 teacher to student ratio; that Power Math was for students who were further behind, more than one or two grades and were unsuccessful in summer school; that they would like to expand the Algebra Readiness program from eighth grade into seventh and down to fifth grade; that the students take a computer-adaptive test that identifies the student's weaknesses down to fourth grade (VanFleet); the question how many years FCPS has had this program (Kory); the response that this was the fifth year of the program (Van Fleet); the question whether the number of students in the program had been expanded every year (Kory); that the system had been limited by state funding; that expansion down grade levels to fifth grade had been included in next year's budget request (Van Fleet); the request for clarification that the expansion would not include expanding the number of students it reaches (Kory); that it would reach more students by going beyond the current eighth grade (Van Fleet); the question how many eighth grade students were currently in the program (Kory); that last year there were about 900 students in the program (Van Fleet); the question whether the number of eighth grade students participating in the program increased every year since it started (Kory); a negative response, due to state funding (Van Fleet); the question whether FCPS could supplement the program (Kory); an affirmative response (Fan Fleet); the question whether staff was thinking about this since it was such a good program (Kory); an affirmative response (Van Fleet); the question when the Board would hear more about that expansion—not the expansion to other grades, but expansion to more eighth graders (Kory); that they had just about reached capacity in the eighth grade, but that it was important not to wait until eighth grade to reach these students, which was why they wanted to spiral the program down to seventh, sixth, and fifth grades; that the program was being piloted in fifth grade at eight elementary schools at this time (Van Fleet); the question how much the program would be increased with the amount included in the budget (Kory); that the budget funding would provide assistance to schools interested in starting the program (Van Fleet); the request for confirmation that it was not for a specific number of schools (Kory); that he did not have the numbers available to address that question (Van Fleet); the request that staff offer an intuitive impression, if the actual scores were not available, of where geographically the math score declines occurred; that she saw they were in all subgroups, except African American, but she wondered if there were pockets around the county (Kory); and that staff were not prepared with that specific information, but they would be happy to provide the information at a later time (Murphy).

Additional comments included the following: that he congratulated staff on the 100 percent SOL pass rate, that for most general education students the SOLs had become less of a threat, and that, hopefully, schools could relax a little and realize that if they focus on the content the scores will come; that he was encouraged by the reading increases, but that there was still a long way to go; that they still needed to work on the minority student achievement gap, that

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

12

March 9, 2006

eighth grade was an important focus because it was the gateway to high school, but that he hoped the system would not lose focus on the earlier grades, especially critical third grade reading; the question whether there was any consideration of looking at data, within a pyramid, at the middle school level with respect to the capabilities of the students coming from individual elementary schools—letting elementary schools know how their students do at the middle school level, to help them know where they might need to re-focus efforts (Hunt); that there was a lot of K-12 articulation going on in the schools right now, looking at pyramid-wide data; that they look at the number of students leaving elementary school and what happens when they get to the middle school; that he hoped within the discussions among principals that there would be some specific, data-driven discussions of how well the elementary students do later in their academic careers (Hunt); that many pyramids hold meetings between, for example, middle school math teachers and sixth grade math teachers (Schoetzau); the request that staff provide some content information on the fifth grade algebra prep class, as he was curious about the philosophy behind that idea; the question how instructional coaches know what is and is not working, what methodologies they should be instructing teachers to use (Hunt); that the instructional coaches not only review the data, but also observe teachers in the classroom, to ensure they are teaching the Program of Studies, the SOL objectives, and essential knowledge; that they also look to see what practices teachers are uses and if they are effective (Fenske); the question how they tie those observations to successful scores (Hunt); that they can look at the data by individual classrooms and teachers, and make comparisons (Fenske); that all instructional coaches were participating in year-long staff development where they meet weekly to share information about practices that seem to be working or not working; that two individuals from the National Staff Development Council—Ann Delahand and Joanne Killian—along with Denny Berry from FCPS have been working with the instructional coaches all year, visiting them in the schools and meeting with them weekly (Schoetzau); that he understood the concept but was looking for details about how they could determine what was working; the question what they were referring to when staff said the coaches looked at the data (Hunt); that the coaches were looking at common assessments, BART, SOLs, etc. (Schoetzau); that he would think there would have to be some documentation about what teaching methods each teacher was using; that it would take a great deal of effort to correlate test results and specific teaching methods (Hunt); that you would not be able to correlate very specific teaching methods with the result because the point differentiated instruction is to teach the concept, test or quiz to see if the student grasps it, and then, if the student has not mastered it, modify the teaching approach (Dale); that instructional coaches provide the best practices to teachers, and the question how to determine which was the best method; that if it was tied to the test scores, somehow the correlation had to be made; that he did not see how the lines were drawn between the results, determining what the methods were, and ensuring that the instructional coaches were providing the best methods to the teachers (Hunt); that if the child did not learn the fraction part of the test, then the instruction in

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

13

March 9, 2006

fractions needs to be complemented (Draeger); that you could certainly determine what was not working (Hunt); that the next step would be for the coach to provide alternative methods for teaching fractions and the students would be re-tested to see which students still did not get the concept; that if there were still students not getting the concept, you would go on to try a third or fourth method (Draeger); that he had heard that the instructional coaches were providing a random group of new practices to teachers that may or may not work (Hunt); a negative response; that the practices provided were research-based (Dale); that what staff had described was trying something to see if it worked and, if not, you try something new (Hunt); that there was not one universal method that would teach all students fractions; that children learn math in different ways and, therefore, different methodologies had to be used (Draeger); the question how does the instructional coach determine which method to bring into the classroom (Hunt); that there was no magic way to identify how a given child would learn a math concept (Draeger); that he was being told, however, that coaches were going into the classroom and providing new instructional practices to the teacher; the question whether this was targeted or whether they just randomly provide different ideas with some research behind them and tell the teacher to give it a try (Hunt); that, for instance, one place to look for best practices would be at Westlawn Elementary where 100 percent of the third graders passed the SOL math test; that is what the coaches are doing, learning from those who have been successful; that there were probably still two or three methods used by that school to teach children fractions (Draeger); the question how all of the instructional coaches get that information (Hunt); that there was an extraordinarily rigorous interview process for the instructional coaches, that including watching how they teach in the classroom; that the coaches hired are master teachers who have at their disposal a great number of strategies to use based on the determination of what the child needs; that the coaches analyze what a child is doing and then apply another strategy (Mary Ann Ryan); that the coaches were always in a continual learning process, working with consultants from the National Staff Development Council, reading professional literature, working with each other to see what is working in each other's schools and bringing those practices back to their own schools (Ryan).

Other comments and questions included: that in the past there had been large programs, such as Success by Eight and Excel, and that the new approach was more targeted; that when he heard "best practices," he thought of things like they were doing at Key Middle School where work was done on Monday afternoons, that he did not necessarily think about what specifically was going on in a teacher's classroom; the question whether there was any collection of information about which 'programs' were working at schools and sharing that information with other schools (Center); that as soon as data is available, it is shared among schools at principal meetings; that real-time data is also shared among schools (Fenske); that instructional coaches work with individual teachers on teaching skills, which is different than what he thought of as best practices—such as that described by Ms. Fenske (Center); that it would be helpful to have at

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

14

March 9, 2006

least one year of historical target data to put the information provided into context (Storck); that these particular targets were adopted two years ago, with baseline data collected the first year and achievement data the next; that where the School Board was heading with their strategic governance plan was much more historical and long-term; that this was a transition year reporting on target data (Dale); that he thought there had been very similar targets in the past and that these were not significantly different; the question whether there were resource limitations that were making target success more difficult, for example expansion of the Algebra Readiness program (Storck); that staff would provide further information on that at a later time (Murphy); the question whether it would be a Quality Program Assurance System (QPAS) report (Storck); a negative response (Murphy); the request for clarification that this then would be based on the observation—review and monitoring—of the success of this program (Storck); an affirmative response (Murphy); the question whether there were any other initiatives where resources might make some difference (Storck); that staff would be analyzing the success of the instructional coaches; that based on preliminary findings, he expected that the Board would see a request for additional coaches in the FY 2008 budget (Draeger); the question whether there were any identified needs not being met, particularly in math, that were being inhibited by lack of resources that the Board should think about in the budget process (Storck); that the focused remediation, Power Math, for summer school students, was important; that he would like to see that course, which was taken in lieu of an elective, continue as support for those students (Van Fleet); that staff would like to continue the Power Literacy courses, because it helped students who read below grade level; the question whether there was specific data available to give a better sense of what these courses are worth; the question whether there was any way to compare that to schools without those courses and whether that was why staff was requesting the continuation or expansion (Storck); that all middle schools had these courses as part of the student accountability plan, to provide assistance to students who had not performed well in summer school; that these courses were for students who were making headway on the benchmarks but had not gotten there yet and needed support beyond just the next math or literacy level course (Van Fleet); the request for confirmation that staff did not see any specific resource limitation to accomplishing the target (Storck); that part of staff's job was to try to identify the best use of current resources as opposed to just requesting added resources; that currently in the budget request there was \$200,000 to \$300,000 to support math programs; that it was important to support remediation programs by placing technology specialists in all elementary schools; staff would love to see class size below 12, but they knew that was not realistic; that 10:1 or 8:1 ratios allowed learning to be accelerated (Dale); the question whether there was a specific criteria used to set up those classrooms (Power Math and Power Literacy)—an identification process used by teachers (Storck); that the program was developed by staff such as those present and filtered through Ann Monday and cluster assistant superintendents, based on student performance (Dale); that she had noted in the information provided that BART was available on-line to middle schools; that she was familiar with how it

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

15

March 9, 2006

was used at elementary schools; the request for information about how it was used at the middle school (Smith); that there were currently two testing windows for seventh and eighth grades; that both tests were mirrors of the SOL test; that the fall test was used to establish baseline data and measure skills students were expected to attain by the end of the school year; that the second test was in the late winter or early spring and was used to look for more areas where students might need additional remediation; that because it was on-line, the results were available to teachers in about 24 hours (Van Fleet); that earlier today he had looked at state data on eighth grade reading and math; that the state did not provide data for economically disadvantaged students at the eighth grade level (Moon); an affirmative response (Ray Diroll); that comparing statewide data with FCPS data for the subgroups for both English and math, all FCPS subgroups—with the exception of LEP—appear to be doing better than the state average (Moon); confirmation of the statement (Murphy); that, for example, the average for eighth grade FCPS Black students in English was 69, the state average was 61; that the FCPS average for Hispanic students was 70, the state average was 67; that the average for FCPS white students was 93, the state average was 82; that the average score for FCPS students with disabilities was 55 versus the state average of 35; that for LEP students, the FCPS Average was 63.4 and the state average was 64, the only group for which FCPS averaged lower than the state average; that the scores were similar for both English and math; that when you considered that about 40 percent of the state's LEP students were in Fairfax, it meant that LEP students in other parts of the state had to be scoring much higher, and he was very concerned about this; the question whether Fairfax County had more challenging LEP students than other parts of the state (Moon); that currently in Virginia there was not one assessment method to determine who is an LEP student, and at what level that student is functioning; that Fairfax had established very specific criteria that were stringent and rigorous to ensure that the right foundation is being provided for students to be successful at each subsequent proficiency level; that as you look at students across the state, since there is not a single assessment measure used statewide to determine LEP, there is quite a variance between districts in terms of who is identified as LEP (Teddi Predaris); that he appreciated the explanation; that he understood that different districts might have different definitions of LEP students; the question whether FCPS' definition was more inclusive or more expensive than other jurisdictions, to include more or less students (Moon); that the FCPS assessment and definitions followed the federal and Virginia guidelines; that Virginia did not have one common measure for the different levels (Predaris); that he was not sure he was getting to the answer he was seeking; and the request that staff provide the definition of LEP used by other jurisdictions, such as Loudoun and Prince William counties and the Tidewater area (Moon).

Discussion of the target presentations concluded with the following: that he wondered how the instructional coach, with a ton of data, could determine what would work or not work in any given classroom (Hunt); that a Board work session is scheduled in May to discuss instructional coaching (Monday); the question

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

16

March 9, 2006

whether there was data other than SOLs on EDSL that was of value to teachers (Hunt); that currently there were Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), SOL, SAT, and some AP/IB data in EDSL, but that the intent was to expand the data, to include BART (Diroll); that his concern was that access to EDSL was being expanded to teachers before it had the data on it that they can use; that his concern was that teachers using EDSL were looking at last year's class as opposed to this year's class (Hunt); that for test results currently in EDSL, teachers are able to look at their current class as well as the previous year, that if not the class they could see the students in the school (Diroll); the request for confirmation that each teacher had access to data on all of the students in the school (Hunt); that he could not speak to how access was distributed at all schools (Diroll); that normally access was limited to need; that his concern was that it was last year's test and how the teacher's class did last year; that the information could be provided later (Hunt); that the school had access to individual student data, therefore, the teachers could track this year's class or last year's (Dale); that he understood the focus was getting each teacher access to EDSL (Hunt); an affirmative response (Fenske); that when doing that, it was important to ensure that there was actual data there they could use and that their access included the students they taught the previous year (Hunt); that is all part of what they do (Dale); that if they have the ability today, then we do not need to increase the access to more teachers; that if you want more access for more teachers, there must be a reason for it (Hunt); that access to EDSL requires that the individual go through a training program; that we would like to get access for more people so they can analyze data on their own; that the data analysis, however, that Mr. Hunt feels should be in place is, indeed, in place (Dale); that he had two more points to make—that the state average was not the bar he wanted to set for FCPS (Hunt).

Dr. Dale commended Pat Murphy and the Department of Accountability for developing the format for the target presentations in order to provide consistency across all of the targets; that while he understood longevity and other issues, with which he fully agreed, the purpose of the target presentations was to report on what the Board adopted two years ago; that there was a bit of a disconnect between the reporting on measures adopted two years ago and where he believed the Board wanted to go in the future; and that there had to be some clarification of expectations for staff presentations. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner commented that this was the third target presentation using this approach; and the question whether staff would be prepared at some point to give the Board feedback on how the Board can be more helpful in this continuous quality improvement consideration. Dr. Dale responded that he would collect feedback from the staff and share that with the Board; that if the Board collectively wanted that type of feedback, he could probably arrange it; and that he would leave that to the chairman and vice chairman.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

17

March 9, 2006

4. ACTION ITEMS

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-1696

- 4.01 Award of Contract** - Amend the contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc., for consultant services for K-12 pupil transportation services, in the amount of \$45,600, and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to proceed with the contract amendment on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit H)

Mr. Moon explained that Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner had made that motion at the regular Board meeting on February 9, 2006; that at that time an amendment in the form of a substitute had been made by Mr. Gibson: "to defer consideration of the amendment to the contract with Management Partnership Services, Inc. (MPS) and direct staff to develop a contract amendment with MPS which would provide for a phase II study of the FCPS transportation system under which options would be developed for opening high schools at a later time than presently under the following constraints or any combination thereof: 1) reduction or elimination of transportation that FCPS is not legally obligated to provide, such as transportation to GT centers, magnet centers, and high school academies; 2) adjustment to school attendance areas to make them more compact, contiguous, and amenable to the development of more efficient transportation routes and schedules; 3) consolidation and reduction of the number of bus stops"; that there had been a motion to postpone consideration of the amendment and the main motion until the meeting on March 9, that the motion to postpone had passed; and that the Board was now back to where they had left off.

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Center seconded, to further postpone the decision for another two weeks.

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner noted that there had been a lot of progress made in the past month on consideration of the two motions presented; that recently some additional information had been received from MPS that would help inform the Board; that at this point, he believed another two weeks would give valuable time to bring the consideration together.

Discussion proceeded as follows: that when the motion had been postponed to tonight, there had been some question of whether MPS would be able to respond in time for a vote at this time; that a letter had been received on March 7 and posted to BoardDocs today, that included a great deal of thought and detail about what might be in a scope of work with a ballpark estimate of cost; that he had talked with Dean Tistadt, assistant superintendent, Facilities and Transportation Services, about whether it could be refined into something on which the Board could vote in two weeks; that the types of things MPS would be looking at would require a lot more work and time than were in the original proposal made in December; that he thought enough information would be provided in two weeks to cast an intelligent vote on what they wanted from MPS (Gibson); the question

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

18

March 9, 2006

whether there would be another work session on this topic, because she had a lot of unanswered questions about the new information posted today from MPS; that she was not sure that just a refinement would answer all of her questions (Wilson); that it was not scheduled for the work session on March 13; that there were no other work sessions scheduled before March 23 if the motion to postpone to that date passed (Moon); that she thought what had been presented today was sufficient enough change that she did not feel she could vote in two weeks without a work session; that she had too many questions, some of which might require staff to respond later (Wilson); that what MPS had responded to was what the Board had agreed to at the last meeting; that part of her concern was that there were new items presented by MPS, such as increasing the walking distance from 1.5 miles to 2 miles with which she was not comfortable; that it would be difficult for her to support a motion that purports to look at that if she was not prepared to vote to institute if it is brought back to the Board; that she did not understand why they would spend money to study something that, if the Board talked about it, they would not be willing to do (Wilson); that his question was whether or not her questions could be answered via e-mail, without having to hold a work session (Center); that she did not think so, because to her it was whether or not this Board would be willing to look at a particular parameter that had not been there before (Wilson); that she agreed with Mrs. Wilson; that there were a lot of changes in the proposal and there needed to be a discussion to get answers before the Board voted (Smith); that Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Smith made a valid point; that it was not her recollection at the Board meeting when the item was postponed that there was consensus to deal with a combination of Mr. Center's and Mr. Gibson's motions; that there was a consensus to postpone, not on the content; that the content sent to MPS was, indeed, a combination of the two motions; that the Board had not talked about it and the figure in the MPS response was significantly larger than that in the original motion; that it also included a lot more detail and issues; that she liked the information received from MPS and she hoped the Board would want to move in that direction (Kory); that the reason for the motion to postpone previously was because there was enough agreement from those at the table that if his motion had not been in the form of a substitute, but an add on to the main motion, they would consider supporting it; that, otherwise, they would have voted previously to award the smaller contract for \$45,000; that he felt it was accurate to say that the Board wanted to see a proposal that combined the two motions and that was what had brought them to this point; that if the Board had simply wanted to vote on the December MPS proposal, they would have voted down the motion to postpone to tonight; that if they had wanted to do that, there would have been no need to get further information from MPS; that he could understand Mrs. Wilson's and Mrs. Smith's concerns and he would not mind having a work session discussion; that the reason they were at this point had been because there were enough people interested in expanding the scope of the study that they had not been interested in voting on the original proposal four weeks earlier; that he could not see having a discussion at the March 13 work session because he did not think anyone was prepared to address it (Gibson); that if there was sufficient concern about having

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

19

March 9, 2006

further discussion, could the topic be fitted into the next work session after March 13 (Center); that the next work session would be April 3 and the first regular meeting following that would be April 6 (Niedzielski-Eichner); that he suggested discussion at the April work session and voting on April 6 (Center); and the inquiry whether anyone wanted to amend the motion to postpone to change March 23 to April 6 (Moon).

Mr. Gibson moved, and Mrs. Kory seconded, to amend the motion on the table by substituting March 23, 2006, with April 6, 2006. The amendment **passed unanimously.**

The motion to postpone the agenda item to April 6 **passed 11-0-1**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mr. Moon, Mrs. Oleszek, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mrs. Smith abstaining.

Mr. Moon directed that the item would be discussed at the April 3 work session and would come to the Board for vote at the regular meeting on April 6, 2006.

4.02 Confirmation of Action Taken in Closed Meeting

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mrs. Belter seconded, to expel a student for possession of illegal drugs at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mrs. Wilson moved, and Mr. Gibson seconded, to expel a student for assault of a student at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mr. Storck moved, and Mrs. Smith seconded, to expel a student for violation of a probationary school assignment. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mr. Hunt moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to expel a student for assault of a student at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mrs. Smith moved, and Mr. Gibson seconded, to expel a student for assault of a staff member at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner moved, and Mr. Gibson seconded, to deny a student's request for placement in a regular program, but permit attendance in an alternative program, on the terms recommended by the Division Superintendent. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Hunt moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, to expel a student for violation of the conditions of a probationary school assignment. The motion **passed unanimously.**

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

20

March 9, 2006

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Hunt moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, to expel a student for assault of a staff member at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Hunt moved, and Mr. Storck seconded, to expel a student for possession of illegal substances at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Storck moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, to expel a student for possession and distribution of illegal drugs at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Storck moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, to expel a student for possession and distribution of illegal drugs at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Storck moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, to expel a student for significant disruption of school activities. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mr. Center, Mr. Storck moved, and Mr. Hunt seconded, to expel a student for possession of illegal drugs, paraphernalia, and a weapon at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Strauss, Mrs. Smith moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to expel a student for threatening to harm a teacher at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Strauss, Mrs. Smith moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to expel a student for possession of a weapon at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Strauss, Mrs. Wilson moved, and Mrs. Smith seconded, to expel a student for involvement in gang-related activities at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Having served on a three-member committee chaired by Mrs. Strauss, Mrs. Wilson moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, to expel a student for numerous acts of misconduct at school. The motion **passed unanimously.**

Mrs. Strauss moved, and Mrs. Belter seconded, to appoint Dean Tistadt as Chief Operating Officer, effective March 1, 2006, and authorize the Chairman to execute a contract reflecting these actions. The motion **passed 11-0**, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Hunt, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting "aye"; and with Mr. Storck away from the table.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

21

March 9, 2006

5. **CONSENT AGENDA**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-2543

- 5.01. **Minutes** – Approve minutes of February 23, 2006, regular School Board meeting (Exhibit I)
- 5.02. **Award of Contract** - Award annual contracts for playground equipment, related components, and playground site work to All Recreation of Virginia, Inc., Custom Park Services, Inc., and Fair Oaks Construction, Inc.; and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contracts on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit J)
- 5.03. **Award of Contract** - Award the contract for the replacement of boilers at Chantilly High and Forestville Elementary Schools to Boiler & Furnace Cleaners, Inc., Hurley Company Division in the amount of \$519,000, and authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit K)
- 5.04. **School Board Policy** - Adopt Policy 2150.2, Prevention of Alcohol and Other Illegal Drug Use by Students (SS; Exhibit L)

Chairman Moon stated that, without objection, the four items on the consent agenda would be adopted. Hearing no objection, the consent agenda passed 11-0, with Mrs. Belter, Mr. Center, Mr. Gibson, Mrs. Kory, Mr. Moon, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, Mrs. Oleszek, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Storck, Mrs. Strauss, and Mrs. Wilson voting “aye”; and with Mr. Hunt away from the table.

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-2628

- 6.01. **FY 2006 Third Quarter Budget Review** - Recommendation to approve the adjustments reflected in the FY 2006 Third-Quarter Budget Review as detailed in the agenda item (FS; Exhibit M)

Chief Financial Officer Deirdra McLaughlin explained the agenda item included adjustments to the FY 2006 budget that would bring the budget up-to-date from the midyear budget review; that there were three important actions in this review; that one was the adjustment to the beginning balance for the FY 2007 budget; that second was an addition to the energy accounts; the third was highlighting county funding provided at different points during the year; and she reviewed the agenda item.

Questions were offered as follows: the question whether the \$4.6 million for utilities would cover the entire fiscal year from July 2005 through June 2006 (Gibson); an affirmative response (McLaughlin); the question whether the FY 2007 advertised budget adopted last month included higher utility costs (Gibson); that they were based largely on the higher costs; that they would have to wait until they were a little closer to adoption of the approved budget, but assuming

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

22

March 9, 2006

the costs stayed the same, there might be a need to add some money to the electricity accounts; that there had been significant adjustments to all of the energy accounts because the budget had been developed during this period of very rapidly rising prices; that if there was an adjustment, she would not expect it to be at the level being made now (McLaughlin); that, however, in all likelihood when the final budget was adopted in May they would need to increase the amount allocated for utilities (Gibson); the agreement that they might need to be adjusted somewhat (McLaughlin); the request whether it would probably be somewhere between \$1 and \$5 million (Gibson); that she thought it would be closer to between \$1 and \$3 million (McLaughlin); the request for confirmation that this money had not yet been requested from the Board of Supervisors (Gibson); an affirmative response (McLaughlin); that his presentation to the Board of Supervisors on March 20 would reflect this information, as well as noting adjustments in state revenue, which had gone down (Dale); that regarding the \$150,000 for test scoring, the question how much cost FCPS had to absorb as a result of the state sending tests to the wrong place and losing them (Oleszek); that she did not recall that amount (McLaughlin); the question whether the amount for test scoring would allow FCPS to get test results back more quickly (Niedzielski-Eichner); that she did not think it would improve the receipt of test results; that the state was not equipped to handle the amount of portfolio assessments FCPS would have, about 700 in one category and 650 in the other; that this would pay for scoring the alternative special education tests; that the results may come sooner, but that was uncertain (Alice Farling, assistant superintendent, special services); that there were two positions in the third quarter review, the operations specialist and the on-line IEP systems database engineer; the question whether those were in the advertised budget (Niedzielski-Eichner); a negative response; that they would have to be added to the FY 2007 budget when it was approved; that if the positions were approved as part of the third quarter review, they would, by definition, have to be added to the FY 2007 budget (McLaughlin); that he would like to discuss that at the work session; that he was concerned about bringing in two new positions when there was a \$40 million shortfall; that he would also like to discuss why there was a shortfall in the Adult and Community Education (ACE) program (Niedzielski-Eichner); and that staff would have that information available (McLaughlin).

- 6.02 Easement Conveyance** - Recommendation that the School Board (i) approve the conveyance of the water line easement to Falls Church, and (ii) authorize the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities and Transportation Services to execute on behalf of the School Board the Deed and any related documents as approved by School Board counsel to accomplish the conveyance (FTS; Exhibit N)
- 6.03 Award of Contract(s)** - Recommendation to award the contract(s) for sound system replacement at Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology and Cooper Middle School to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder(s), and to authorize the Division Superintendent, or his designee, to execute the contract on behalf of the School Board (FTS; Exhibit O)

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

23

March 9, 2006

6.04 CTEMS Annual Plan 2006-2007 - Recommendation to approve the Career and Technical Education Management Systems (CTEMS) annual local education plan and the 2006-2007 Application for State and Federal Career and Technical Education funds (IS; Exhibit P)

6.05 School Board Policy – recommendation to approve Policy 8350.2, Real Property Disposal (FTS; Exhibit Q)

7. **SUPERINTENDENT MATTERS**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-3326

7.01 **Superintendent Matters**

Excited about the move tomorrow to the new central administration center located at 8115 Gatehouse Road, Falls Church.

8. **SCHOOL BOARD REPORTS**

TAPE REFERENCE: 2-3448

8.01 **Committee Reports**

Forum on Board Topics; March 9, Ilryong Moon, Chairman

Discussion of national anthem performance by outside groups at School Board meetings and how to consistently engage in district dialogues.

8.02 **Board Member Announcements**

Jane Strauss, Dranesville District

Herndon High School had won at the basketball state semi-finals in double-overtime 72-70, and will go to the finals in Richmond; 1981 was the last time a Northern Virginia team won a state title, and Herndon won the title in 1951. Wished the team good luck.

Daniel Storck, Mount Vernon District

Thanked Board members and the 150 to 200 parents who had participated in the meetings concerning overcrowding at South County High School. Thanked Betsy Fenske, Dean Tistadt, and Gary Chevalier for the nice job of presenting and handling challenging questions. Tuesday night had met with the Laurel Hill community and John Bertocchi

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

24

March 9, 2006

did an excellent job. Work had been completed with the community and will work with each of the Board members to bring this to closure.

Janet Oleszek, Member at Large

Participated in Read-Across-America and attended teen driving seminar at the Government Center sponsored by the Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. Important to teach young adults to drive safely and parents can contact the School Board Office for further information. A Future Professional Conference for middle school girls was held at Jackson Middle School. Belle Whelan, former Virginia Secretary of Education, was the keynote speaker and Isis Castro, State Board of Education Member, did an excellent job. Special thanks to Principal Carol Robinson who managed to keep everything moving smoothly.

Kaye Kory, Mason District

Congratulated Parklawn Elementary School for continuing their computerized evening ESOL class for parents of their students; that this program had been very successful and is free. Thanked the principals who had invited her to participate in Read-Across America.

Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District

Marshall High School had also made the basketball semi-finals but had lost in the last seconds by 2 points

Stephen Hunt, Member at Large

Pleased to attend the Chamber of Commerce valor awards for police, fire, and rescue personnel for heroic acts. That they put their life on-line for us and he appreciated that. Thanked the FCPS School Resource Officers who keep our schools safe and provide a secure learning environment for students and staff.

Catherine Belter, Springfield District

Thanked all Principals who had invited Board Members to their schools during Read-Across America month

Ilryong Moon, Member at Large

Edison High School is in the state finals and wished luck to Edison and Herndon High Schools.

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting No. 15

25

March 9, 2006

Ms. Kunkel, Mr. Center, Mrs. Smith, and Mrs. Wilson had no comments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

TAPE REFERENCE: 3-0208

9.01 The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.