

MINUTES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2006

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

RUTLEDGE STATE OFFICE BUILDING

BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

Joe Isaac, Chair

John Tindal, Chair-Elect

Inez M. Tenenbaum

State Superintendent of Education

Secretary and Administrative Officer to the Board

I. WELCOME/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Isaac brought the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. He asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

The following State Board of Education members were in attendance: Joe Isaac, Chair; John Tindal, Chair-Elect; Ms. Rebecca Burch; Mr. Jessie R. Curtis; Mr. Fred "Trip" DuBard; Mr. Mike Forrester; Mrs. Kristin Maguire; Mr. Ben Mitchell; Mrs. Patsy Pye; Dr. Danny Varat; Mrs. Virginia Wilson; Mr. Al Simpson; Mr. Ron Wilson; and Dr. Kristi Woodall. Mr. Charles McKinney, Mrs. Terrye Seckinger, and Ms. Diane Sumpter were excused for their absence. State Superintendent of Education Inez Tenenbaum; Carol Collins, Administrative Assistant; Shelly Bezanson Kelly, Parliamentarian; and staff of the State Department of Education were also present.

II. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES OF OCTOBER 11, 2006, MEETING

Mr. Ron Wilson moved for approval of the minutes for the October 11, 2006, meeting. Ms. Rebecca Burch seconded the motion. The motion carried.

III. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 8, 2006

Mr. John Tindal moved for approval of the State Board agenda for the November 8, 2006, meeting. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

IV. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS, INCLUDING NEWS MEDIA

Chair Isaac welcomed all visitors and asked them to stand and be recognized.

V. STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION REPORT

Mrs. Tenenbaum recognized the following students who served on the 2006 Student Ad Hoc Advisory Committee and presented them with an award.

- Keith Davis
Calhoun County High School
Calhoun County School District
Nominated by: Dr. Anne Crook, former Board member
Current Board member: Ms. Patsy Pye
- Jacob Anderson
Broome High School
Spartanburg School District Three
Nominated by: Mr. Mike Forrester
- David Oberst
Georgetown High School
Georgetown County School District
Nominated by: Mr. Joe Isaac
- Cecelia Sade P. McCoy
C.A. Johnson Preparatory Academy
Richland School District One
Nominated by: Ms. Diane Sumpter
- Laura Brooke Smith
Manning High School
Clarendon School District Two
Nominated by: Mr. John Tindal

Ms. McCoy and Ms. Smith were unable to attend the meeting. Mrs. Tenenbaum stated that the purpose of the Committee was to provide board members with feedback on important education issues, legislation, and policies from a student point of view. This Committee also provided students with an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process that affects public schools.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Issac recognized the following three people for public comments on the Uniform Grading Policy. Mrs. Jennie Yon, President, South Carolina School Counselors Association; Mrs. Linwood Floyd, Past President, South Carolina School Counselors Association; Mrs. Doris Nelson, School Board member and Past President, South Carolina School Counselors Association; and Ms. Harriet Gardin Fields, Public Policy Chair, South Carolina School Counselors Association.

VII. STATE BOARD ITEMS

**56. Teacher Recruitment, Training, and Certification Items
Kristin Maguire, Facilitator**

01. TRTC Items Overview

No items were submitted from TRTC.

**55. Curriculum and Instructional Materials Items
Kristi Woodall, EdD, Facilitator**

FOR APPROVAL

01. C&I Items Overview

Lucinda Saylor, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented a brief overview of the items.

**02. Academic Standards for Modern and Classical Languages
(First Reading)**

Cathy Jones, Education Associate, Office of Curriculum and Standards, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item. Ms. Jones stated that the State Board of Education must approve all new and revised academic standards. The State Board last adopted the Foreign Language Curriculum Standards in 1999. As part of the cyclical review process, these standards, along with those in all the core areas, must be revised. The title of the document has changed from "foreign languages" to "modern and classical languages" in order to highlight the presence of Latin as a language choice in our schools.

A panel of language educators representing various languages, levels, and geographical regions of the state began the development of the revised standards. The State Department of Education recommended that the State Board of Education approve this item for first reading.

Mr. Mike Forrester moved for approval of the Academic Standards for Modern and Classical Languages for First Reading. Ms. Rebecca Burch seconded the motion.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire expressed concern over the redundancy in the Standards format.

Mrs. Maguire stated that these standards did not seem to set the children up so that when they go to college and take courses they can actually read literature at a fluent rate. Ms. Saylor explained that what makes this set of standards different from all of the others brought to the board is that students start languages at different grade levels. A traditional level one class may be in grades three, four, five, six, seven, or eight. Language learning is described in stages in this document because students start languages at different places in our school system.

Mrs. Tenenbaum explained that the State Department of Education plans to provide a detailed support document giving teachers more information to accompany the standards. This was done for the science standards, and teachers stated that this was the best document that was received because they understand exactly what these words tell them to do. This will be done for this document as well. There will be an accompanying document that makes this much clearer, and all the issues brought up by Mrs. Maguire will be in that accompanying document.

Mr. Forrester expressed concerns regarding page 27 of the document where it talks about “students who are in the beginning stage of learning a modern language may be at any grade level—first, sixth, ninth, or twelfth—depending on the scope and sequence of the program of instruction established by the particular school district.” This is a wide spectrum of coverage.

There being no further discussion Dr. Woodall called for the vote. The motion carried with two opposing votes by Mrs. Kristin Maguire and Mr. Ron Wilson.

FOR INFORMATION

03. Mathematics Academic Standards 2007 Field Review Draft

Heyward Hickman, EdD, Education Associate, Office of Curriculum and Standards, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item.

The purpose of this item is to update the State Board of Education on the revision and field review process for the mathematics academic standards. As outlined in the State Department of Education and Education Oversight Committee (EOC) Standard Operating Procedure, the *South Carolina Mathematics Curriculum Standards 2000* have been

reviewed by committees of educators (including educators with backgrounds in special needs, primary education, and English language learning), parents, community members, and national experts. All committees made recommendations for revisions. The state writing panel has met to implement the recommendations for revisions received from the various committees and from the MidContinental Regional Education Laboratory (McREL) into the field review draft of the 2007 Mathematics Academic Standards. The field review period will occur from October 10 through November 29, 2006. Input from the field review will be used as a basis for making final revisions to the 2007 Mathematics Academic Standards document prior to submission to the State Board of Education in January 2007, for first-reading approval.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire stated that the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) has now come out with their focal points and asked how much the writing team will take into account the NCTM revisions and focal points. Dr. Hickman stated the team had seen the report and they have used the focal points as one of the guiding documents for producing this document.

04. Results of Survey on Physical Science and Biology

Lucinda Saylor, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Curriculum Services and Assessment, presented this item. Ms. Saylor stated that this survey was conducted on behalf of the Board's request for additional input into the selection of a required science course for high school graduation.

Act 254 of 2006 requires students graduating in 2010 and beyond to have earned one unit in a science course for which there is an end-of-course examination. The survey that was conducted sought more input into that selection. At the close of the survey on October 20, 2006, 709 people had responded to the survey. A complete analysis of the survey results was presented to the State Board. The results of the survey have also been included with the minutes

Chair Isaac asked if 2007–08 will be the first year that the test will be given. Ms. Saylor responded that was correct for NCLB. Mr. Isaac then asked if there was absolutely no way biology could be used for NCLB purposes in 2007–08. Ms. Saylor stated this was correct. We don't have the test, and it has to be submitted for peer review, which is an extensive process.

Dr. Woodall expressed concern and stated there is a lot of overlap in standards and the previous biology test.

Mrs. Tenenbaum stated that several things would have to be completed to switch the biology at this point. The Board would have to amend regulations. The State Department of Education could ask for funds next year for test development. The bid process could then be done contingent

upon the funds being available. It would still take us out of this school year, and it would probably have to be done the next school year, beginning in August 2007–08. Dr. Siskind stated that we might be able to compress the timeline by one year.

Mr. DuBard stated that his concern about the whole discussion is that it seems disconnected from what is best for our state and our children. It seems the issue is what is best for the administrators and the timeline, instead of what will be needed in five or ten years in terms of our graduates. He felt that the board's role was what would the economy need down the road.

Mrs. Maguire asked why health care providers were not listed.

Ms. Wilson expressed concern that since we are trying to lower the drop-out rate, why are we are pushing students into more rigorous courses with no outlet. She asked why there couldn't be an option of either physical science or biology. Ms. Saylor stated that she thought we could do this.

Dr. Woodall explained that we have to choose one test that we report out for South Carolina under NCLB in science. We know that our upper-level students are going to do well in either subject, but our concern now is for the bottom half of the students who traditionally struggle in physical science. The question now is, if we have to choose one to report out as to how your high school is doing in science instruction, what input would you have or content wise, which one would you think is most beneficial to South Carolina.

Dr. Woodall asked the students from the Student Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for feedback.

Mr. Oberst, from the Student Ad Hoc Committee, stated that content wise, he thinks physical science is much more beneficial because it offers that scope of physics, chemistry, etc. It covers the main sciences and gives the student the opportunity to see which one they might want to pursue. With biology it is narrowed down to microbiology. He felt that because physical science offers a bigger scope, and if only one is required, physical science should be the one offered.

Mr. DuBard objected to the discussion of the Board stating that he did not think the question was how we take care of the lower half of the kids. The question is how we produce students who are going to be successful. He expressed concern that if you allow a student to graduate, and he is trained in a subject that is not needed by the business community, have you really helped the student. He pointed out only 175 of the people who took the survey were non-educators.

Dr. Varat asked that the Board revisit the NCLB issue. In reading point six, there are two points. One is the Department of Education is not allowed to use an "either/or" scenario on any of the subject tests. The state of Arkansas has implemented two tests for one subject, and NCLB said they have to take both. Ms. Saylor deferred to Dr. Siskind to answer this question. Dr. Siskind stated that this was the example she was given when she spoke to the U.S. Department of Education. She clarified that in Arkansas it was not science, it was two math courses. The problem is that if you use the tests for accountability, then you have to show the tests are comparable. There is no way to show that physical science and biology are comparable. You need to be careful and not get into the situation Arkansas did and have to require both courses. Dr. Siskind stated that she did not think Arkansas was the only state that had done that.

Mrs. Tenenbaum suggested that we stick with physical science and work with the U.S. Department of Education before starting the process. Dr. Varat asked if the Department had any idea when the U. S. Department of Education would give their decision.

Chair Isaac then asked if the Board was going to start the process. When do we get to the point of no return where we have to continue with the process? Ms. Saylor stated that if we have the money, and we reinstate the regulation that requires the Biology end-of-course test, we are then at the point of no return.

Chair Isaac asked if there was nothing coming from the U.S. Department of Education, would the Board be putting itself in jeopardy of possibly having to do two tests. Dr. Siskind stated that this was correct.

Ms. Wilson asked if the NCLB was supposed to be reviewed in 2007, would this be a part of the review. Ms. Saylor stated that she assumed it would be.

Mr. DuBard went over the options for clarity.

Mr. Wilson asked how many legislators were sent the survey. Ms. Saylor stated that she did not know. When the survey went out, it was requested that it be forwarded.

Ms. Tenenbaum asked Dale Stuckey and Shelly Kelly in the Office of General Counsel what would be the timeline if you wanted to change Regulation 43-234. Ms. Stuckey stated that the regulation would be coming to the Board in December for second reading, so changes could be made to the regulation at second reading. Ms. Stuckey stated that there was also a regulation at the General Assembly dealing with end-of-course tests. The General Assembly would have to ask the Board to withdraw, amend, and resubmit that regulation. The Board on its own could not request the withdrawal and amendment of the regulation.

Ms. Maguire asked what content area was covered on HSAP. Ms. Saylor stated ELA and math.

Chair Isaac asked if the Board wanted to instruct the State Department of Education to do anything regarding this issue before the December meeting or leave it as is.

Dr. Woodall asked Ms. Tenenbaum how the Board should proceed. Ms. Tenenbaum said, as she stated earlier, this would be a lengthy process. She stated we already had physical science in place, and if the Board wanted to stay with that, the Department had no problem. If the Board feels strongly that they want to go to biology, then the Department will start the process. The Department will abide with the decision of the Board.

Mrs. Maguire asked, if for the regulation next month, do we want all children to be required to take physical science or take biology or leave it as is, which is pass a course where there is an end-of-course assessment.

Chair Isaac stated that he was going to poll the board members on how they wanted to proceed. Ms. Tenenbaum stated that instead of taking a poll, the Board members should just tell the Department what they wanted to do, and the Department would handle getting it done.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there was a test in place for biology. Ms. Tenenbaum stated that there was one, but the science standards had been changed so they would have to do a new test to be in alignment with the standards passed this year. Before the Department could do anything, they needed to know the will of the Board.

Dr. Siskind stated that the items would also have to be field tested. This would take time. Chair Isaac stated that we had said that the quickest timeline would be the third year when biology would be ready, if the Board chose to do that.

Mr. Simpson asked about the cost to change. Ms. Saylor stated that Dr. Siskind had estimated \$1.5 million. This cost would be for a single year; there would be cost for administration and one-time cost for development. The Department would have to ask the General Assembly for funding.

Chair Isaac then asked all of those who want physical science as the course that is tested. Six members voted in favor.

Chair Isaac then asked all of those who want biology as the course that is tested. Five members voted in favor.

Mrs. Maguire stated that the reason she voted for physical science is because we require every student to take physical science.

Chair Isaac stated that Mr. Mike Forrester would be the Facilitator for the Finance and Legislative items today. Mrs. Seckinger was unable to attend the meeting today because her mother is in poor health. He also stated that Ms. Diane Sumpter was not in attendance at the meeting today because of eye surgery. Mr. McKinney was also absent.

**54. Finance and Legislative Items
Mike Forrester, Facilitator**

FOR APPROVAL

01. F&L Items Overview

John Cooley, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Finance and Operations, presented a brief overview of the item.

02. Facilities Waiver Request—Bamberg County School District One

Alex C. James, Director, Office of School Facilities, Division of School Enterprise Operations presented this item. Mr. James stated that the waiver is requested under S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-261 (Supp. 2005), District and School Planning, to allow occupancy of a nonconforming building.

Bamberg School District One is requesting a variance from the requirements of Section 108.2.2 of the *2006 South Carolina Facilities Planning and Construction Guide (Guide)* to allow the construction of a new 10,000 square-foot field house, classified as an educational occupancy, using a design-build project delivery procurement method. Section 108.2.2 specifically precludes the use of design-build procurement for educational occupancies but allows it for many other occupancies. Examples include district offices, maintenance facilities, bus facilities, and assembly occupancies. This section was intended to allow design-build for small projects of limited scope (not a whole school). While this project is an educational occupancy, it is of limited size and separated from the main school building; as such the design-build method should be acceptable. Mr. James noted that the design-build method will be under consideration for use with all educational occupancies in the next *Guide* update meeting. The Office of School Facilities recommends approval of this waiver on a one-time basis.

Ms. Rebecca Burch moved for approval of the facilities waiver request for Bamberg County School District One. Mr. Ben Mitchell seconded the motion.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire stated she would vote against this waiver because there was an alternate route that could have been followed. There was no reason to require a variance.

Mr. Forrester called for the vote. The motion carried with one opposing vote by Mrs. Kristin Maguire

FOR INFORMATION

04. State Board of Education Financial Statements

John Cooley, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Finance and Operations, presented this item to provide the State Board with an update on its budget.

52. Educational Policy Items Joe Isaac, Facilitator

FOR APPROVAL

01. Policy Items Overview

Dale Stuckey, Esquire, Chief Counsel, Office of General Counsel, presented a brief overview of these items.

02. Resolution Regarding Eligibility of Home School Student for the Byrd Scholarship

Shelly Bezanson Kelly, Esquire, Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, presented this item. Ms. Kelly stated that the purpose of this resolution is to allow home school students to participate in the federal Robert C. Byrd Scholarship Program (Byrd Program).

She explained that the Byrd Program is a federal scholarship program that is awarded to 96 students statewide based on academic excellence. Students are selected by their schools to submit an application based on the number of high school seniors that are enrolled in the school. The Byrd Program is open to public and private school children and the federal regulations allow for home school student participation. The regulations define an eligible student as a graduate from a "public or private secondary school or students who have the equivalent of a certificate of graduation recognized by the state." The state does not recognize an equivalency certificate for home school graduates. Home school students are, however, eligible to participate in the LIFE Scholarship program. Out of fairness and inclusiveness, home school students should be allowed to participate in the Byrd Program. It is recommended that the Board pass a resolution stating that if a student meets the graduation eligibility program requirements of LIFE, then that

student is eligible to participate in the Byrd Program according to application requirements and procedures.

Dr. Kristin Woodall asked how the Home School Association chooses the students. Ms. Kelly stated that the Home School Associations know the number of seniors they will have and will have to choose among them.

The State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve this resolution.

Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved for approval of the Resolution regarding eligibility of home school students for the Byrd Scholarship. Mr. Ben Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Kelly stated that this would be effective this year.

03. **What is the Penny Buying for South Carolina?—Twenty-Second Annual Reporting on the South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984, December 2006**

Cynthia Hearn, Education Associate, Office of Research, Division of School Enterprise Operations, presented this item. Ms. Hearn stated that the Education Improvement Act of 1984 (EIA) requires the State Board of Education to provide an annual assessment of the Act to the General Assembly by the first of December. This report fulfills that requirement.

This year's assessment report examines two programs. Section 1 of this report updates previous studies of the child development program conducted by the State Department of Education and follows the test performance of child development participants through the sixth and seventh grades. Section 2 is a descriptive study of the South Carolina School Improvement Council. Ms. Hearn introduced Ms. Wei Yao, the author of the child development section of the report.

This publication needs to be accepted by the State Board of Education at the November meeting in order to meet the December first due date for submission to the General Assembly and the Education Oversight Committee.

Mr. Al Simpson moved for approval of the *What is the Penny Buying for South Carolina?—Twenty-Second Annual Reporting on the South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984, December 2006*. Ms. Virginia Wilson seconded the motion.

Dr. Danny Varat asked about part one, on page 8, of the report. It talks about the variables that either can't be controlled or are purely unknown. He said he did not see a lot of evaluation of those things; there is some level of control but didn't see an explanation. For example, how do you control in this fiscal analysis for variations and program quality (program

quality in Greenville versus program quality in McCormick versus program quality in Charleston). How do you control this statistically in the study so no one looks at this and says a program is a program is a program.

Ms. Hearn stated that the study looked at children participating in state-funded programs. These programs were required to meet certain standards. Ms. Yao stated that, due to the limitation of the data sources, the control used in this study was the socioeconomic status of subjects, students who were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Dr. Varat stated that what he understood was that you could not control the effectiveness of the program in another place as the sole variable. In other words Greenville County is doing one set of things with a demographic of 150 percent level of poverty versus what Charleston is doing. We don't know which one is more effective than the other. Ms. Yao stated this report does not address this.

Ms. Hearn stated that the second recommendation speaks to this. It suggests that studies based on multiple data sources should be conducted for program improvement.

Dr. Varat then asked why we are unable to do that at this point. Ms. Hearn stated that we did not collect the data in 1995–96 when these children were in the child development program. Ms. Yao stated that we did not have program implementation information for 1995–96.

Dr. Varat asked if there was a reflection in here of the difference between center-based programs and classroom-based programs. Dr. Yao stated that an analysis was done in this report, and there was no significant difference found.

Dr. Varat then stated that center-based programs were probably Head-Start and AYC programs. There is not a private section program in the report. Ms. Hearn stated there was not.

Dr. Varat asked for a five-minute break to write his motion. Ms. Tenenbaum stated that she would like to hear from the Research staff first. Ms. Hearn stated that it is the Board's report, and the Board can tell the research staff what they want to look at. The recommendation is to be more specific when looking at variables, programs, compliance, etc. Dr. Varat feels that the report should show that we are not there yet. It is not known what the best practices are in early childhood; we don't know how to control statistics from rich counties to poor counties.

Ms. Hearn asked if he wanted them to add to the limitations listed in the report. She stated that they do try to point this out. Dr. Varat stated that it should specifically include the fact that the private and parochial centers are not part of this study; therefore, there is no way to compare what is going on in those places, the merit they have, the scores, etc. with what is

going on in the public sector. The reader of the report should be aware of this.

Mrs. Tenenbaum stated that we don't want to editorialize what the report is. It was never designed to be a comparison between public and private schools. We can say this is nothing more than tracking students in public-based settings whether it is center-based or public schools and how they do over time. It is not a study that contrasts the public or private or county by county.

Chair Isaac asked Ms. Kelly, Parliamentarian, if we would have to do an amendment to add language to this document. She stated yes.

Dr. Varat made a motion to amend the report with the language to be developed over the next few minutes with the staff. The chair requested a second. The motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Isaac called for the vote to accept this report. The motion carried with two opposing votes by Dr. Danny Varat and Mrs. Kristin Maguire.

04. Proposed New Regulation to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-272.2, State-Level Resolution Process for Disputes Involving Unaccompanied Youth and Homeless Children (to be codified at Supp. 2007) (First Reading)

Brenda J. Myers, McKinney-Vento State Coordinator, Office of Safe Schools and Youth Services, Division of District and Community Services, presented this item. Ms. Myers stated that the proposed regulation is necessary to comply with federal law requiring that the state have in place a state-level process to review and decide requests for the review of district-level decisions regarding the enrollment in public schools of homeless children and unaccompanied youth.

The state currently has in place a review process for homeless children and unaccompanied youth that, according to the August 14, 2006, report of a federal monitoring team, require additional provisions. The proposed regulation will rectify this issue.

The State Department of Education recommends that the State Board of Education approve R 43-272.2, Review Process for Homeless Children and Unaccompanied Youth.

Mr. DuBard asked how many kids fell under this category. Ms. Myers responded that for 2005–06 there were 6,811 homeless students identified.

Mr. Tindal asked if that number was higher due to Hurricane Katrina or is it pretty stable from year to year. Ms. Myers stated that there were 814 Katrina students.

Mrs. Maguire asked for consensus on how many times this regulation is actually used. Ms. Myers stated everyday but not to the point of having to have attorneys involved.

Mr. Wilson asked how they found out students were homeless.

Dr. Woodall asked if hotels and motels applied. Ms. Myers acknowledged they did count.

Mrs. Maguire asked how this intersected with legal and illegal aliens. Ms. Myers stated that they were not allowed to ask this question. Mrs. Maguire asked how it would work if a school district denied a student stating that he was here illegally. Ms. Myers stated that the school should not be asking that question.

Ms. Tenenbaum responded that Congress decided that regardless of a student's parents' legal status, the student should be in school every day. If a child is here illegally, this would be dealt with by immigration, but in the meantime we want that child in school with breakfast and lunch and being taught.

Ms Tenenbaum recognized Ms. Myers for her efforts with Katrina.

Dr. Woodall asked about admitting students and not knowing their immunization history. Ms. Myers stated that it is not that you don't have to have those records, but you can't deny enrollment to a student until they are received.

Mr. John Tindal moved for approval of the proposed new regulation to 24 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-272.2, State-Level Resolution Process for Disputes Involving Unaccompanied Youth and Homeless Children (to be codified at Supp. 2007) (First Reading). Mr. Ben Mitchell seconded the motion.

Chair Isaac called for the vote. The motion carried.

05. Proposed Revisions to State Board of Education Rules of Governance BBCDA, Criteria for Review of Fingerprint Examination of Applicants for Initial Certification, and BBCDB, Reinstatement of Certificate

Jane Turner, Esquire, Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, presented this item. Ms. Turner stated that the Department of Education recommends revisions to certain State Board of Education Rules of Governance that relate to the issuance, reinstatement, and reissuance of educator certificates.

Revisions to two State Board of Education Rules of Governance are needed in order to clarify the responsibilities of the Department's Certification Review Committee, to update terminology, and to change the Rule names so as to conform with the terminology changes within the Rules.

Mr. John Tindal moved for approval of proposed revisions to State Board of Education Rules of Governance BBCDA, Criteria for Review of Fingerprint Examination of Applicants for Initial Certification, and BBCDB, Reinstatement of Certificate. Mrs. Kristin Maguire seconded the motion. The motion carried.

06. Appointment of Member to the Charter School Advisory Committee

J. C. Ballew Jr., Education Associate, Office of Safe Schools and Youth Services, Division of District and Community Services, presented this item.

The previous State Board of Education appointee from the SCAPCS, Dr. David Church, was recently appointed to serve on the South Carolina Public Charter School District Board. Mr. Larry DiCenzo was recommended by Richard Weldon, President of the SCAPCS, to replace Dr. Church.

Mr. John Tindal moved for approval of the appointment of Mr. Larry DiCenzo to the Charter School Advisory Committee. Mrs. Kristin Maguire seconded the motion. The motion carried.

FOR INFORMATION

07. Appointment of Nominating Committee for 2007 Chair-Elect for the State Board of Education

Joe Isaac, Chair, South Carolina State Board of Education, presented this item. He explained that this item is for the appointment of a nominating committee for the 2007 State Board of Education Chair-Elect.

According to the South Carolina State Board of Education Rules of Governance, Code BBAA, Method of Election of Officers:

The elected officers of the Board will be the Chair and the Chair-Elect. The Chair of the State Board of Education shall appoint a Nominating Committee at the November Board meeting of not more than three Board members. The Nominating Committee will recommend to the State Board of Education in December a current Board member who has at least two years remaining on his or her terms for Chair-Elect. The Chair-Elect will become Chair at the January Board meeting of the year following his or her term as Chair-Elect.

Chair Isaac stated that he has selected Ms. Rebecca Burch, Mr. Trip DuBard, and Mr. John Tindal to the Nominating Committee for 2007 Chair-Elect for the State Board of Education. The nomination will be brought to the December State Board meeting.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The State Board of Education held a meeting on Wednesday, November 8, 2006, in the Basement Conference room of the Rutledge Office Building to discuss educator licensure cases. The following Board members were in attendance: Joe Isaac, Chair, John Tindal, Chair Elect, Ms. Rebecca Burch; Mr. Jessie R. Curtis; Mr. Trip DuBard; Mr. Mike Forrester; Mrs. Kristin Maguire; Mr. Ben Mitchell; Mrs. Patsy Pye; Mr. Al Simpson; Dr. Danny Varat; Mr. Ron Wilson; Ms. Virginia Wilson; and Dr. Kristi Woodall. Mr. Charles McKinney, Mrs. Terrye Seckinger, and Ms. Diane Sumpter were excused for their absences.

Chair-Elect Tindal brought the meeting to order and declared the Board in Executive Session.

Open Session

1. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education accept the voluntary surrender of the certificate of Richard L. Starks, certificate 096965, and approve the Consent Order of Voluntary Surrender, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Ron Wilson seconded the motion. The motion carried.
2. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of accept the voluntary surrender of the certificate of David R. Thiem, certificate 215274, and approve the Consent Order of Voluntary Surrender, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.
3. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Pamela B. Sellers, certificate 174241, for a period of one year, and adopt the Order of Suspension, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Joe Isaac seconded the motion. The motion carried.
4. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Meleisa S. Rauton, certificate 164203, for a period of one year, and adopt the Order of Suspension, on the grounds of breach of contract. Mr. Joe Isaac seconded the motion. The motion carried.
5. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board suspend the certificate of Austin P. Shelley, certificate 223332, for a period of one year, and adopt the Order of Suspension, on the grounds of breach of contract. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

6. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the Board issue a public reprimand to Zachary E. Norris, certificate 166222, and approve the Consent Order of Public Reprimand, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Ms. Rebecca Burch seconded the motion. The motion carried.
7. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the Board issue a public reprimand to Joseph Von Settlemyre, certificate 218145, and approve the Consent Order of Public Reprimand, on the grounds of test security violation. Mr. Joe Isaac seconded the motion. The motion carried.
8. Mr. Mike Forrester moved that the Board issue a public reprimand to Elizabeth M. Myers, certificate 191585, and approve the Consent Order of Public Reprimand, on the grounds of unprofessional conduct. Mr. Joe Isaac seconded the motion. The motion carried with five opposing votes by Mrs. Kristin Maguire, Mr. Ron Wilson, Mr. Ben Mitchell, Mr. Al Simpson, and Ms. Virginia Wilson.

Executive Session

Open Session

9. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education deny a certificate to Alma Fisher Jones. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Executive Session

Open Session

10. Mrs. Kristin Maguire moved that the State Board of Education deny approval to student teach for Charles Lewis Pingree. Mr. Mike Forrester seconded the motion. The motion carried.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

A Study Session was held upon adjournment of the State Board of Education on the Uniform Grading Policy.