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(ABSTRACT)

On March 26, 1986, Governor Gerald L. Baliles appointed the Commission on Excellence in Education and charged them with the responsibility of bringing him recommendations for specific actions to place Virginia in the top ten states in the quality of education it offers. The Commission's Report, entitled Excellence in Education: A Plan for Virginia's Future, contained thirty-six recommendations and was submitted to the Governor in October, 1986.

Specifically this study was designed to determine how and why the thirty-six recommendations were made by the Commission. Those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission were to be identified. A third purpose of this study was to determine whether the impact of the Commission's Report had met or exceeded the expectations of those responsible for the report.
Minutes of the Commission meetings were obtained and thoroughly analyzed. An attempt was made to determine those key actors and key factors responsible for the recommendations from the minutes. Information was obtained from this source as to: the membership of the Commission; the organization of the Commission into committees; those staff members from the State Department of Education serving the Commission; topics discussed at each Commission and committee meeting; speakers appearing at Commission and committee meetings; and an insight into the key actors responsible for the recommendations.

The second phase of this study was to interview each Commission Member, Governor Baliles, the Secretary of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the two Deputy Superintendents, and each staff member of the Department of Education assigned to assist the Commission.

From the interviews and the minutes of the meetings a matrix was developed which included each of the thirty-six recommendations and the key actor(s) and/or factor(s) for each. Comparing minutes of each meeting to information collected from interviews with twenty-nine individuals and other documents (e.g. newspaper reports), a triangulation methodology was used to determine the most influential actor and/or factor for each recommendation.

Perceptions of the consequences of the report were obtained during the interviews with: Commission Members;
Governor Gerald L. Baliles; and Dr. Donald J. Finley, Secretary of Education. A copy of two Report Cards, prepared by the Department of Education presented the Department's perceptions of progress made. These perceptions were reported in Chapter 5.

This study concluded that five key actors and/or factors were most influential for the recommendations made by the Commission:

1. Governor Gerald L. Baliles was identified as the key actor responsible for the appointment of the Commission on Excellence in Education.

2. Dr. S. John Davis, Superintendent of Public Instruction, was identified as the most influential actor in shaping the recommendations made by the Commission.

3. Many individual Commission Members, and their four subcommittees were identified as key actors and key factors responsible for the Commission's final report.

4. Speakers appearing before the Commission and Reports being presented to the committees were also identified as key actors and key factors influencing the thirty-six recommendations.

5. Dr. Donald J. Finley, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, was identified as a key actor in establishing the Commission and its goals.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"Will bold action follow proposals in education?"
This question was asked in an article appearing in the Richmond Times Dispatch on January 12, 1987 (Cox: B.1, 6). Charles Cox in his article was referring to the thirty-six recommendations presented to Governor Gerald L. Baliles on October 28, 1986. These recommendations culminated the work of a "Blue Ribbon" panel appointed by the Governor nearly a year earlier and represented the most recent steps taken in educational reform in the state of Virginia at that time.

The "Blue Ribbon" panel was officially known as the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education and consisted of sixteen members. This Commission was formed on March 26, 1986 and was given the challenge to bring the Governor recommendations for specific actions to place Virginia in the top ten states in the quality of education it offers. The Governor, in fact, asked for the recommendations right away since: "It would help me prepare for the 1987 General Assembly if I could receive your findings by November 1" (Governor's Remarks to the Commission, March 26, 1986). On October 28, 1986 the Commission submitted its report entitled: Excellence in Education. A Plan for
Virginia's Future. The report contained thirty-six recommendations, which the Commission believed if implemented, could make things happen. As Mr. Lemmon reported in his letter to the Governor: "With support from government and education leaders and the citizens of Virginia, we are certain of this" (Lemmon, 1986: 3).

The recent reform movement in American public education traces its beginning to the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education published on April 26, 1983. That report gave our nation's public schools failing grades. It pointed out:

"We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of it's people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people,"

The report further declared:

"If an unfriendly power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war" (United States Department of Education, 1983: 5).

The view being presented by the National Commission, was that American education had lost sight of its purpose. Academic excellence was no longer its aim. Due to the mediocre performance of its students, America had become a nation "at risk". The Commission perceived a redistribution of knowledge, information, learning and
intelligence spreading throughout the world leaving the United States with but a slim competitive edge. Among other things the report prescribed more academic requirements, additional academic or competency tests, longer school days or years, and more/better training and pay for teachers.

Since the report of the National Commission on Excellence Education in April 1983, countless other reports have been issued echoing many of the same themes about public education in America. Groups such as the Education Commission of the State’s Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, the Twentieth Century Fund, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the National Science Board, are but a few who have issued their own reports on American public education. In fact, by October 1983, only six months following *A Nation At Risk*, the Education Commission of the States reported that some 135 state and local education commissions had been appointed and were working toward their own recommendations for improvement in public education (ECS Working Paper, 1984: 1).

**RECENT EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN VIRGINIA**

*Report of the Governor’s Commission on Virginia’s Future, December, 1984*

In November 1982, Governor Charles S. Robb appointed the Governor’s Commission on Virginia’s Future and
charged this commission to: "... take the measure of Virginia's shadow during the closing decades of the twentieth century" (Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future, Vol.I, 1984: 3). In his address to the Commission members, the Governor outlined their purpose as follows:

Careful thought about the shape of Virginia's future is critical to the welfare of our people .... One of our major ... difficulties is inadequate attention to long-range thinking .... The price all of us will pay for this uncorrected, single-minded attention to the present is the near certainty that the future will take us by surprise and perpetuate the ad hoc short-term manner in which we live our lives, manage our affairs, and govern our society .... We must first define a vision of what we want Virginia to be, and then ask ourselves, "What must we do to achieve it?" (p. 7).

Governor Robb's Commission, chaired by William B. Spong, Jr., then Dean of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, was subdivided into five Task Forces: Economic Development, Education, Environment and Natural Resources, Government and Planning, and Human Resources. While each Task Force report had its own impact on the state of Virginia, this paper examines only the report and recommendations of the Education Task Force. The names of the members can be found in Appendix A.

In its report, published in December 1984, the Education Task Force gave credit to Virginia's public schools for their accomplishments to date stating that "... public elementary and secondary schools are better now than
they were in 1960, despite the upheaval of massive resistance and desegregation". It further gave credit to Governor Robb "... for focusing attention on the critical needs of public education and for providing the leadership necessary to increase the percentage of the state spending allocated to local schools" (p. 19). However, the report hastened to point out that much was left to be done for Virginia to fulfill Thomas Jefferson's dream or for it to fulfill its own constitutional mandates concerning high quality educational programs. In fact, in its conclusion, the Task Force criticizes the state for failure to meet its obligations in public education. Specifically, the report states:

Virginia has failed to meet its constitutional mandates of 1970. Progress toward that goal has been too slow. Needed changes will not come quickly, easily or cheaply. Just to bring our primary and secondary students to a state of excellence will require a greater devotion to answering the needs of our children than Virginia has ever shown. Nevertheless, all Virginians have a stake in ensuring that our passage to a new millennium is marked by pride in what we have achieved rather than rueful acknowledgement of what might have been (Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future, Vol.II, 1984: 24).

Specifically, the Report of the Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future made eight recommendations to fulfill the constitutional mandates the people gave the General Assembly in 1970. They were:

1. Education should be the highest priority
of this Commonwealth. As it nears the year 2000, Virginia should aspire to a State-wide educational system that is among the nation's very best.

a. Virginia should rank among the top ten states in the quality of education it offers.

b. At least one of its universities should rank among the nation's top twenty-five research universities.

2. Virginia should increase spending on education to a level commensurate with its fiscal capacity.

3. Disparities in educational quality in Virginia should be reduced.

a. The quality of programs in school divisions where instruction is weakest should be upgraded.

b. Efforts to equalize opportunity in higher education should continue.

c. State grants to Virginia's students who wish to enroll in private colleges and universities should be continued.

4. Virginia should create conditions that make teaching a career with financial and professional rewards equal to its importance.

a. An indispensable step must be to raise teacher salaries to nationally competitive levels and then seek to reach a higher ranking.

b. Teachers should be given the opportunity for twelve-month employment.

c. Since most of the instruction over the next twenty years will be supplied by teachers who now teach, Virginia should assign a higher priority to training and professional growth for present teachers.

d. The curricula in Virginia schools of education should be changed to place emphasis on instruction in the subjects a new teacher will teach, coupled with some instruction to sharpen classroom techniques.

5. Every school division should ensure that each student is functionally literate before completing the elementary grades. This goal is sufficiently
important to justify special state funding to see that it is attained.

6. Demographic and economic changes will require greater emphasis on early childhood and adult education.

7. Virginia should exploit the full potential of new technology as a major part of its efforts to upgrade education at all levels.
   a. To benefit from new technology, Virginia should invest heavily in equipment, instructional materials, and research and development.
   b. New technology in its multiple forms should be used to overcome inequalities among Virginia school divisions.
   c. Virginia's colleges and universities should work with the Department of Education to help local schools use new technology.

8. The governance of public education at all levels should be reexamined and reshaped.
   a. The State Council of Higher Education should have more authority and more determination to eliminate or change programs that are unnecessarily duplicative or wasteful of Virginia's limited resources.
   b. Preschool and adult education, two future growth areas, should have a place in the Virginia governance system (Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future, Vol.II, 1984: 19-21).

In essence, Governor Robb's Task Force on Education called for change, change that would cost the state considerably more money for public education. Their report pointed out, that while Virginia at that time ranked above average among the states in ability to pay for education, it ranked among the bottom one-third in it's spending on primary and secondary education.
According to the National Education Association's *Ranking of the States* for the year 1983, Virginia ranked number 11 of the 51 states (the report includes the District of Columbia as a state in its rankings), in both Total Personal Income and Total Disposable Personal Income. Virginia also ranked 15th in Personal Income Per Child of School Age for that same year. Also, this report indicated that for the 1983-84 school year, Virginia ranked 34th in Public School Revenue Per Pupil in Average Daily Attendance, with $3,168.00 expended per child, and ranked 45th in Estimated Percent of Revenue for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools from State Governments with a percentage of 33.88% (National Educational Association, 1985: 30-33, 44, 46).

In reference to educational opportunity being equal within the state, the Commission report pointed out that there existed some divisions with the ability to fund education ten times greater than other, poorer divisions. Including state and federal funds for the school year 1982-83, for example, per pupil expenditures ranged from $4741.00 in the wealthier divisions to a low of $1,658.00 in poorer ones. This was found to be "totally unacceptable" by the Task Force.

To accommodate change and to "fulfill the constitutional directive the people gave the General Assembly fifteen years ago", the Task Force suggested a
revision in the State funding formulae and an increase in revenue for public education to fully fund its own Standards of Quality mandated by the state's constitution. The Task Force also recommended the state increase educational expenditures to a level consistent with its ability to pay.


On July 1, 1982 Governor Robb also appointed a separate task force on Science and Technology. This task force, chaired by Mr. T. Justin Moore, Jr, was charged to study the state's educational system, concentrating on the course offerings and programs in mathematics and science and its graduates, to determine the status of preparation of Virginia's labor force to meet the demands of high-technology industries. A primary goal of the task force members was to determine how Virginia could attract future-oriented, high-technology industries into the state. Their report presented to the Governor in July, 1983, contained some alarming findings.

The Science and Technology Task Force agreed with the National Science Board Commission and the National Commission on Excellence in Education's reports that the educational "crisis" extended from the university level down through the high schools to the elementary grades. Their report states:

There is an escalating awareness that our
elementary and high school education systems face severe difficulties in trying to meet the needs of our increasingly high-tech society. We appear to be raising a generation of Americans who generally lack the understanding and the skills necessary to participate fully in a technological world in which mathematics, science and engineering are essential to the development and maintenance of our Nation's economic strength, military security, and commitment to the democratic ideal of an informed and participating citizenry (Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology, 1983: 7).

They saw high-technology industries being inexorably linked to the fields of science and engineering and to colleges and universities who produce those graduates. Further, the report stated that the country and the state of Virginia was "disadvantaged" and, unless the educational system changed, would become even more so in the future. In 1983, the United States produced only about six percent of its baccalaureate degrees in the field of engineering. In Japan, not only were more engineering degrees being awarded in absolute terms, but twenty percent of the baccalaureate degrees were in engineering. West Germany for the same year produced forty percent of its college graduates with engineering degrees according to the Task Force Report.

In addition to the low percentage of engineering students prepared in Virginia the Task Force expressed concern about the insufficient number of qualified minority students, especially Black. The Task Force Report stated that "The percentage of minority S&E [Science and Engi-
neering] university graduates in Virginia is considerably less than in the rest of the nation, primarily because a large fraction of Virginia's minority freshmen students drop out of S&E disciplines by their sophomore year" (p. 8).

The solution to this "crisis" recommended by the Task Force, was to develop the talents of the state's youth through in-depth study of mathematics and science. According to the Task Force, the state should equip science labs with the latest equipment, recruit and/or train teachers, and excite them to teach. Further, students must be required to complete more courses in the mathematics and science fields before they graduate from high school. According to a national study cited by the Task Force in a 5-hour instructional day in the typical elementary school, only about 45 minutes is devoted to mathematics, mostly computation; and only about 20 minutes is devoted to science. In the typical high school most science and math courses are optional with only one third of the school districts requiring more than one year of science and one year of mathematics to graduate. The end result, according to this study, produced only about one-third of the nation's high school graduates having completed three years of mathematics and one-fifth having completed three years of science (p. 11).
The Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology presented twenty-five recommendations. Of these, six dealt with the state's elementary and secondary schools. The six were:

1. The state (should) require all high school students to complete a balanced and rigorous program stressing both technological and communication literacy and establish the following minimum requirements for high school graduates:
   a. All high school graduates should have a reasonable balance of courses selected from the science and humanities but be required to complete 2 years of science and 2 years of mathematics between grades 9-12;
   b. All college bound students should be required to complete 1 additional year of science and 1 additional year of mathematics between grades 9-12.

2. A science education framework (should) be established and implemented which will ensure that all school graduates:
   a. Have a balanced program in the physical and biological sciences;
   b. Have a knowledge of the major concepts of a particular science course;
   c. Have a program of science which provides for the development of scientific skills/proceses and attitudes as well as scientific knowledge through courses stressing laboratory and field work.

3. The following special activities in science [should] be supported:
   a. Pilot schools of science (should) be established for students with a broad range of abilities, as a means to raise the level of awareness regarding the importance of science in the school curriculum and to serve as models for other schools to emulate;
   b. The Governor's school for the gifted
especially in the areas of mathematics and science, [should] be expanded.

4. Strong emphasis (should) be placed upon helping to alleviate the mathematics and science high school teacher shortage and upon improving the backgrounds of those currently teaching mathematics and science in high schools by:

b. Insuring competitive salaries for teachers and provide (ing) a mechanism for differential compensation (for example, extended contracts and the master teacher concept) in areas of critical shortage;

b. Providing summer and in-service institutes for the purpose of both retraining teachers for areas of critical shortages and for improving the backgrounds of current teachers. All pre-service and in-service programs should encourage the development of inquiry and problem-solving based on methods in both mathematics and science;

c. Providing educational loans that allow students entering the teaching profession in areas of critical shortage to repay the loans by teaching;

d. Encouraging business-industry cooperation in terms of joint appointments;

e. Providing pay or other incentives to encourage teachers in areas where a surplus exists to be retrained in areas where there is a shortage.

5. Additional emphasis (should) be placed upon the development of science programs for the elementary schools and for the strengthening of elementary teachers’ science and mathematics background.

6. Additional emphasis (should) be placed in the State’s elementary and high schools upon the effective utilization of the newer educational technologies -- microcomputers and video disc, for example -- as a means of enhancing educational programs in mathematics and science. This will require extensive training of teaching staffs throughout the State. Budgets and administrative guidelines for in-service elementary and high school programs should encourage the incorporation of new technologies into existing programs (Governor’s Task Force on Science and Technology,
Of the twenty-five recommendations presented by the Task Force on Science and Technology, three were selected to be "of the highest priority". The number one priority would require all high school students (grades 9-12) to complete a minimum of 2 years of science and two years of mathematics in order to graduate from high school. College bound students would be required to complete three years of each subject successfully.

The other two recommendations with the highest priority reported by the Task Force involved the state's colleges and universities. The state's major research universities should be expanded, in accordance with the proposal submitted jointly by the University of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to create a Center for Innovative Technology (CIT) in Northern Virginia. Colleges and universities within the state should establish graduate programs in high-tech disciplines with the goal of providing delivery systems responsive to industry's needs throughout the state. Without this expansion, or at least the state's immediate attention to this area, the Task Force saw Virginia's labor market becoming severely handicapped. According to the report, employment opportunities of the future would significantly increase in the high-tech area. High-tech products such as microcomputers, robots,
data-processors, word processors and other such inventions yet to come would have a multiplier effect on current industries and threaten the labor force. Many workers would need re-training in order to remain employed. Therefore, argued the Task Force report, Virginia's colleges and universities must expand their services to train tomorrow's labor force and, indeed, re-train many of today's labor force.

*State Superintendent's Statewide Planning Committee's Report June 1, 1984.*

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of Virginia, convened a committee on March 21, 1984 and charged it with two tasks. The first was to provide continuous advice to the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education over a period of time. The second was to review the State Board of Education's Six-Year Plan and Objectives and the Needs section of the Board's Annual Report on Public Education and to suggest revisions and deletions to these reports.

The Committee members met three times and submitted its report on June 1, 1984. The report listed two " overarching concerns" for public education in Virginia. First, schooling should be viewed "... as an articulated program from kindergarten through (the) university level" (*Superintendent's Statewide Planning Committee Report*, 1984: 1). Therefore, the state should encourage cooperation among the
agencies responsible for educating youth within this span. The second concern involved the importance of citizen and community involvement in and support of the schools.

Nine identified needs regarding public education were identified by the Committee. These needs were:

1. A need for an external group from the State Department of Education which would be "... representative of various concerns, trends and events impacting on education." (p. 5). to meet regularly and to provide advice to the State Board and State Department of Education.

2. A need for high quality in-service activities to be provided to all public educators from the classroom teacher to the Division Superintendents throughout the state.

3. A need for more and greater attention for alternative programs within the schools aimed for the "at risk" student. This student was identified as a student possessing "multiple intelligences", and/or those poor or minority students including the growing populations of Asians and Hispanics in the state.

4. A need to emphasize the educational requirements of the minority student. Aspirations of these students must be raised in many instances.

5. A need to improve the quality of textbooks.

6. A need for School Board Members to be trained.

7. A need to implement the Standards of Quality statewide.

8. A need to ensure that teachers are appropriately using the Standards of Learning Objectives provided by the State Department of Education.


Shortly after taking office in January 1986, Governor Gerald L. Baliles, having served as ex officio member to Governor Robb's Commission on Virginia's Future, set the tone for public education in the state during his term in office. He called for another commission on education to be established, and on March 24, 1986, he signed Executive Order Number 86 creating the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education.

The Commission's response submitted in October 1986, recommended "several actions that, if implemented, will place Virginia in the first rank of the states in the quality of education and will assure that a far greater number of young Virginians will become contributing members of society" (Commission on Excellence in Education's Report, 1986: 6). The recommended actions included the following:

1. Virginia's school divisions provide voluntary developmental preschool programs for four-year-old children.

2. Virginia establish literacy tests in reading, writing, and arithmetic for all students in grade 6.

3. Remediation be provided for students scoring in the bottom fourth on standardized tests.

4. State funding be provided for summer school programs.

5. The state support programs to reduce the performance gap between black and white students.
6. The state support special college preparation programs for minority students.

7. Smaller classes be required in the first grade and in English classes.

8. The state expand its support for division and regional nonresidential special schools and programs for gifted students.

9. The Department of Education develop a state plan to ensure greater cooperation among the agencies concerned with the welfare of special education students.

10. An undergraduate degree in an arts and sciences discipline be required for all teachers educated in Virginia.

11. Virginia's approved program standards for prospective teachers be revised to limit professional education course requirements to 18 semester hours.

12. All colleges and universities review and restructure their programs for educating teachers.

13. Virginia have competitive teacher salaries that will attract and keep highly qualified teachers.

14. The state provide financial incentives to school divisions to help them develop ways to keep effective teachers in the classroom.

15. The number of forgivable loans for teacher candidates be increased.

16. More emphasis be placed on leadership in the training of principals.

17. School divisions evaluate and compensate principals on the basis of performance.

18. More aides, volunteers, part-time instructors and technology be used to assist teachers.

19. Individualized recertification plans, based on a point system, be required for each teacher.
20. All teachers should have, or be working toward, graduate degrees.

21. Regional graduate professional education centers be established.

22. The state employ an Assistant State Superintendent for Technology.

23. Electronic classrooms be available to all schools.

24. Teachers in the middle school grades be provided with microcomputers for the classroom and with instruction in their use.

25. The Department of Education establish an electronic communications network with school divisions and develop a standardized database.

26. The Virginia Public School Authority provide loans to help school divisions buy technological equipment.

27. The Department of Education restructure education in the middle school grades.

28. Virginia set a goal that no school division shall have a dropout rate higher than the present statewide average, and that the present statewide average be reduced by one-half.

29. Middle school programs provide assistance to students who are potential dropouts.

30. Training programs be required for school board members and division superintendents.

31. The Governor and the General Assembly redefines the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and local school boards, superintendents, and principals.

32. Outstanding schools and deficient schools be identified.

33. Funds be established to reward outstanding schools and to help deficient schools.
34. The General Assembly revise the statute establishing criteria by which the Board of Education may consolidate school divisions that fail to meet the Standards of Quality.

35. The present continuing contract law relating to school teachers and administrators be reviewed by the General Assembly.

36. Where appropriate, these recommendations be included as part of the Standards of Quality (Excellence in Education: A Plan for Virginia's Future, October, 1986: pp. 7-19).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What was the reason for establishing yet another state-level commission to study public education in Virginia? Did the Governor believe, for example, that public education in Virginia was still lacking in quality; that it did not adequately meet his or the public's expectations in terms of its effectiveness? Did he believe that changes had occurred since the previous reports to the extent that the earlier recommendations were no longer relevant, valid, or appropriate? Did he believe that he needed to demonstrate the importance of education to his administration? Or, did the Governor believe that the previous reports were too vague to result in specific initiatives? Perhaps the Governor was simply demonstrating his interest in public education and he believed that a new Commission would recommend those changes necessary to produce the profound effects in public education for which he was looking. Whatever the reason, the Commission was
established in March 1986, and presented its report to the Governor in October 1986.

This study was designed to investigate the work of Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education and to determine how the thirty-six recommendations came into being. It was intended that this study would determine which actors or what factors were most influential in shaping the recommendations finally presented to the Governor. Further, it was intended that this study would help to determine the reasons the Governor had for appointing the Commission; the Governor's perceptions of public education in the state at that time; and the extent to which the Commission Members shared this perception with the Governor.

Sixteen persons were officially appointed to the Commission by Governor Baliles. Five of those persons had previously served on Governor Robb's Commission on Virginia's Future. Specifically, the five members served on the seven-member Education Task Force which rendered its report to Governor Robb's Commission. How influential were these members in the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education?

Ten members of the State Department of Education staff were assigned to assist the Commission. This group, referred to as the "Blue Ribbon Staff", began meeting on February 7, 1986, making preparations for the Commission by
gathering materials and selecting potential speakers for their future meetings. What influence did these staff, their materials, and/or speakers have on the recommendations of the Commission?

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction attended many of the meetings held by the Commission. He selected the staff and met regularly with the State Board Members. Was he the most influential actor in the development of the recommendations?

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Policy making is always a complex and sometimes "messy" process. Well intended policy makers often marvel at the unintended consequences which result from their efforts. Sometimes those consequences are serendipitous - positive but unplanned benefits. At other times the consequences are disastrous and need to be addressed by subsequent action. Examination of the policy process can help us to determine whether outcomes match intents and if not, whether remedial action is required.

It was hoped that this study would help to determine which actors or what factors were most influential in shaping the thirty-six recommendations finally presented to the Governor by the Commission on Excellence in Education.
It was expected that this study would reveal, to some degree, how these key actors or decision makers perceived public education in the state of Virginia. It was further expected that this study would provide insight into the expectations and intent of those preparing the state-level reports.

**SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

Each of the Task Force, Committee and Commission reports indicated that the state of Virginia has a good public school system. Some of its schools have ranked among the best nationally. However, some of its schools are "marginal at best", according to the Baliles' Commission Report. This disparity of educational opportunities in the state was acknowledged by the Governor upon the appointment of his commission. Too many students, he said:

... do not yet enjoy truly equal educational opportunity. Student achievement varies widely. Broad gaps also exist in expenditures, pupil-teacher ratios, courses available, teacher qualifications, facilities, equipment and teacher aids (Lemmon, 1986: 1).

This study did not examine the history of public education in the state of Virginia; nor did it examine educational reform in the state other than the reports already mentioned. It was the intent of this paper to determine how and why the thirty-six recommendations were originated.
This study also sought to identify those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing the Commission’s recommendations.

A third purpose of this study was to determine whether the impact of the Commission’s report had met or exceeded the expectations of those responsible for the report. A comparison was made with the State Department of Education’s Report Card prepared in October 1989 which gives the department’s assessment of each of the thirty-six recommendations at that time to the responses of each of the Commission Members and Governor Baliles’ response to the question asked in the interview: "In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the report"?

LIMITATIONS

This study was limited to the specific recommendations made by Baliles’ Commission on Excellence in Education. Through a comprehensive study of these recommendations and interviews with those persons who served the Commission, the most influential actors and key factors to the extent possible were determined.

Only those persons who served on the Commission on Excellence in Education, the Governor, those State Department personnel assigned to assist the Commission, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and other key actors as determined from interviews were included in this study.
A total of thirty persons were identified to be interviewed. Of these, only twenty-nine were able to be scheduled during the time frame in which this study was conducted. Five persons were interviewed by telephone by their choice, which shortened the interview time as compared to others and, possibly shortened the amount of information obtained from these individuals. Four persons were interviewed as couples to accommodate their time schedules and preferences. In one instance this arrangement was beneficial to the interviewer since more information was probably given by one person prompting the other; in the second instance, this arrangement seemed to hamper the flow of information.

Since the Commission's work was done in 1986 and interviews were conducted in the Spring of 1990, many of the individuals found it difficult remembering specifically who or what was responsible for each of the recommendations the Commission submitted. Therefore, the minutes of each the committee meeting became very important in the search for this information. Tapes of the full Commission meetings were obtained and reviewed to assist also.

Attributions of direct quotes from those inter-
viewed were given only with consent.

Only those perceptions of the consequences of the thirty-six recommendations as stated in the State Depart-
ment's October 1989 Report Card and the statements given by Commission Members and the Governor in interviews are reported.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

This study is organized into six chapters. Chapter two reviews the literature that was prepared for the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education by the State Department of Education's "Blue Ribbon Staff" as well as the literature provided to the Commission Members during their meetings which was topic specific to that meeting. Also, any literature mentioned by a Commission Member during the interview which was given credit as having influenced that member's decision to promote or support a recommendation made by the Commission is also included.

Chapter three describes the methodology of data collection and analysis procedures.

Chapter four identifies the most influential actors and key factors that influenced the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission.

Chapter five provides the perceptions of the Commission Members, the Secretary of Education, Governor Gerald L. Baliles, and the State Department of Education as to whether or not the outcomes/actions resulting from the Commission's Report met or exceeded their expectations.
Chapter six contains the summary, conclusions, implications and recommendations for future commissions or state-level groups as they work with the educational programs within the state.
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CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In preparation for Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education, Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed ten members to a "Blue Ribbon Staff" chaired by his Deputy Superintendent, Mr. William J. Burkholder (February 1986). One of the primary missions assigned to this staff was to review the current literature on public education (including the reform literature that was so prevalent at that time), to collect appropriate articles, and to prepare a collection for each Commission member. This material was collected and prepared for each member's use and was presented to the Commission Members at their organizational meeting on March 26, 1986.

During the meetings of the Commission other literature was presented to the Commission Members by speakers and/or organizations specific to the topic under consideration that meeting.

This chapter reviews this literature in an effort to determine what influence, if any it might have had on the thirty-six recommendations contained in the Commission's final report.
Reading Materials Prepared by the State Department's "Blue Ribbon Staff"

The literature presented to the Commission Members on March 26, 1986 by the State Department of Education's staff was organized into three categories:

1. General Information on Virginia
2. Statistics Specific to Virginia
3. Other Approaches to the Study of Educational Quality

A complete bibliography of this material may be found in Appendix B.

All of the materials provided to the Commission members were thoroughly reviewed as a part of this study. Other specific items cited by Commission members have been thoroughly reviewed and the relationship between the item and the specific recommendation analyzed.

1. General Information on Virginia

In November, 1982, Governor Charles S. Robb appointed the Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future. This Commission, chaired by Senator William B. Spong, Jr., who also served on Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education, was subdivided into five Task Force groups; one of which was the Education Task Force. Two reports were presented to the Governor by this Commission in December 1984. These reports were entitled: Toward a New Dominion: Choices For Virginians, Volumes I and II.
These two reports were included in the reading materials for Governor Baliles' Commission. Not only do the recommendations of the Education Task Force Report seem to parallel several of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Baliles' Commission, the membership of the two Commissions contained many of the same people. For example, five of the seven members who served on the Education Task Force also served on the sixteen member Commission on Excellence in Education. These five members were: Mr. John P. Fishwick, Mrs. Joan S. Jones, Mrs. Lois Rochester, Senator Hunter B. Andrews, and Mr. Willard L. Lemmon, Chairman of the Commission on Excellence. In addition, Senator William B. Spong, Jr., Chairman of the Robb Commission also served on the Baliles' Commission. The relationship of the eight recommendations made by the Education Task Force on the thirty-six recommendations of the Commission on Excellence is discussed in Chapter 5.

While the Commission on Virginia's Future was working, Governor Robb had also appointed a separate Task Force on Science and Technology. This Task Force was assigned responsibility for studying the state's educational system, concentrating on the course offerings and programs in science and mathematics. In addition, the Task Force was asked to evaluate both high school and college/university graduates to determine the status of preparation
of Virginia’s labor force. The ensuing report entitled: Report of the Governor’s Task Force on Science and Technology was published in July 1983. It contains twenty-five recommendations, six of which deals with the state’s elementary and secondary schools.

Although no Commission Member mentioned this report as having influenced their deliberations, it is important to note that the Chairman of the Science and Technology Task Force was Mr. T. Justin Moore, also a member of Governor Baliles’ Commission. A review of this report also suggests a relationship between it and Governor Baliles’ Commission Report. Examples include:

a. The preparation of teachers is given strong emphasis in both reports. Both reports call for an improvement in the teacher’s background and preparation.

b. Improvement of teacher’s salaries is called for in both reports.

c. Providing forgivable loans for potential is suggested in both reports.

d. The Governor’s school for the gifted, while perhaps having a different connotation in each, is included in both reports.

e. The importance of technology and it’s utilization in the public schools is given strong emphasis in both of these reports.

Another report contained in the package of materials provided by the State Department of Education to the Commission members was entitled: Identified Needs in Public Education: Current Conditions, Activities, and Rationales;
a report prepared for the Superintendent’s Statewide Planning Committee on June 1, 1984. The report contains nine "identified needs" regarding public education in Virginia. At least four of these "identified needs" are represented in the Commission on Excellence’s report. Again, while no one from the Commission mentioned this report in their interviews it may be useful to examine these four "needs" as they appeared in the 1984 document. They are:

a. A need for in-service training for Division Superintendents.

b. A need for more and better alternative programs for "at risk" students.

c. A need to raise the aspirations of the minority student.

d. A need to train School Board Members.

2. Statistics Specific to Virginia

This section of the State Department’s collection of reading materials contained nine items.

The first item was entitled: How Virginia Stands; a report prepared and presented by Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, to the House Education Committee and the Senate Committee on Education and Health in joint session on June 17, 1983. This presentation reviewed the national literature on educational reform and compared the recommendations made in these
reports to the status of Virginia's public schools at that time.

The second item distributed to the Commission was *Where Virginia Ranks*, a publication produced by the Virginia Education Association Research Service (October 1985). It included data obtained from *Rankings of the States, 1985*: a publication of the National Education Association. Examples of the data included Virginia's rank nationally and among Southern States for some 117 items such as: governmental revenue; school revenue; governmental expenditures and debt; and school expenditures, to name just a few. Each state was ranked from highest to lowest in the nation on each item.

The Virginia Board of Education's April, 1985, issue of the *Statistical Manual* which contained a comparison of SAT scores in Virginia to the nation, among other statistics, was the third item.

The Virginia Department of Education's 1980 Survey of High School Seniors was the fourth item. This survey was designed to provide information to assist high school seniors in making educational and vocational decisions and plans for their future.

The Southern Regional Education Board's Report entitled: *Measuring Student Achievement: Comparable Test Results for Participating Southern States, the South and the Nation* was the fifth item. This report included
results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress Testing Project which included Florida, Tennessee, and Virginia in 1985. The test results indicated that eleventh graders in Virginia scored higher than the other three states participating while all three states scored at or above the national ranking.

The sixth report was written by J. Wade Gilly and W. Mark Crain, two professors at George Mason University in Virginia and was entitled: Public Attitudes Toward the Public Schools in Virginia. This document, published on January 4, 1985, reported a favorable impression being held by Virginia's public towards their schools, with over half, (56%) of the public assigning the public schools a grade of A or B.

All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School, was a report published in 1985. This seventh report given to the Commission Members, was written by Harold L. Hodgkinson. The report was divided into four sections. Section one contained a briefing on major demographic trends which pointed out some of the impacts of broken homes, teen-age pregnancies, drugs, etc. on today's public schools. Section two examined the success of today's high schools in retaining students until graduation. Since 1980, the numbers of graduates had fallen from 76% to 73% indicating that the number of drop outs was increasing. The third section,
which dealt with the transition to college, pointed out the number of youth in today's public schools was declining as was the youth population. According to the report, special emphasis needed to be given to the increasing minority populations to assist them in their preparation for college at the high school level. Section four, which dealt with the completion of college programs, stressed that more effort was needed on the college's part to adapt to these changing demographics (Hodgkinson, 1985: 12).

"The 17th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" from the September issue of the Phi Delta Kappan and "Jobs of the Future" from the December 23, 1985, U. S. News and World Report, completed the items included in this section. The Gallup Poll presented a 1985 rating of the nation's public schools equivalent to that earned by the schools in 1984, when the schools had achieved the highest grades in a decade. "Jobs of the Future" reviewed occupations of the future and predicted computing and engineering to have the greatest demands for future employment.

3. Other Approaches to the Study of Educational Quality

Some twenty-one items were collected and placed into this category by the State Department's "Blue Ribbon Staff". The first six articles were statistical in nature and included the National Education Association's Ranking
of the States, which has already been mentioned; the Council of Chief State School Officers' *Criteria for Review and Selection of Individual Indicators*, and *Executive Summary*, as examples. Three of the items provided by the Staff of the State Department of Education were descriptive in nature. Included in this category were a description of the Varina Electronic Classroom, a report on Vocational Education prepared by the State Department of Education, and a May 2, 1986, Ed-Line report entitled: "Student Values Key to Educational Success". Six items were prescriptive in nature. Examples of these included: *Missouri Public Schools - Reaching for Excellence*, which listed the reforms of that state's public educational system; the Charles Mott Foundation's *The State's Excellence in Education Commission's: Who's Looking Out for At-Risk Youth*; and other items that gave potential solutions to today's public school "problems". The remaining six items were articles written by authors having some reputation within the educational arena. Included were articles by John I. Goodlad, Theodore R. Sizer, Ernest L. Boyer, and Arthur D. Roberts and Gordon Cawelti. A complete listing of these items may be found in the appendix.

*Topic Specific Literature Presented to Meetings held by the Commission on Excellence in Education*
Two Commission members, Mr. Kenneth S. White and Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe) attended a meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education in 1985. At that meeting Mr. Brad Butler, Chairman of the Board of Procter and Gamble was the guest speaker. At that time Mr. Butler also chaired the Education Task Force on the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. The Committee for Economic Development is a national organization located in Washington, D.C.. Founded in 1942, it consists of 225 Trustees who are heads of major corporations and university presidents. The Committee has a full-time staff of 44 and a budget of three million plus annually. Working with expert advisors, the Committee conducts research and formulates policy recommendations on national and international economic issues including education, energy, urban development, and government management. Mr. Butler’s topic for the meeting was the recently published: Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools, a Statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, 1985. The Project Directors for this book were Denis P. Doyle and Marsha Levine. Contributions from other staff members are cited throughout the book.

Both Commission members were impressed with Butler’s presentation and the book, to the extent that Mr. White, who was then serving as Chairman of the State Board
of Education, obtained copies of the book and a tape of Butler's speech which he made available to all the members of the State Board of Education and members of the State Vocational Advisory Council.

Chapter three of this book entitled: "Investment Strategies in Education", contained a description of the Perry Preschool Program in Ypsilanti, Michigan stating: "... one year of the program is an extraordinary economic buy". The message being that this program for "at risk" children was indeed a wise investment and one which should be duplicated throughout the United States.

Further, Chapter three of this book argued the need for reform at the Middle School level in public education as well. While test scores were improving at the elementary school level (even for low-achieving students), according to this study, they did not find the same results for students at the middle or junior high schools. The reason for this, according to the book, was that problem solving skills were not adequately being addressed in America's Middle Schools. A reform was necessary at this level to prevent the ever increasing number of dropouts in our nation's schools.

Program on Youths through Age Fifteen and The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age Nineteen.

While the Commission's minutes did not reflect how these two books were introduced, the Ypsilanti, Michigan, Perry Preschool Program was referenced on page 7 of the Commission's Report. Both these books described the effects of this program on approximately 100 children who participated in a preschool program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, between the years of 1962 to 1967. All children were from poor minority families and each had test results indicating low intelligence quotients. Approximately one half of them had one-parent homes and less than twenty percent of the parents of the children had completed high school. The children were divided equally into the preschool program and into a control group with no preschool program and monitored over a period of nineteen years.

The results of the Ypsilanti study, as reported in these two books were phenomenal. Employment and college entry were almost double for the preschool group of children. Arrest rates for the preschool group were over forty percent lower and teenage pregnancy was about one half. The number of students entering special education from the preschool group was half of the control group and test scores were at or above the national average for the preschoolers.
According to these reports, preschool education was certainly a wise investment for America.

Another source given credit for impacting Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence Report was *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative For Educational Reform* prepared by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983, and published by the United States Department of Education. Mrs. Margaret S. Marston (Lampe), a member of Governor Baliles' Commission served on the National Commission as well. In her interview she credits this study as having influenced her decisions on five of the recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence.

Two items presented to the Teacher and Teaching Committee of the Commission of Excellence which also had an impact on the final report of the Commission are: *A Nation Prepared: Teachers For The 21st Century*, the Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (May, 1986); and *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group*, published by the Holmes Group, a coalition of research universities committed to the improvement of teacher education (1986). Recommendations from these two reports included:

1. Schools of education should be merged with colleges of arts and sciences. (Holmes Report)

2. Bachelors degrees in education should be abolished; all professional educational courses
for teachers should be conducted at the graduate level. (Carnegie Report)

3. Creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards to grant teaching certificates to those who pass difficult tests, similar to the medical and legal professions' certification methods. (Carnegie Report)

4. Salaries should be based on the level of teaching responsibility, competence, seniority, and productivity; not on the number of graduate credits earned. (Carnegie Report)

5. Professional education courses should be required, but the bulk of teacher training should be conducted by professors in schools of arts and science. Apprenticeships would be encouraged. (Holmes Report)

6. Administrative structures within schools need to be re-evaluated. Principals are not able to be the instructional leaders and administrators. The hospital mode of administration is recommended. (Holmes Report)

7. Differentiated staffing is necessary with para-professionals assuming lunch duty, bus duty, reports and record keeping. (Carnegie Report)

8. Teacher salaries of forty thousand dollars or more are recommended. (Holmes Report)

9. Career ladders for teachers are recommended, but not merit pay. (Holmes Report)

In the area of technology among the Commission's Recommendations, Dr. S. John Davis, Mr William Burkholder, and Dr. E. B. Howerton, during their interviews, credited a study completed in 1982 by the State Department of Information Technology entitled Communications/Automation Transition Plan (CATS). Following an extensive investigation of the Department of Education and its needs throughout the state as far as communications were concerned, the Depart-
ment of Information Technology made the following recommendations in its report:

1. Develop and automate a standardized data base for educational information to support all levels of public education.

2. Establish a communications network with the divisions to support the transfer of data and electronic mail.

3. Develop or adopt standardized software to support school administration.

4. Develop or adopt administrative software to support teachers.

5. Adopt standards for micro-computer hardware and software.

The final item identified in the interviews as having impacted the thirty-six recommendations made by Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education was a report entitled: *Action For Excellence: 21 Recent School Reform Initiatives in Missouri*, Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, September, 1984. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) referred to this report in connection with recommendation number 19, teacher recertification. The Funding and Equal Access Committee also referenced the Missouri Plan in their recommendation of the four year old program, which is Recommendation Number 1 in the Commission's Report.

Summary

Nine sources were quoted by those persons inter-
viewed and/or revealed by the minutes of the Commission as having influenced the origin of the thirty-six recommenda-
tions made by the Commission on Excellence in Education. These nine items were:


CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The recent reform movement in public education traces its beginnings to the report of the National Commission on Excellence published in 1983. Since that report many state and local education commissions have produced their own recommendations for improvement in public education. Virginia had two Governor-appointed Commissions during the 1980’s charged with the responsibility to look at the state’s public education system and recommend improvements.

The purpose of this study was to examine the latest Commission’s work to determine how and why the thirty-six recommendations were made. Those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing the thirty-six recommendations presented to the Governor by the Commission on Excellence in Education were identified. The report entitled: Excellence in Education: A Plan For Virginia’s Future, was thoroughly studied, including the minutes of each meeting. Interviews were conducted with Governor Baliles, each Commission Member (except for one), each member of the State Department of Education staff assigned to assist the Commission and other "key actors" who helped shape the recommendations.
It was expected that this study would provide a perception of public education in the state of Virginia held by these key actors or decision makers. Further, it was expected that this study would provide insight into the expectations and intent of those who played a key role in producing this state-level report.

Data Collection

This chapter outlines the steps taken in the conduct of this research. It includes the procedures used in obtaining and analyzing the minutes of each Commission meeting. It also includes the procedures used in scheduling and conducting interviews with each Commission Member, the Governor, the State Secretary of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the key staff members from the State Department of Education assigned to the Commission. Questions asked during the interviews are also included in this chapter.

Analyzing the Minutes From the Commission

The first step taken in this investigation was to obtain copies of the minutes from each of the Commission's meetings. Members of the State Department of Education were extremely helpful in this regard, especially Dr. M. Kenneth Magill, who served the Commission as an assigned staff member during its tenure. Through Dr. Magill, names, addresses, and phone numbers of the members of the
Commission on Excellence in Education were identified along with the names of the assigned State Department of Education staff members who served the Commission. A brief resume for these individuals is provided below.

Members of the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education:

1. Mr. Willard L. Lemmon, President of the State Board of Education, 1986 and appointed Chairman of Commission on Excellence in Education. Appointed to the Board of Education in 1982; lives in Marion; president of Lemmon Investment Corporation; served six terms in the House of Delegates; served on the House Appropriations Committee and was Chairman of the joint Senate-House Committee studying the Standards of Quality for public education; also served as chairman of the Education Committee; member, Virginia Foundation of the Humanities; and served as a member of the Education Task Force, Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future.

2. Senator Adelard L. Brault
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1985; lived in Fairfax in 1986; (now lives in Sun City Center, Fla.); married; three children; Founding partner of Brault, Gatchener, Palmer & Grove in Fairfax; member of the Fairfax, District of Columbia, and American Bar Associations; Fellow in the American College of Trial Lawyers; Past President, Fairfax Bar Association; member, Virginia State Senate 1966-1984; served on Finance, Education & Health, and General Laws Committees; Majority Leader, 1976 to 1980; chief patron of Virginia's first law which mandated a program of special education for all pupils 2-21; and served as a member of the Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology.

3. Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr.
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1984; lives in Virginia Beach; married; 3 children; owns a business and real estate investment firm, DeFord, Inc.; Board of Directors, Virginia Beach Federal Savings and Loan, Virginia Orchestra Group, and the Virginia Marine Science Museum; Trustee, Virginia Wesleyan College and Humana Hospital; member of
numerous civic and community organizations; former member and past chairman of Virginia Beach School Board.

4. Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr.
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1985; Partner in the law firm of Sidley & Austin in Washington, D. C.; married; 4 children; has residence in Keswick; and teaches courses at U.Va. Law School; served as Domestic Policy Advisor to Vice President Walter Mondale; advised the Vice President on education, social services, health, youth employment; graduated cum laude from Howard University in 1971; editor-in-chief of the Howard Law Journal; Trustee, Washington Hospital Center and the D. C. Retirement Board.

5. Mrs Frances A. Lewis
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1983; lives in Richmond; married; 3 children; serves as Executive Vice President of Best Products, Inc; has received numerous state and national recognitions and awards for her work in the arts and in public service; Trustee, Virginia Environmental Endowment; member of Board of Richmond Renaissance and Virginia Retail Merchants Association; member of Committee on Exhibitions, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.

6. Mrs. Margaret S. Marston (Lampe)
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1979; lives in Arlington; married; 3 children; member of numerous civic and community organizations, including serving as member of the board and chairperson of the Virginia Congress of Parents and Teachers; member, Northern Virginia Service League and Task Force on Delinquency; appointed by Secretary of Education, T. H. Bell, to the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which published its report in April 1983 entitled A Nation At Risk; chaired the National Institute of Education Task Force on Educational Laboratories; co-chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

7. Mrs. Suzanne F. Thomas
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1984; lives in Alexandria; married; 3 children; former teacher Henrico and Alexandria school systems; member of numerous civic and community organizations, including the Junior Auxiliary of the Alexandria Hospital, Alexandria Community Y, Torpedo Factory Art
Center Foundation, and Woodlawn Plantation; Board of Governors for St. Agnes School; Board of Trustees for Episcopal High School.

8. Mrs. Sandra Adair Vaughan
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1986; lives in Petersburg; married; 2 children; graduate of Georgetown University Law School; registered tax advantaged investment specialist; co-owner of Convenient Health Care; member, National Coalition of 100 Black Women, American Bar Association, National Association of Executive Women, Board of Directors of the Petersburg Chamber of Commerce and numerous other professional and civic organizations; former vice chairman of the Petersburg City Schools and Board of Directors of the Virginia School Boards Association.

9. Mr. Kenneth S. White
Appointed to the Board of Education in 1977; lives in Lynchburg; married; 3 children; graduate of U. Va. Law School; partner in the law firm of Edmunds, Williams, Robertson, Sackett, Baldwin, & Graves; member of the American Bar and Virginia Bar Associations; served on numerous committees in each of these associations; past president of the Lynchburg Chamber of Commerce; member, Board of Directors of Craddock-Terry Shoe Corporation, Central Fidelity Banks, Inc., C. B. Fleet Company, Inc.; member of numerous civic and community organizations.

10. Mr. John P. Fishwick
Mr. Fishwick retired as chairman and CEO of Norfolk and Western Railroad; counsel to the law firm of Windels, Marx, Davies, & Ives, N. Y. City; chairman and CEO of the Erie Lackawanna Railroad Company; president and CEO of the Delaware and Hudson Railway Company; president and director of Dereco, Inc.; director of Allied Corporation, Shenandoah Life Insurance Company, Norfolk Southern Corporation, and Piedmont Aviation Incorporated; Chairman of the Education Task Force, Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future; trustee of Roanoke College, Virginia Theological Seminary, and Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; graduate of Roanoke College and an LL.B. from Harvard University.

11. Mrs. Joan S. Jones
Mrs. Jones lives in Lynchburg and is a member of the State Council of Higher Education; a graduate of Wells College and Lynchburg College; member of
the House of Delegates from 1974 to 1981; served as a member of the Lynchburg City School Board; member of the League for Women Educators; former board member Virginia Association for Children with Learning Disabilities; and a member of the Education Task Force, Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future; and a member of the Lynchburg City Democratic Committee.

12. Mrs. Lois B. Rochester
Mrs. Rochester owns and operates the School and College Consultant Service, an educational consulting service in Charlottesville; chairwoman of the State Financing of Education Committee of the League of Women Voters; former headmistress of Riverdale Country School; former Chairman of the Education Committee and past-president of the League of Women Voters for Charlottesville; a graduate of Barnard College and U.Va.; and a member of the Education Task Force, Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future.

Senator Spong retired as Dean of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law of the College of William and Mary in 1985; attended Hampden-Sydney College and received his LL.B. degree from U.Va.; did postgraduate study at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland; served in the Virginia House of Delegates, the Virginia Senate and the U. S. Senate; former general counsel for the Committee for the Conduct of Foreign Policy; served as Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future; trustee of Hampden-Sydney College; member of the Board of Visitors of the Air Force Academy and of the Naval Academy; member of Phi Alpha Delta, Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Kappa, and Pi Kappa Alpha.

14. Senator Hunter B. Andrews
Senator Andrews of Hampton, has served in the Virginia Senate since 1964. He is the Majority Leader of the Finance and Education and Health Committees. He received his A. B. degree from William and Mary College and his LL.B. degree from U.Va.; attorney; member of the Hampton School Board for five years; first chairman, Hampton Roads Educational Television Association; member, Board of Directors, Sovran Financial Corporation; commissioner and former vice-chairman, Education Commission of the States; ex-officio member of the Education Task Force, Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future. (Resigned Governor Baliles' Commission on Excell-
ence in July 1986, after attending one meeting).

15. Mr. T. Justin Moore, Jr.
Mr. Moore has been counsel to the Richmond based law firm of Hunton & Williams since May 1985; former chairman of the Board of Directors of Dominion Resources, Inc., and its subsidiary, Virginia Electric and Power Company; graduate of Princeton University and U. Va. Law School; former member of the Boards of Directors of Southeastern Electric Exchange, Edison Electric Institute, and the Atomic Industrial Forum; former chairman of the Virginia College Building Authority; the Board of Trustees of the Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges; a member of the board of the Governor's Advisory Board on Industrial Development; origin-ator and board chairman of Richmond Renaissance; director of Philip Morris, Inc., GTE Corporation, and Central Fidelity Banks, Inc., of Richmond; member of the Board of Trustees of Colonial Williamsburg; and Chairman of the Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology.

16. Mrs. Dorothy S. McDiarmid
Mrs. McDiarmid, of Vienna, has served as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates for more than twenty years. She is chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee and a member of the Education Committee of the House; a graduate of Swarthmore College; a partner in McDiarmid Associates and McDiarmid Realty; a member of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges; the League of Women Voters; National Democratic Women's Club; the International Platform Association; chairwoman of the Virginia Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Council; member of the Virginia Council on Health and Medical Care; the Task Force on Deinstitutionalization of Mental Health-Mentally Retarded patients, and the Criminal Justices Board; past chairwoman of the Virginia Foundation for Humanities and Public Policy; and served as a member of the Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology.

17. Senator Stanley C. Walker
Senator Walker lives in Norfolk; presently serves in the Virginia Senate; was appointed to Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education to replace Senator Hunter Andrews in July 1986; did not attend a meeting of the Commission and remained unavailable for an interview with this author.
Assigned State Department of Education Staff Members:

1. Mr. William J. Burkholder  
   Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.

2. Dr. Callie P. Singleton  
   Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

3. Dr. Thomas A. Elliott  
   Director, Division of Humanities and Secondary Administration.

4. Dr. M. Kenneth Magill  
   Administrative Director for Assessment and Evaluation.

5. Dr. Gerald L. Bracey  
   Special Assistant for Policy and Program Planning.

6. Dr. Margaret Roberts  
   Associate Director, Office of Community Relations.

7. Mr. Joseph P. Roberts  
   Supervisor of Research and Program Development.

8. Dr. Lois S. Rubin  
   Supervisor in the Division of Testing.

9. Mrs. Jane C. Koontz  
   Coordinator, Professional Education Information Center.

10. Mr. Harry L. Smith  
    Retired, previously a Special Assistant for Public Information and Publications.

Other "Key Actors" Identified by Reviewing the Minutes of the Commission:

1. Dr. Donald J. Finley  
   Secretary of Education, State of Virginia.

2. Dr. E. B. Howerton  
   Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Meetings of the Commission on Excellence in Education

The first meeting of the Commission on Excellence was held at Patrick Henry High School in Roanoke, Virginia on March 26, 1986. At this meeting the Commission members were sworn in by Governor Baliles, who delivered his charge to the members. He began by quoting from Governor Robb’s Commission on Virginia’s Future report and ended by stating his charge to the group:

Education should be the highest priority of this Commonwealth. As it nears the year 2000, Virginia should aspire to a State-wide educational system that is among the nation’s very best ... Virginia should rank among the top ten states in the quality of education it offers.

Your responsibility ... is to consider and recommend actions that will achieve what the Governor’s commission set forth as a goal. ... your task is not to study or restudy - it is to take or recommend specifications. Your assignment is not to reinvent the wheel but to start the wheel rolling.... things don’t just happen; they must be made to happen (Remarks of The Honorable Gerald L. Baliles, Charge to the Commission, March 26, 1986).

Following the swearing in of the members, Mr. Lemmon, Chairman of the Commission called the first meeting of the group together. This meeting consisted of hearing from the following persons:

Dr. Jay V. Rogers, Senior Associate, The Naisbitt Group, Washington, D. C.. Dr. Rogers cautioned that changes in public education shouldn’t be dictated from the top down. He encouraged the Commission to show results and
to establish a "vision" at the state level for Virginia's school divisions.

Dr. Mark Musick, Director of State Services for Southern Regional Education Board, was the second speaker who encouraged the Commission to do the expected well, and also do the unexpected. He asked how would the Commission know when the state had reached the top ten in the nation? He listed some of the innovations taking place in the Southern Region that might be of some interest to them.

Dr. David Spence, Vice President and Director of Research for the Southern Regional Education Board followed Music and stressed the need for motivation of students and for college preparations.

Dr Gerald Bracey from the State Department of Education reviewed the "Blue Ribbon Staff's" packet of indicators which had been prepared by the staff during the period from February to March 1986. The materials included:

A. Indicators of Achievement: test scores; illiteracy rate in the state; GED attainment; percent of students mastering SOL's at grade level; adjustment of achievement for ability; and percent of teachers passing BTAP.

B. Other Indicators of Achievement: percent of students graduating; drop out rate; success of students in college; number of graduates with marketable skills; minority achievement; percent of schools undergoing regional accreditation; and percent of resident graduates who vote.

C. Indicators Using Course Requirements and Enrollments: units of credit required for graduation;
number of credits students take; percent of students earning advanced studies diploma; number of advanced placement courses offered; percent of students taking advanced placement courses; and number of students taking remedial courses in colleges.

D. Indicators Using Dollar Measures: teacher salary; per pupil expenditures; educational expectancy as a percent of per capita income, and as a percent of government expenditures.

E. Indicators of School Climate: vandalism; number and type of discipline actions against students; teacher involvement in staff development; teacher and pupil attendance; community involvement; pupil teacher ratio; and instructional time.

F. Miscellaneous Indicators: length of school period, day, year; availability of counselors; enrollment trends; use of technology; kindergarten enrollment; and unit of governance (size of school division, schools, etc.)

G. Programmatic Efforts: establish data base with other states; develop incentives to attract teachers to specific areas of the state; establish a teacher exchange program with foreign countries; establish: a program of testing and assistance for teachers, an objectives-based curriculum; an assessment program for this curriculum, an evaluation program for this curriculum; expand training program for school boards; establish alternative programs and schools-within-schools a la Goodlad; use cross-age tutoring; emphasize primary sources rather than textbooks at secondary schools; and establish bonuses for teachers to teach advanced courses ("Aspects of Education Which Have Been Suggested as Indicators of Quality", March 26, 1986).

Mr. Lemmon then asked the Commission to officially approve the State Department Staff appointments to assist the Commission. The staff was approved unanimously.

A "Pop Quiz" was given to the Commission members by Mr. Burkholder, Chairman of the "Blue Ribbon Staff" assist-
ing the Commission. It consisted of two questions. They were: "If you were asked to name the ten things which, if implemented, (new or current program) would bring Virginia into the top ten, what would they be?" and "List the ten indicators that you consider to demonstrate, or measure, quality educational programs."

A total of 206 different responses were given to the two questions, several responses were obviously repeated. Those responses repeated most often and the number of responses were:

**Quality Educational Programs**

1. An above-average record on Advanced Placement.  
   15 responses

2. Dropout statistics - analyzed and compared in context and by grade and viewed along with GED statistics.  
   11 responses

3. Per-pupil expenditure.  
   8 responses

4. Success of H.S. graduates in college - measured by grades and/or vigorous extracurricular achievements.  
   7 responses

5. High School graduation requirements - course requirements - that require four years to complete.  
   5 responses

6. Test scores.  
   5 responses

7. Percentage of students completing schooling.  
   4 responses

8. Pupil-teacher ratio.  
   3 responses

9. Illiteracy statistics - but not assuming all high school dropouts are illiterate or that all high school graduates are literate.  
   2 responses

56
Ten Things to Bring Virginia to the Top 10

1. Massive dollar and many pronged attack in preschool and earliest grades to motivate children to learn. 9 responses

2. Teacher salaries above the national average. 6 responses

3. Revised funding formula designed to eliminate disparities and linked to student achievement. 5 responses

4. Search for and recruit outstanding people to join the teaching profession and provide adequate salaries for teachers. 5 responses

5. Training etc. of principals. 4 responses

6. Lower percentage of illiterates, dropouts, teen-age pregnancies, etc. 4 responses

7. Pupil-teacher decrease. 3 responses

8. Better public relations and community support. 3 responses

9. A revamped remedial education program tied to promotion standards. 3 responses

10. Elementary guidance adequately staffed. 3 responses

11. Incentives for advanced placement. 2 responses

12. NTE implementation (with scores reported by colleges) and BTAP implementation. 2 responses

13. Increase teacher preparation and understanding of motivation for all students - average, special, and gifted. 2 responses

14. Teacher involvement in planning and choosing materials, leading to greater teacher recognition and self-esteem. 2 responses

15. Teacher career ladder, compensation package (not merit pay) to professionalize teacher force. 2 responses

(Results from "Pop Quiz", State Department of Education, March 26, 1986).
All other responses were single in number.

Following the "quiz", and a discussion of indicators, Mr. Lemmon appointed a special committee to recommend a plan of action and indicators to be used by the Commission as they began their work. The members of this committee were: Mr. Kenneth White, Chairman; Mrs. Joan S. Jones; Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr.; Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr.; Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe); and Senator William B. Spong, Jr..

The "Indicators Committee" met on April 16, 1986 and developed a "Plan of Action" for the Commission to follow in developing their recommendations to Governor Baliles. The Commission was to subdivide into four committees, group the indicators accordingly, consider each and make recommendations to the full Commission for their consideration. It further was decided that an evaluative report comparing Virginia to other states would be impossible, rather the Commission should concentrate on goals. The committee developed the following statement to provide a framework within which the committees could function:

An effective statewide K-12 educational system requires commitment to the principle that each child be educated to his or her potential in order to pursue further education and/or employment; and an informed citizenry and a governance system that will enable this goal to be achieved (Lemmon, April 17, 1986: 2)
The four committees and their membership were:

1. **Teachers and Teaching**  
   Suzanne Thomas, Chairman  
   Hunter Andrews  
   Margaret Marston  
   Joan Jones  
   DOE Staff Member: Thomas Elliott

2. **Student Preparation and Achievement**  
   Kenneth White, Chairman  
   Frances Lewis  
   Robert DeFord  
   Dorothy McDiarmid  
   DOE Staff Member: Gerald Bracey  
   Callie Shingleton

3. **Funding and Equal Access**  
   James Dyke, Jr., Chairman  
   John Fishwick  
   Lois Rochester  
   William Spong  
   DOE Staff Member: Joseph Roberts

4. **Structure and Organization**  
   Adelard Brault, Chairman  
   T. Justin Moore, Jr.  
   Sandra Vaughan  
   DOE Staff Member: Kenneth Magill

The Commission’s second meeting was held at the General Assembly Building in Richmond, Virginia on April 22-23. At this meeting they voted unanimously to adopt the “Plan of Action” from the indicators committee and proceeded to have meetings within their committees. May 28, 1986 was chosen as the date to hold public hearings throughout the state and the Commission selected four sites for them to be held: Lake Taylor High School, Norfolk; J.R. Tucker High School, Henrico County; Minnie Howard Administration Building, Alexandria; and Wytheville High School, Wytheville.
Each of the four committees met on April 22-23. The Funding and Equal Access Committee set the following dates and held meetings on: May 6, May 15, and June 24. The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee set the following dates and held meetings on: May 7, May 21, June 4, June 18-19, and June 24. The Structure and Organization Committee set the following dates and held meetings on: June 3, June 10, June 17, and June 24. The Teachers and Teaching Committee set the following dates and held meetings on: May 8, May 21, June 3, and June 24.

The Commission held its third meeting on June 24-25 in the James Monroe Building in Richmond. The purpose of this meeting was to receive the Committee Reports and give guidance to the writers for the "draft report" of the Commission.

On July 30-31, September 5, and September 24-25, subsequent meetings of the Commission were held to consider recommendations from the committees to be included in their report to the Governor. At the September 24-25 meeting, the final recommendations were chosen and the report was prepared. October was scheduled for printing of the report.

The committee minutes revealed those in attendance, speakers, materials presented to each committee and the specific recommendations ultimately made by each committee to the full Commission.
Interviews With Key Actors

Having this information in hand, the next step in the research process was to determine the procedures to use in interpreting the data. A meeting with the Dissertation Committee was held on January 25, 1990, to discuss this issue. After some discussion, the "key actor" method of research was selected.

The following materials were extremely helpful in assisting in this research methodology:

Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Area, Harry M. Caudill, 1962,1963. In his introduction to the book, Mr. Caudill reports his methodology of collecting the material for his book: "What I have written is drawn from experience - from seeing, hearing, and working with mountaineers."

A. B. Hollingshead's Elmtown's Youth, a project started in 1941 and not completed until 1947 due to "an interruption of World War II", also used this methodology.

In reviewing the state policy making literature, the following books were helpful: *Who Governs?*, by Robert A. Dahl, 1961; *Legislated Learning*, by Arthur E. Wise, 1979; *State Policy Making for the Public Schools*, by Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr., 1976; and *Evaluating State Education Reforms: A Special Legislative Report*, by Michael W. Kirst, 1987.

Interviewing individuals who occupy positions of power has been validated as an acceptable sociometric technique in research for designating individuals as key actors in decision-making decisions (Kimborough, 1971; 8).

Data collected was to be triangulated for verification; interview responses were to be checked against the minutes of each committee, against responses from other interviews, and against the final report of the Commission.

The next step in the research process was to interview Governor Baliles, the Secretary of Education, each Commission member, the State Superintendent, and the State Department Staff to determine which key actors and what key factors were most influential in shaping the recommendations ultimately produced by the Commission.

Scheduling and Conducting Interviews with State Department of Education Staff Members

The first interview was held on February 20, 1990 at 3:30 p.m. with Dr. Thomas Elliott who served as the
Department of Education Staff person assigned to the Teachers and Teaching Committee. The interview took 45 minutes. Dr. Elliott gave permission to use the tape recorder, a Panasonic Microcassette Voice-Activated Model Number RN-109, as did all other persons interviewed (with one exception, Mrs. Jane Koontz).

Five staff persons were interviewed on February 21, 1990. They were: Dr. Callie Shingleton, Dr. M. Kenneth Magill, Dr. Margaret Roberts, Mrs. Jane Koontz, and Mr. Harry Smith. Each interview took about an hour.

Dr. Lois Rubin was interviewed on February 26, 1990 from 9:35 - 10:10 a.m..

Three persons were interviewed on February 27, 1990; they were Mr. Joseph Roberts, Dr. S. John Davis and Dr. E. B. Howerton. The General Assembly was in session making it difficult to schedule Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton, therefore, it was necessary to combine their interviews into one.

Mr. Burkholder had left the State Department of Education and was working with the U. S. Department of State in Washington, D. C., therefore I had to schedule a separate interview time for him. This interview was held on March 1, 1990 from 11:00 to 12:30 p.m..

Dr. Gerald Bracey, also had left his position with the State Department and was working in the Research &
Evaluation Department of the Colorado Public Schools in Englewood, Colorado. A telephone interview was necessary to include Dr. Bracey. This interview took place on April 2, 1990 from 11:05 to 11:35 a.m..

Altogether, 12 persons were interviewed who had worked with the Commission and were working as Staff with the State Department of Education while the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education was at work.

Each person from the State Department was asked only one question: "Who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education?"

Each of these interview tapes were later transcribed verbatim.

**Scheduling and Conducting Interviews With Commission Members**

On March 6, 1990 I mailed letters requesting appointments with each Commission Member. The letters were typed on Virginia Polytechnic and State University stationary. These letters indicated that I would call within a week to schedule an appointment at their convenience. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix C.

I began calling members on March 12, 1990. The first interview was held on Wednesday, March 14, 1990 at 11:00 a.m. with Mrs. Frances Lewis at her office. The
interview took 53 minutes to conduct and was taped using the equipment described earlier.

On Thursday, March 15, I interviewed two Commission members; Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe) and Mr. James Dyke, Jr.. Mrs. Lampe's interview was by conducted over the telephone. It was held from 3:00 to 3:20 p.m.. Mr. Dyke's interview was held in his office in Richmond. Mr. Dyke had recently been appointed as Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Virginia. It was held from 4:27 - 4:53 p.m.

Senator Spong's interview was held on Friday, March 16, 1990, at 9:40 a.m. in his office as Interim President of Old Dominion University. It took 35 minutes.

Mrs. Jones' interview took place in her home in Lynchburg, Virginia, on Saturday, March 17, 1990, from 10:05 until 11:30 a.m.

Senator Brault had moved to Sun City Center, Florida, therefore, this interview was conducted over the telephone and took place on Monday, March 19, 1990. We had arranged by telephone on March 13th for me to call at 9:00 a.m. on this day. The interview took 20 minutes.

On Tuesday, March 20, I drove to Roanoke to interview Mr. John Fishwick between 9:40 - 10:20 a.m.. I then drove to Lynchburg and interviewed Mr. Kenneth White on the same day from 2:30 until 3:20 p.m..
Mrs. Lois Rochester's interview was conducted at her home in Charlottesville on Wednesday, March 21, from 3:20 - 4:20 p.m.

Mrs. Suzanne Thomas, now the President of the State Board of Education, and Mr. Robert DeFord, a member of the Board were interviewed together on Thursday, March 29, 1990, at the Jefferson Sheraton Hotel, Richmond from 5:20 - 6:00 p.m.. The State Board was meeting in Richmond on this date.

Mr. T. Justin Moore's interview was conducted by telephone on Tuesday, April 3, 1990, form 2:45 - 3:00 p.m.. This interview was one of the shortest conducted. Mr. Moore had reviewed the Commission material and remembered only the recommendations made by the committee on which he served.

Mr. Lemmon wrote me a note from his vacation in Florida early in March saying he would be willing to grant me an interview upon his return. This interview was held on Thursday, March 29, 1990, over lunch in the Commonwealth Building in Richmond. Mr. Lemmon was in Richmond preparing to meet with his "New Commission" which had been appointed by Governor Wilder in February, 1990, to study disparity in the funding of education. Mr. Lemmon is Chairman of this Commission. The interview was held from 12:35 until 1:30 p.m.. On this same date I was able to
interview Mrs. Sandra Vaughn by telephone between 6:25 - 6:55 p.m.

Mrs. Dorothy McDiarmid, who is co-chairing Governor Wilder's "Disparity" Commission was interviewed by telephone on Friday, June 1, 1990, from 2:15 - 2:30 p.m.

Senator Stanley Walker, who was appointed by the Governor to replace Senator Andrews upon his resignation from the Commission, was not available for an interview. After 18 phone calls, efforts to schedule an interview were abandoned. The minutes reflect that Senator Walker did not attend any of the meetings of the Commission on Excellence in Education.

Therefore, fifteen of the sixteen Commission Members were interviewed during the period of March 14 - June 1, 1990.

Each Commission Member was asked two questions: Who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education?; and, In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the Commission's Report?

Each of the interviews were later transcribed verbatim to provide a written account as to who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations and the consequences of the report, as reported by each Commission Member.
Scheduling and Conducting Interviews with Governor Gerald L. Baliles and Dr. Donald Finley, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia.

On March 6, 1990 I wrote letters to Governor Gerald Baliles and Dr. Donald Finley requesting an appointment for an interview. The letter to Dr. Finley was an exact copy of the letter written to the Commission Members. The letter written to Governor Baliles was original, yet similar to the Commission letter. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix D.

On March 8, 1990, I called Dr. Finley, whom I have known for some time. Although my letter had not yet arrived, Dr. Finley granted the appointment and the interview was held on Thursday, March 15, 1990 from 1:35 - 2:20 p.m.. Dr. Finley was asked the same two questions asked of the Commission Members: Who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education?; and In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the Commission’s Report?

On March 23, 1990, Governor Baliles’ Secretary called stating that the Governor wanted a list of questions to be asked during the interview. A second letter with a list of nine questions were delivered to his secretary on the same day. This interview was held on Wednesday, April 4, 1990 from 1:35 until 2:00 p.m. in his office at the law
firm of Hunton and Williams in Richmond, Virginia. The questions asked of Governor Baliles were.

1. Why did you appoint the Commission on Excellence in Education?
2. What selection process did you use to choose the individual members for the Commission?
3. What were your expectations from the Commission?
4. Were you pleased/satisfied with their work and their thirty-six recommendations?
5. What factors did you see affecting the Commission as they were accomplishing their work?
6. In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission?
7. Do you believe that the Commonwealth of Virginia has risen in its ranking nationally in public education since the issuance of the Commission’s Report?
8. Where would you rank Virginia nationally in its public education programs in 1986, and today?
9. Would you like to offer any other comments concerning the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education, or in general about public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia?

The second letter and the attached questions can be found in Appendix E.

Each of these two interviews were taped, with permission, using the same equipment described previously. These two interviews were transcribed verbatim to provide a written record of the responses to the questions.

**Organization of the Data**

Altogether, twenty-nine of thirty planned interviews were conducted.
Following the interviews, each was transcribed verbatim. All tapes and their transcription are available for further reference, if necessary.

The transcriptions were used to form a matrix in determining who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education. This matrix, in the form of Table 1, may be found in Appendix G.

In most instances, the origin of each recommendation was identified this way. I then reviewed the minutes of each meeting again to review the discussion that took place surrounding that decision; to determine what was said and by whom. This was an attempt to verify who or what was responsible for the recommendation as it appeared in the final Commission Report.

This analysis is reported in Chapter 4.
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CHAPTER 4
REPORT OF THE DATA

The primary purpose of this study was to reveal who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made to Governor Baliles to improve public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia by his Commission on Excellence in Education.

Twenty-nine individuals were interviewed who participated in the development of these recommendations. They included: Governor Gerald L. Baliles; the Secretary of Education for Virginia, Dr. Donald J. Finley; fifteen of the sixteen Commission Members; the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. S. John Davis; and the staff from the State Department of Education assigned to the Commission.

These interviews and a thorough study of the minutes of each meeting held by the Commission and it's Committees revealed the following:

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 1. Virginia's school divisions provide voluntary developmental preschool programs for four-year-old children.

This recommendation was made by three of the four committees of the Commission. The only committee that did not recommend this was the Teachers and Teaching Committee.

Specifically, two of the Commission Members claimed ownership of this recommendation; they were Mr. Kenneth
White, who credited Brad Butler's speech on the Perry Preschool Program for giving him the idea; and Mrs. Joan Jones, who remembered that she and Mrs. Dorothy McDiarmid worked together on this item while serving in the House of Delegates for the State of Virginia some years ago.

Mr. White stated in his interview:

That one I remember very clearly because it was something that was very near and dear to my heart. I guess I became interested in that concept when I heard a man named Brad Butler speak. Brad, as I say was the Chairman of Procter and Gamble, one of the biggest companies in the country... he works with something in New York called the Committee on Economic Development. And he chaired their Education Task Force that produced a report entitled: Investing in Our Children. He spoke at a meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education out in Seattle and his subject was an overview of that report and the work they had done on it.

... that Committee on Economic Development Task Force had done more, what I considered to be in-depth surveying of what the American job market was really looking for in terms of kids, well, not only the job market, but colleges and universities. ... they really spent a lot of time, not only interviewing the colleges and universities around the country, the Fortune 500 companies, but the little companies; small businesses. And what they were saying was; I need somebody that can understand the English Language, that can express themselves both verbally and in writing, and they've got a good work ethic, a good attitude and the rest of it will take care of itself.

... But a major portion of what he was talking about in terms of a means to reach that end was the cost-effectiveness of pre-kindergarten education. He cited the Ypsilanti, Michigan study. ... he'd provoked enough interest in my mind to read that (study) and I got copies. I got a tape of his address and made it available to everybody on the Board of Education. ... and we got copies of the book report: Investing in Our Children.
So, anyway, the Board was looking at this thing at a very informal way when the Governor’s Commission came along. The more we talked about it, it just made all kinds of sense. In terms of the amount of money, if you just wanted to look at it from a money standpoint, the amount of money that we’re spending on these kids that are educational misfits for whatever reason. Once they drop out of school and get into trouble, we’re spending billions of dollars there, compared to a fraction of these dollars that you would spend on the front-end of a four-year-old education. And the predicted results were quite amazing and had a dramatic appeal.

...(But) it would have to be voluntary programs, because some parents might not necessarily want their kids to be involved. We also viewed it as something that was not simply a nursery school or a head-start all over again. We viewed it as something that if a parent, or set of parents, voluntarily put their kid in this; there would be a parental component, the parents would be involved, too. It wasn’t just for the kids.

So, of all the things I remember, that was probably the "biggie" as far as I’m concerned (Interview; March 20, 1990).

Mr. White's claim to this recommendation was supported by: Dr. Davis; Dr. Shingleton; Dr. Roberts; Mrs. Marston (Lampe), who also attended the meeting in Seattle; and Mr. Lemmon, who agreed that: "Ken is probably right".

Mrs. Jones stated in her interview that:

Number one is an issue which Dorothy McDiarmid and I addressed when we both were in the House of Delegates. We co-authored a Kindergarten Bill ... and our interest was that some children who were poor would not be held back because of their age and that was the result of a lot of discussion where nobody indicated that we would ever be able to serve four year olds in the public schools. We just felt that there was a lot of attrition as a result of children getting into school and being bored and not being in proper programs, etc. That's one that had been around for a long time. ... I'm not sure yet what the public school's responsibility is in this area. I just know that it's somebody's responsibility to get to those
children early. We had all kind of hair-brain ideas like eliminating the last year of high school again so that we could have the money. We did talk about solutions, but we felt that others would want to look at it (Interview; March 17, 1990).

Mr. Dyke stated that Mrs. McDiarmid played a role in initiating this recommendation and so did Mrs. Rochester.

The other specific source credited for this recommendation was Governor Robb's Future's Commission. Dr. Finley and Mrs. Rochester remembered this as it's origin. Mrs. Rochester served on the Future’s Commission and remembers spending "... a considerable amount of time on that issue".

Reviewing the report of the Governor’s Commission on Virginia's Future entitled: *Toward a New Dominion: Choices For Virginians, Vol. II*, two references were found in the Education Task Force report that supported Dr. Finley and Mrs. Rochester's claim:

Demographic and economic changes will require greater emphasis on early childhood and adult education.

Preschool and adult education, two future growth areas, should have a place in the Virginia governance system (1984: 20-21).

According to the minutes of the Commission, Recommendation Number 1 emerged from three of the committees. The Funding and Equal Access committee reviewed the "Missouri Plan" in its meetings which led it to make this recommendation on June 24, 1986. This reference was:
Action For Excellence: 21 Recent School-Reform Initiatives in Missouri, and the specific "initiative" referenced was:

The General Assembly recently approved a bill authorizing state funds for preschool screening and education services. Although no money was appropriated this year, this bill has been a major priority of the State Board and the Governor for several years (1984: 2).

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee chaired by Mr. White heard from Denis Doyle, one of the authors of Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools. They gave credit to the Perry Preschool Program for influencing them in their decision.

The Structure and Organization Committee credited the Virginia Association of School Administrators and Dr. Davis for their recommendation of Number 1. However, Mr. Burkholder remembers that Senator Brault did a lot of work on this recommendation and gave him credit for it. In talking to Senator Brault about this, he remembered his committee working on this recommendation and doing a lot of work on it himself but when asked if it was his idea, his response was: "Now I can't say that this originated with me".

Mr. DeFord, Jr. credited testimony from people about children entering school with a vocabulary of only 75 words or less as the reason for his support of this recommendation.
After hearing from those persons interviewed and reviewing the minutes, it was obvious that recommendation number one was about to happen with or without the Commission's Report. As Mr. White said in his interview, the State Board of Education was looking at the four-year-program when the Commission came along. With members of the Board serving on each of the committees, and with former members of Governor Robb's Task Force on Education, who had discussed such a program for Virginia's schools serving on the Commission, the four-year-old program was destined to happen. In fact it was one of the few recommendations that received unanimous support by the Commission when they voted on September 24-25, 1986.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. White and the Perry</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Singleton, Dr. Roberts, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mr. Lemmon, and Mr. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Program</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Marin Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. McDiarmid</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones and Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rochester</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke and Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Robb's Futures</td>
<td>Mrs. Rochester and Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. DeFord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: Kids entering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school with a vocabulary of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 words or less.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 2. Virginia establish literacy tests in reading, writing, and arithmetic for all students in grade 6.

Eighteen of the people interviewed remembered the origin of this recommendation: All remembered that Mr. John Fishwick originated this recommendation.

Mr. Fishwick also claims this idea. In his interview, Mr. Fishwick stated:

... one finding that I'm more familiar with than anything else is something that wasn't really related to my subcommittee. It was a question of reading, writing, and arithmetic, that's the Literacy Passport (Test). And that got in there really, I think, to a certain extent through accident.

What happened was we were having a meeting and one of the things I think is essential in all these commissions is to have the press present, the "sunshine view". Because, unless you can get some exposure on what's going on and some ideas, you never have a chance to get any real public backing for any ideas that are generated. They can easily be buried because you get into this thing of education and all views that are expressed about money and how you divide the money up.

Well, in this case, what happened was, we were talking about reading, writing, and arithmetic and you get into a problem in education, really I think one of the key problems in education is to what extent the function of the school system in Virginia is to educate people as opposed to perform some social function. In other words, when I went to school, if you didn't... when you took an examination and didn't pass, you stayed there. But now, with the change in the family structure, in having so many people coming from one (parent) homes and having no real family, there's been this great emphasis on: you want that person to develop pride in himself, it's very depressing for a person who's had no good background at home to come in and flunk, not to learn to read and write. So you pass him,
so you get all these football players that have finished, not only high school, but college that can’t read nor write. We’ve got this basic dichotomy in our aims, we’re going to try to educate people or we’re going to try to make them all happy and push them along.

All these National Reports in evidence talk about we’ve got to teach people all these tough things and yet when it comes right down to the “rat killing”, all the mothers come in and the Parent Teachers Association come in and they say: “Oh, it’s poor little Johnny, he’s got a mother who’s on dope and he’s never had a father and therefore, we’ve got to ... we want to do something to sort of build up his confidence in himself”.

Well, anyway we were talking about that and I said one day at one of the meetings at which the press was there that we ought to have some kind of test. It was all right to talk about teaching people Japanese and computers and all that, but the first thing you had to do was to learn reading, writing and arithmetic. I just sort of, on the spur of the moment said: “You know, we ought to make this like a Literacy Barmitzva. When the kid gets to be about in the sixth grade he’s about 12 or 13 years old; we give him a test; can you read, write and do arithmetic?”; and I said “What you ought to do is say, O.K., if you can’t read, write, and do arithmetic then we stop you there. You’ve got to do that before you can go anywhere else”; and make a big occasion of it, make an occasion (of) it so that it’s not only a stick, but a carrot. You make it really the equivalent of graduation from high school. You give him a diploma. At least, by the time he’s in the eighth grade you say to him: “You ain’t going any further, you’re not going to get on the football team nor the basketball team, you’re not going to be in the band, you’re not going to be a cheerleader in high school. You’re going to stop here until you learn to read, write and do arithmetic”.

Well, the Richmond Press picked that up. I guess it was because of the phrase (and) put it in the paper. Well, Mrs. Baliles picked it up too, and she started saying that was a good idea. The Governor picked it up too. Well it put it in a position, you know, they pretty much had to do something. It was something that wouldn’t cost anything much, just give another test. That’s how that got put in there (Interview; March 20, 1990).
This recommendation was made by the Funding and Equal Access Committee. Mr. Fishwick was a member of this committee.

In summary, the key actor most influential in developing this recommendation was:

Key Actor/Factor: Identified by:
Mr. Fishwick ... Dr. Davis, Dr. Shingleton, Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Rubin, Mr. Roberts, Dr. Finley, Mrs. Lewis, Mrs. Jones, Senator Spong, Mrs. Marston (Lampe) Senator Brault, Mrs. Rochester, Mr. DeFord, Jr., Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. McDiarmid, Mr. White, Mr. Lemmon, and Mr. Fishwick

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 3. Remediation be provided for students scoring in the bottom fourth on standardized tests.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) gave credit to Dr. Davis, the State Board and the State Department of Education for it's origin.

Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Vaughan and the members of two committees; Student Preparation and Funding and Equal Access agreed, that without this recommendation, they could not have supported recommendation number 2, the literacy test. Both of these committees had this as one of their recommendations. Dr. Roberts also stated that this recom-
mendation resulted from number 2.

Dr. Davis’ comments regarding this recommendation were: "I initiated these (3 and 4), I felt that we had to provide funding in support for number 2" (Interview; February 27, 1990).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe) and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came from Recommendation Number 2.</td>
<td>Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Vaughan, and Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 4. State funding be provided for summer school programs.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

Mr. Dyke stated that Mrs. Lewis and Mr. White were the source of this recommendation.

The recommendation was made by the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee of which Mrs. Lewis and Mr. White were members.

Mr. White’s comments concerning this recommendation, as well as, recommendation number 3 were:
... that's the equity measure. You know, if you’re going to hold people back because they haven't achieved certain levels, you’ve got to, with the other hand, provide the means by which they can better themselves (p. 5).

Mrs. Lewis did not comment on this recommendation other than to say that the state now does provide some remediation money to school divisions.

Mrs. Vaughan and Mr. Lemmon agreed, that without this recommendation, they could not have supported the passage of recommendation number 2, the Literacy Passport Test. Dr. Roberts also stated that this recommendation was a result of the passage of number 2.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>... Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. White</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came from Recommendation Number 2</td>
<td>... Dr. Roberts, Mr. Lemmon, and Mrs. Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 5. The state support programs to reduce the performance gap between black and white students; and

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 6. The state support special college preparation programs for minority students.

Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr. and Mrs. Sandra Vaughan claimed credit for the origin of these two recommendations.
This was corroborated by: Dr. Roberts, Mr. Lemmon, Mr. Burkholder, Mr. Joseph Roberts, and Mrs. Rochester. Dr. Roberts gave credit to both Mr. Dyke and Mrs Vaughan, while Mr. Lemmon, Mr. Burkholder, Mr. Roberts and Mrs. Rochester gave credit only to Mr. Dyke.

Mrs. Rochester stated in her interview:

A lot of data of course, targets the Black population, and we definitely were concerned about that. We weren’t just pussyfooting around. Other minorities aren’t so much state wide ... and you don’t have the great gap there. The gaps between Blacks and Whites are so striking, you can’t miss them (Interview; March 21, 1990).

Mrs Jones stated that recommendation number 5 was very important “because the gap was widening”, according to testimonies presented to the Commission (no persons were identified by Mrs. Jones in her interview, and none were revealed in the minutes).

The Funding and Equal Access Committee recommended it to the Commission. Mr. Dyke chaired this committee.

Dr. Davis gave Mr. Dyke credit for number 6, but didn’t remember the source of number 5. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) also gave credit to Mr. Dyke for number 6 but credited all of the Commission Members for originating number 5.

Mr. White, did not remember the origin of number 5, but stated that a “substantial body of knowledge” was available on number 6. Dr. Shingleton and Mrs. Lois
Rochester gave credit to "Project Discovery", a program to promote minority enrollment into colleges, as the basis for number 6.

Mr. Dyke's comments regarding this recommendation were: "Five and Six were two that I particularly pushed to reduce the performance gap between black and white students and the college prep programs" (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Mrs. Vaughan's statement concerning numbers 5 and 6 was: "I supported programs for the minority student. ... (Mr.) Jim Dyke and I supported these" (Interview; April 11, 1990).

Mr. Burkholder's comments shed some light into the thinking of Mr. Dyke on these two recommendations:

I suppose the primary spokesperson for this (recommendation numbers 5 and 6) (was) Mr. Dyke. He was a strong spokesperson for this. About the time the Commission was organized, Jim had attended a social function in northern Virginia that had been organized by the Fairfax School System. That function involved about 30 kids, minority 8th graders, in this program. A co-operative program had been set up between V.P.I. (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) and Fairfax County. If they maintained their grades, these minority kids would be able to attend V.P.I. I remember Jim came back and said to the Commission - we ought to be supporting these kind of preparations (Interview; March 1, 1990).

In summary, the key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been the most influential in developing these two recommendations were:
Recommendation Number 5

Key Actor/Factor: Mr. Dyke
"Testimony or belief about widening gap"

Identified by:
Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Roberts, Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Vaughan, Mr. Lemmon, and Mr. Dyke
Dr. Roberts and Mrs. Vaughan
Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Rochester, and Mr. Dyke

Recommendation Number 6

Mr. Dyke
Mrs. Vaughan
Project Discovery

Identified by:
Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Roberts, Mr. Roberts, Dr. Davis, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Vaughan, and Mr. Dyke
Dr. Roberts and Mrs. Vaughan
Dr. Shingleton and Mrs. Rochester

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 7. Smaller classes be required in the first grade and in English classes.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee recommended it to the Commission.

Four individuals stated that it was "necessary" because of the recent state writing requirement. These individuals were: Dr. Davis, Dr. Shingleton, Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Jones.

Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) gave credit to Mrs. Thomas for this recommendation particularly for the English class size. Mr. Burkholder remembered that Mrs. Thomas had been an English Teacher and with the new writing
requirements, English Teachers needed more time with their students. Dr. Rubin and Mr. Lemmon credited the Teachers and Teaching Committee, chaired by Mrs. Thomas.

Dr. Finley stated that Mr. Lemmon, "... had been an advocate of smaller lower grade classes going back into the 70's really, in his capacity as Chairman of the Education Committee of the House" (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Mrs. Vaughan credited the entire Commission.

Dr. Davis’ comments about his originating number 7 were as follows:

It was at this same time ... you recall that we placed in the Accreditation Standards the writing requirements at the 11th and 12th grades which culminated in a defense of that writing assignment before a live audience. ... And I felt that we should try to reduce the size of the English classes and down to the first grade. So that was the effort (Interview; February 27, 1990).

In summary, the key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;Writing Assignment&quot; ...</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Shingleton,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required by the Standards</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder, and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 8. The state expand its support for division and regional nonresidential special schools and programs for gifted students.
Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe) claimed credit for this recommendation.

Two committees recommended it to the Commission. They were: Student Preparation and Achievement, which advocated nonresidential schools and Funding and Equal Access, which advocated residential schools. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) served on the Teachers and Teaching Committee.

Dr. Davis, Dr. Singleton, and Mrs. Jones gave credit to the Governor’s Magnet Schools for this idea, while Mr. Burkholder remembered the "Special Interest Groups" asking for a residential gifted school.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe’s) comments in this regards were: "That was me. I am a strong proponent for such a school. There are many localities that aren’t able to provide these programs for youngsters who need them" (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton gave credit for this recommendation to Mrs. Lewis with Dr. Davis also giving credit to the Governor’s Magnet Schools, as mentioned above.

Mrs. Rochester credited the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, which is one of the committees that recommended it to the Commission, while Mr. Lemmon credited the Teachers and Teaching Committee that did not.
In summary, the key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Magnet Schools</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Shingleton, and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Special Interest Groups&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 9. The Department of Education develop a state plan to ensure greater cooperation among the agencies concerned with the welfare and education of special education students.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Funding and Equal Access Committee recommended it to the Commission. In their report submitted to the full Commission dated June 24, 1986 a section entitled "Special Education" stated:

The state should make a commitment that every potential special ed (education) student is identified early and is provided with an equal educational opportunity no matter whether they are located in the poorest school division or the richest. This will include several recommendations, including: ... (A) Directive to (the) State Department to develop guidelines for more collaboration among state agencies that impact on special education students (p. 11-12).

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton credited a study group from Florida which had recently been contracted by the State Department of Education to review the Special Education Department as having originated this idea.
Mr. Burkholder remembered that the State Board had a special case in litigation during this same time frame. "Congressmen and the Federal Department of Education were involved. That was heavy on the minds of Education Members of the Commission". He believed that this litigation matter originated this recommendation.

Mrs. Jones, Mrs Rochester and Mr. Lemmon credited testimony from Division Superintendents, Special Interest Groups and public hearings and agencies as the origin.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) stated that Mrs. Eva Tieg, Secretary of Health and Human Resources for the Commonwealth of Virginia was the first with this idea.

In summary, the key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Group from Florida</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's Testimony</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Group Testimony</td>
<td>Mrs. Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings and Agencies</td>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Tieg</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 10. An undergraduate degree in an arts and sciences discipline be required for all teachers educated in Virginia.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction claimed credit for this recommendation.
The Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended it to the Commission. The reason for this recommendation, according to the minutes of the committee dated June 24, 1986 was:

Many of the brightest, most talented people in Virginia are not being attracted to the teaching profession. Various studies, as well as, respected leaders from education, business, and industry, attribute this situation to the following: ... The quality of teacher preparation programs, which tend to be viewed as less challenging and of lower calibre than other programs in institutions of higher education (p. 1).

Eight of the persons interviewed agreed that it came from this Committee. They were: Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Mrs. Jones, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, Mr. White Mrs. Thomas, and Mr. Lemmon. Mr. White added that the "Pedagogy Debate" was instrumental in the development of this recommendation.

At one of the committee meetings dated May 8, 1986, this committee met with a panel of teachers consisting of three high school, one middle school and one elementary school teacher. A discussion ensued about teachers and teaching in the state. Many "concerns" were expressed and noted during this meeting; recertification of teachers, teacher training, staff development, extracurricular activities duties being assigned to teachers, etc. were among them. At this same meeting the committee heard from Dr. Howerton who addressed current perspectives on teachers and teaching as viewed by the Holmes Consortium and the
Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Two of the recommendations from these reports (Holmes and Carnegie) called for the abolitionment of the Bachelor Degree in Education, with schools of education being merged with colleges of arts and sciences; and all professional education courses for teachers being conducted at graduate school level.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited this recommendation as having come from the National Commission's Report, the Carnegie Report and from the Deans of colleges of education.

Senator Spong was given credit for having originated this idea by Dr. Howerton and Mr. Burkholder.

Mrs. Thomas was credited with it by Mr. Dyke, Mrs. Lewis and Senator Spong.

Mr. Dyke also credited Mrs. Marston (Lampe).

Mr. Burkholder gave credit to Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Lewis and Mr. Dyke for this recommendation.

Dr. Davis' comments regarding his originating this recommendation were:

We started that in 1981. Well, I just thought we were concentrating too much on pedagogy and not enough on content. I delivered the message in 1981, and I spoke with the Deans and I met with them several times. I suggested that they were naive, if they thought that this was going away, and nothing happened, nothing changed, and so it changed after that (Interview; February 27, 1990).
In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been the most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, Dr. Finley, and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Spong</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke, Mrs. Lewis, and Senator Spong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony to the Teachers and Teaching Committee</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission’s Report</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Report</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Deans</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “Pedagogy Debate”</td>
<td>Mr. White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 11. Virginia’s approved program standards for prospective teachers be revised to limit professional education course requirements to 18 semester hours.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

Dr. Davis’ comments were quoted under number 10 above. About number 11, he simply said that this was a part of the same idea.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended it to the full Commission. At the committee meeting on May 8,
1986, Dr. Howerton quoted from the Holmes Consortium and the Carnegie Forum on Education:

Professional education courses should be required, but the bulk of teacher training should be conducted by professors in schools of arts and sciences. "Apprenticeships" would be encouraged (p. 1).

Seven people interviewed stated that the Teachers and Teaching Committee made this recommendation. They were: Dr. Roberts, Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Thomas, Mr. White, and Mr. Lemmon.

Dr. Finley stated that Governor Robb's Commission mentioned this idea with Senator Spong, the Chairman of this Commission, being in support of this idea.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited Dr. Howerton and the Department of Education with this idea.

Senator Brault credited the idea to Mrs. Thomas.

Mr. Dyke gave credit to Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe).

Mrs. Jones said: "Well, ... 18 was a recommendation from the Department of Education, because we didn't know".

Dr. Roberts told about the full Commission meeting with a group of students and discussing their high school careers during which this subject emerged. In reviewing the minutes, this meeting was held on June 24 - 25 in the James Monroe Building in Richmond. As Dr. Roberts put it:

I'll tell you, the thing that really did it for this, and this (pointing to recommendation numbers 11 and 12), is we had a group
of high school student body presidents that were here in Richmond for, I believe it was the Model General Assembly, (it was Student Representatives of the Model Executive Government Conference and the Virginia Student Government Association) ... about 12 of them came in one morning. They sat and talked to the full Commission. And one of the things that I remember that the Commission's mouth just dropped is when one of those kids said: "at my school we can't have advanced placement courses because our teachers don't know enough calculus and advanced study stuff to teach them. We can't find teachers that know enough to teach them". Their mouths just went BAM, down on the table. Other kids came behind him and reinforced this. The Commission was totally aghast (Interview; February 27, 1990).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Spong</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke and Senator Brault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Robb's</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Student</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education Staff</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Howerton</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Consortium and Carnegie Forum on Education</td>
<td>From Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; May 8, 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 12. All colleges and universities review and restructure their programs for educating teachers.

Dr. S. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, claimed credit for this recommendation.
Dr. Davis' comments were reported under number 10 above. He simply said that number 12 was a part of this same idea. Dr. Howerton confirmed Dr. Davis' statements that he (Jack Davis) and Senator Spong were responsible for this recommendation.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee made this recommendation to the full Commission.

Eight people interviewed confirmed that this committee made this recommendation. They were: Dr. Roberts, Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Mrs. Jones, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Thomas, Mr. White, and Mr. Lemmon. Dr. Roberts added: testimony of the above mentioned students and teachers was the deciding factor that caused this committee to make this recommendation. Mrs. Jones, a member of this committee, stated in her interview:

... one of the things we found out ... that was the Presidents (university) weren't paying attention about teacher education and that really annoyed us. Out of our concern and recognition that the Presidents didn't really know how the teachers were being educated, and out of our concern that there were courses that needed to be revised, grew number 12 (Interview; March 17, 1990).

Mr. Burkholder gave credit to Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Lewis, Mr. Dyke and Mr. Lemmon.

Mr. Dyke credited Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe). Mrs. Marston (Lampe) stated that the State Board and the Department of Education were responsible for this recommendation.
In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Spong</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Student Testimony</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Deans</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board and State</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 13.** Virginia have competitive teacher salaries that will attract and keep highly qualified teachers.

No one claims credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended it to the Commission. In reviewing their minutes, the meeting held on May 8, 1986, again referred to the recommendations from the Holmes Consortium and the Carnegie Forum as quoted: "Salaries should be based on level of teaching responsibility, competence, seniority, and productivity - not on the number of graduate credits accumulated."

Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Mrs. Jones, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Thomas, and Mr. Lemmon stated that the Teachers and Teaching Committee originated this recommen-
Dr. Roberts remembered hearing the testimony of the teachers' panel at the meeting of the Teachers and Teaching Committee held on May 8, 1986. She believed this influenced the decision for this committee.

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton credited Dorothy McDiarmaid with this idea.

Mr. Burkholder, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mr. White and Mrs. Vaughan credited the entire Commission.

Mr. Dyke gave credit to Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe).

Mr. Moore credited the Structure and Organization Committee for this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. McDiarmaid</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Consortium and...</td>
<td>From Minutes: Teachers and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Forum on Education...</td>
<td>Committee; May 8, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony...</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)...</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 14. The state provide financial incentives to school divisions to help them develop ways to keep effective teachers in the classroom.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.
This recommendation was made to the full Commission by the Teachers and Teaching and the Funding and Equal Access Committees.

In the Teachers and Teaching report to the Commission dated June 24, 1986, this recommendation read:

Financial incentives to school divisions should be provided for developing and implementing differentiated staffing/career ladder plans most suited to their respective localities. Such plans should clearly define the professional responsibilities and requirements for advancement at each stage and should have as their goal, keeping effective teachers in the classrooms (p. 3).

The minutes of the Funding and Equal Access Committee dated June 24, 1986, recommended that the state:

Establish a fund to pay salary supplements to teachers in sparsely populated areas and in other areas considered undesirable places to live (p. 7).

Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Rochester, Senator Spong, Mrs. Jones, Dr. Rubin, Dr. Elliott and Dr. Roberts credited the Teachers and Teaching Committee for this idea with Dr. Roberts crediting specifically the teacher panel that appeared before the committee.

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton credited Mrs. McDiarmid for this recommendation.

Mr. Dyke gave credit to Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) for this recommendation, while Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the National Commission.
Mr. White and Mrs. Vaughan gave credit to the full Commission.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. McDiarmid</td>
<td>... Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony</td>
<td>... Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission</td>
<td>... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 15. The number of forgivable loans for teacher candidates be increased.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

Funding and Equal Access and Teachers and Teaching are the two committees that recommended it to the Commission.

On June 3, 1986, Dr. Thomas Truitt and Dr. Renfro Manning, representing the Virginia Association of School Administrators appeared before the Teachers and Teaching Committee stating the position of their organization. One of the recommendations they presented was: "Expand college loans for prospective teachers. Such loans should be forgiven for teaching services in Virginia" (p. 5). At the same meeting, Mrs. Mary H. Futrell, President of the National Education Association stated her organization's position on this subject: "Scholarships, fellowships, and
grants should be offered to minority students who are poor but academically gifted and want to enter the teaching profession" (p. 4).

The June 24th minutes of the Funding and Equal Access committee stated their recommendation under the heading "Incentives for Teachers": "Expand the forgivable scholarship/loan program to attract teachers to special education and attract minorities to the teaching profession" (p. 7).

Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Rochester, Senator Spong, Mrs. Jones, Dr. Rubin, Dr. Elliott, and Dr. Roberts stated that this recommendation came from the Teachers and Teaching Committee with Dr. Roberts giving credit to the teacher panel that appeared before the committee.

Mr. Dyke recalled Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) as having originated the idea while Mrs. Marston (Lampe) stated that Senator Brault originated the idea.

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton identified Mrs. McDiarmid as the key actor in developing this recommendation.

Mr. White gave credit to the entire Commission, and Mrs. Vaughan stated that she and Mr. Dyke were key supporters of this recommendation.

Key Actor/Factor: Identified by:
Mrs. McDiarmid ... Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton
Teacher Testimony ... Dr. Roberts
Mrs. Thomas ... Mr. Dyke
Mrs. Marston (Lampe) ... Mr. Dyke
Senator Brault ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)
Mr. Dyke ... Mrs. Vaughan
Mrs. Vaughan ... Mrs. Vaughan
Dr. Thomas Truitt, Dr. ... From Minutes: Teachers and
Renfro Manning, and Teaching Committee; June 3,
Mrs. Mary Futrell 1986

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 16. More emphasis be placed on leadership in the training of principals.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 17. School divisions evaluate and compensate principals on the basis of performance.

No one claimed credit for the origin of these two recommendations.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended both to the Commission.

The fourth meeting of this committee was held on May 21, 1986, at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Richard Flanary, Director of the Principal's Assessment Center at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and David Lepard, Director of the Principal's Assessment Center at George Mason University provided information about the roles their centers played in the screening and selection of principals and the degree of accuracy of this program which had been sanctioned by the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

At this same meeting, the committee heard from Dr. Burnett Joiner, Dean of the School of Education, Grambling State University, who told the committee: "Attention to programs for training principals and superintendents to be
effective, dynamic, educational leaders is essential" (Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; May 21, 1986).

At the May 21st meeting, the Teachers and Teaching Committee also heard from David Mandel, Associate Director, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, who spoke on the reforming of teacher education and discussed the rationale for the study and recommendations made in *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. This report was prepared by a Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum and describes the six recommendations made by the Task Force.

Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Senator Spong, Mrs. Jones, Dr. Rubin, Dr. Elliott, and Dr. Margaret Roberts stated that these two recommendations came from the Teachers and Teaching Committee with Dr. Roberts and Mrs. Jones giving credit to the teacher panel that appeared before the committee. As Dr. Roberts put it in her interview:

Here, numbers 11 through 17, I remember ... the committee on Teachers and Teaching were absolutely taken by the meeting they held out at the Hyatt (Hotel) with teachers. Suzanne Thomas said just the other day how that turned out to be one of the most helpful and most influential meetings she had (Interview; February 21, 1990).

The meeting with teachers, Dr. Roberts was referring to, was the meeting of the Teachers and Teaching Committee held on May 8, 1986, at which the teacher panel of five teachers appeared.
Mrs. Thomas credited David Mandel for recommendation number 16.

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton credited Mrs. McDiarmid for recommendation number 16.

Dr. Howerton and Mrs. Jones believed that number 17 was a compromise on the evaluation of the performance of teachers. *The Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia*, July 1983, was very specific on how teachers were to be evaluated (see: page 13 of this manual). The evaluation of principals, however, had been left to the individual school divisions or division superintendents.

Mr. Dyke credited Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe); while Mrs. Rochester gave credit to the Structure and Organization Committee for number 17.

Mr. White stated in his interview:

Sixteen was, I think, a manifestation of the Commission's recognition that the principal is the key. He's the moving force from the standpoint of the curriculum. We really needed to do more to enhance those skills. The state needed to be much more involved with that. (Recommendation) Seventeen fits along the same lines (Interview; March 20, 1990).

Dr. Donald Finley credited Ted Sizer and the literature of that time. However, Dr. Finley appeared before the Teachers and Teaching Committee on June 3, 1986 and spoke to this recommendation:

Secretary of Education Donald Finley brought attention to the importance of the principalship and suggested the involvement of the principals' assessment centers in the training of principals.
He commented that the higher the standards the principals set for themselves, the higher will be the standards teachers hold for themselves (p. 7).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing these two recommendations were:

**Recommendation Number 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors/Factors:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. McDiarmid</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Sizer and the &quot;Current Literature&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: National</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports to the Teachers and Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Mandel</td>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that the &quot;Principal is the key to the Success of a School&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Flanary, Dr. David Lepard, Dr. David Mandel and Dr. Burnett Joiner</td>
<td>From Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; May 21, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
<td>From Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; June 3, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commission’s visit to the &quot;U.Va. Principal’s Center&quot;</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation Number 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors/Factors:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ evaluation procedures compared to teachers’</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Sizer and the &quot;Current Literature&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: National</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports to the Teachers and Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that the &quot;Principal is the key to the Success of a School&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 18. More aides, volunteers, part-time instructors, and technology be used to assist teachers.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Teachers and Teaching and Student Preparation and Achievement committees were responsible for bringing it to the Commission.

On June 3, 1986, Mrs. Mary Futrell, President of NEA, appeared before the Teachers and Teaching Committee and stated: "Increased support staff is needed to free teachers from non-teaching duties. Teachers now spend 40 percent of their time in non-teaching duties" (p. 4).

At this same meeting Dr. Renfro Manning and Dr. Tom Truitt, representing VASA requested: "Eliminate non-instructional tasks by providing paraprofessionals and technology to assist in the classroom, permitting the teacher to concentrate on instruction" (p. 5).

On June 24, 1986, the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee presented the following recommendation to the Commission:

The Department of Education should work with the statewide volunteer council to develop models of one-to-one tutoring in reading with a component for working with parents to help them read and work with their children. These models should include demonstrations concerning one-to-one tutoring and adults reading to children. Retired people should be involved in tutoring and reading to
young children (p. 7).

Dr. Davis gave credit to Mrs. Thomas for this recommendation. Mr. Dyke credited Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe).

Mr. Burkholder gave credit to Mrs. Rochester.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) and Mrs. Jones credited the testimony of the teachers that appeared before their committee on May 8, 1986, with Mrs. Marston (Lampe) adding the testimony of the Virginia Education Association and parents.

Senator Spong, Mr. Lemmon and Mrs. Thomas stated that this recommendation came from the Teachers and Teaching Committee.

Mrs. Rochester stated that both the Teachers and Teaching and the Student Preparation and Achievement Committees were responsible.

Mr. White stated in his interview that more teacher time for students was needed.

Mrs. Vaughan stated that she was a strong supporter of this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>... Dr. Davis and Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rochester</td>
<td>... Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 19. Individualized recertification plans, based on a point system, be required for each teacher.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee was responsible for it being included in the Commission’s Report.

At the first meeting of this committee held on April 22, 1986, one of the “indicators” they chose to investigate was: “certificate renewal – greater diversity”.

The Committee asked the State Department Representative, Dr. Elliott to choose seven teachers from across the state representing K-12, all structures (urban, suburban, and rural) to meet with them. A panel of five teachers met with the committee on May 8th at the Richmond Hyatt Hotel. These teachers were:

Gaye Adegbalola, James Monroe High School, Fredericksburg City Schools;
Betty Arrington, E. C. Glass High School, Lynchburg City Schools;
Christine Tankard, Cape Charles High School, Cape Charles Schools;
Mary Trimmer, Swift Creek Middle School, Chesterfield County Schools; and
Leola Watkins, Carver Elementary School, Richmond City Schools.

The following "concerns" were noted during the question and answer session with the panelists:

... Most interesting and creative courses for recertification are offered in college/university schools other than schools of education. "Methods" courses do not infuse creative approaches to teaching (p. 2).

Dr. Davis remembered this teacher panel and gave credit to them for this recommendation along with Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Jones, two members of this committee.

Mrs. Jones gave credit to the teacher panel that appeared before her committee and stated that other states have this plan.

Dr. Howerton credited the panel of teachers and Mrs. Jones.

Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Thomas and Mr. Lemmon gave credit to the Teachers and Teaching Committee.

Dr. Finley credited Dr. Davis.

Mr. Dyke credited Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) while Mrs. Marston (Lampe) gave credit to the Missouri Plan and the National Commission. The Missouri Plan entitled: Action For Excellence: 21 Recent School-Reform Initiatives in Missouri, reports that their General Assembly enacted a law in 1984 which eliminated the lifetime teaching certificate beginning in 1988. Their State
Board will develop standards for one or more renewable certificates in the future which will be based on requirements for teacher training and experience (1984: 3).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Testimony</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Missouri Plan</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that &quot;Other States are doing this&quot;</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 20. All teachers should have, or be working toward, graduate degrees.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

This recommendation was made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee. At their meeting held on June 3, 1986, the committee agreed with the following recommendation: "The percentage of Virginia teachers with graduate degrees should be increased from the present 35 percent to 70 percent" (p. 9).

In their final recommendation made to the Commission on June 24, 1986, the language was: "The percentage of Virginia teachers with graduate degrees in their teaching
discipline should be increased" (p. 4).

Ten persons interviewed stated that this recommendation came from this committee. They were: Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Thomas, Senator Spong, and Mr. Lemmon. Mrs. Jones remembered that testimony played a key role in the development of this recommendation. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) stated the College Deans were instrumental in shaping this recommendation.

Mr. Dyke gave credit to Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Marston (Lampe).

Mrs. Vaughan stated that she was a strong supporter of this recommendation.

In summary, these key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony before the Teachers and Teaching Committee</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Deans</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 21. Regional graduate professional education centers be established.

While no one specifically claimed this recommendation, Mrs. Joan Jones stated that these centers would:
"... parallel the idea of the Commonwealth Centers in
Higher Education. They would develop more expertise." 

(Interview; March 17, 1990).

This recommendation was made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee, of which Mrs Jones served as a member. At the May 8th meeting of this committee, Dr. Howerton pointed out that a Virginia initiative to fund regional teacher centers across the state had once failed due to the lack of funding.

At the June 3rd meeting, the Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended that the teacher centers should be reactivated to provide professional development experiences for teachers. In their final recommendation to the Commission on June 24, 1986 this recommendation read:

Graduate Teacher Education Speciality Centers should be established at selected, state-supported institutions of higher education to provide programs in areas of specialization on a regional basis (p. 2).

Seven people interviewed stated that this committee made this recommendation. They were: Dr. Elliott, Dr. Rubin, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Lemmon, Mrs. Rochester; and Senator Spong.

Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mr. Dyke gave credit to Mrs. Jones.

Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the testimony of college deans for this recommendation. Mr. Burkholder stated:

There was a lot of duplication of offerings.
In various schools of higher education. There were a lot of situations where the Commission heard of 2 or 3 people in a class, for example, counseling. That was the genesis of the concern and they felt that all schools shouldn't be offering this degree. If you had a center at William and Mary and one at V.P.I. for the counseling degree, for instance, -- of course the colleges of education took exception to this (Interview; March 1, 1990).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Dyke and Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Deans' Testimony</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 22. The state employ an Assistant State Superintendent for Technology.

Mrs. Frances Lewis claimed credit for the origin of the recommendations on technology. She stated in her interview:

Where is technology? One thing that continued all the way through, that wasn't entered in my committee ... of course, I had instigated it, was technology (Interview; March 14, 1990).

The Funding and Equal Access Committee recommended it to the Commission. This committee had an entire block of recommendations regarding technology in their final report submitted to the Commission on June 24, 1986. This particular recommendation read: "Create and immediately fill a position of Assistant Superintendent for Tech-
nology". This recommendation goes further in defining the exact duties of the position to include 5 functions. These functions are:

1. The preparation of a five-year plan of technology for the state's public schools;

2. Work with other state agencies in the development of this plan;

3. Develop a training program to train teachers and administrators in the use of technology;

4. Promote cooperation among industries, school divisions, colleges, and universities in conducting research in the use of educational technology;

5. Participate in the budgeting process to ensure that the state's budget includes sufficient funds for technology (p. 7-8).

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton gave credit to Mr. Dyke and the Communications/Automation Transition Plan, (CATS study), for this recommendation. The CATS study referred to a study done in 1982 by the Department of Information Technology for the state of Virginia. This study contained five recommendations to the Department of Education to be phased in over a period of four years to upgrade technology throughout the public schools and within the Department.

Mr. Burkholder credited Mr. Dyke, Mr. Fishwick and Mrs. Lewis for this recommendation.

Dr. Margaret Roberts credited the electronic classroom, while Mr. Joseph Roberts thought it was the Structure and Organization Committee's idea.

Dr. Finley and Mr. Dyke credited John Fishwick.
Mrs. Marston (Lampe) gave credit to Mr. White, while Mr. White credited the entire Commission.

Mrs. Lois Rochester stated that it was the Funding and Equal Access Committee's idea.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CATS Study</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fishwick</td>
<td>Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Finley, and Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. White</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Classroom</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 23. Electronic classrooms be available to all schools.

Mrs. Frances Lewis takes credit for the recommendations on technology. She stated in her interview:

"I instigated it".

Two committees recommended it to the Commission; Student Preparation and Achievement and Funding and Equal Access.

Under the heading "Programs for the Gifted", the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee on June 24, 1986 recommended:

Opportunities for students to take advanced placement courses should be increased. Enroll-
ment in school programs, use of electronic classroom, and early matriculation in community and four-year colleges/universities should be encouraged (p. 5).

The Funding and Equal Access Committee's concern was rural students, specifically their June 24th minutes reflected:

A state-wide expansion of the Varina project's electronic classroom is a method of providing courses which otherwise would not be available to students in rural areas (p. 12).

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton credited the CATS study and the Funding and Equal Access Committee for this recommendation. Mrs. Rochester also credited the Funding and Equal Access Committee, whereas, Mr. Burkholder gave credit only to the CATS study.

Dr. Roberts gave credit to the existing Varina High School's electronic classroom.

Mr. Roberts stated that Mr. Dyke originated the idea while Mr. Dyke credited Mr. Fishwick.

Dr. Finley gave credit to Robb's Future's Commission, Senator Spong and Senator Andrews. As he stated in his interview:

The disparity thing, which is still being pursued, ... was Senator Spong who spoke strongly about that. And, again the Future's Commission with Spong, and others, including Hunter Andrews, they hit that issue (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the Department of Education.

Mr. White credited the entire Commission.
Mrs. Jones stated that the purpose of this recommendation was: "To reduce disparity and provide better instruction".

Mrs. Vaughan stated that she was a strong supporter of this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CATS study</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Classroom</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Mr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fishwick</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Robb's</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Spong</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Andrews</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 24. Teachers in the middle school grades be provided with microcomputers for the classroom and with instruction in their use.

Mrs. Frances Lewis takes credit for the recommendations on technology. She stated in her interview: "I instigated it".

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee recommended it to the Commission.

The committee meeting held on June 18, 1986 began with a presentation being made by Ms. Toni Stone, who is the Founder and Director of "Playing to Win", a non-profit
organization devoted to using low-technology equipment in working with people whom schools have failed. Mrs Lewis knew Ms. Stone and had her invited to this meeting.

When Ms. Stone was asked what specific recommendations she would make to the committee:

She responded by saying that the middle school is the place where emphasis should be placed first. She said that teachers must learn and become enthusiastic about the uses of the computer, and then their enthusiasm will spill over to the students (p. 2).

Following the presentation, the committee discussed various ways to implement her ideas.

Five persons interviewed gave credit to Mrs. Lewis as having originated this recommendation. They were: Dr. Davis, who included Toni Stone; Dr. Howerton, who included the CATS study; Mr. Burkholder, who included Toni Stone; Mr. Dyke who included John Fishwick and Ken White; and Mr. Lemmon.

Dr. Margaret Roberts gave credit to the electronic classroom as having originated this recommendation.

Mr. Roberts credited Mr. Dyke; Dr. Finley credited research; Mrs. Rochester gave credit to the Funding and Equal Access Committee and Mr. White credited the entire Commission.

Dr. Rubin credited the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee and Ms. Stone.
Mrs. Vaughan stated that she was a strong supporter of this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, Mr. Burkholder, Mr. Dyke, Mr. Lemmon, and Mrs. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Toni Stone</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, Mr. Burkholder, and Dr. Rubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATS Study</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Classroom</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Mr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Research</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fishwick</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. White</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 25. The Department of Education establish an electronic communications network with school divisions and develop a standardized database.

Mrs. Frances Lewis takes credit for the recommendations on technology. She stated in her interview: "I instigated it".

The Structure and Organization Committee recommended it to the Commission.

On June 17, 1986 Ms. Pat Storino, Systems Development Supervisor, Department of Information Technology appeared before this committee, at their request, to discuss the use of technology in establishing a commun-
cations system for the Department of Education and school
divisions in the state. She informed the committee of the
research already done by her department on this matter.

At this same meeting Dr. Michael F. Sullivan,
Assistant State Superintendent, Maryland Department of
Education spoke to the committee about the communi-
cations network developed by the Maryland Department of
Education.

In its June 24th minutes this committee stated
the reasons for this recommendation as follows:

According to specialists in the State Depart-
ment of Information Technology, current reporting
procedures are not efficient. School division super-
intendents are reported to have estimated that each
division spends 2,000 to 6,000 hours annually pre-
paring reports for the Department of Education and
federal agencies. Also, there is a proliferation
of equipment and software by school divisions as
they attempt to meet their operational needs.
Despite a sizeable expenditure of money, divisions
are still unable to use the equipment to communicate
with each other (p. 9).

Mr. Joseph Roberts stated that this recommendation
was initiated by the Structure and Organization Committee.

Dr. Howerton gave credit to the CATS study for this
recommendation.

Dr. Roberts credited the electronic classroom.

Mr. Dyke credited Mr. Fishwick.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited Mr. Lemmon.

Mrs Rochester credited the Funding and Equal Access
Committee.
Mr. White credited the entire Commission. No one actor or factor was given credit by more than one person interviewed for having been the most influential in developing this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATS Study:</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton and From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 17, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Information Technology (Ms. Pat Storino)</td>
<td>From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 17, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Department of Education (Dr. Michael F. Sullivan)</td>
<td>From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 24, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Superintendents quoted in CATS Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Classroom</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fishwick</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 26. The Virginia Public School Authority provide loans to help school divisions buy technological equipment.

Mrs. Frances Lewis takes credit for the recommendations on technology. She stated in her interview: "I instigated it".

Funding and Equal Access was the committee that recommended it to the Commission. The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee also mentioned it in their report.
In the minutes of Funding and Equal Access Committee on June 24, 1986 the following reference was made:

... the Commonwealth should develop a program to assist localities in paying for capital outlays. As the state brings more technological equipment into the classrooms, the Board should consider the feasibility of providing low interest loans to localities for the purchase of computers and other equipment which will enhance the use of technology in schools (p. 6).

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee’s reference to this recommendation suggests a cost-sharing approach. These cost-sharing procedures would enable divisions to acquire basic technology. Also, the state should develop and fund demonstration schools. This committee further recommends the use of the personal computer as a dropout prevention tool. (The Committee’s recommendation is quoted under recommendation number 27).

Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton gave credit to Dr. Finley for this idea.

Dr. Roberts credited the electronic classroom.

Mr. Joseph Roberts stated that the Structure and Organization Committee originated the idea.

Mr. Dyke credited Mr. Fishwick.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) gave credit to Mr. Lemmon, Senator Brault and the Department of Education.

Mrs. Rochester credited Mr. Dyke.

Mr. White gave credit to the entire Commission.
In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been the most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Classroom</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fishwick</td>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>Mrs. Rochester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 27. The Department of Education restructure education in the middle school grades.

No one claimed credit for the origin of this recommendation.

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee recommended it to the Commission. On May 7, 1986 Mr. Denis Doyle, one of the authors of the book, *Investing in Our Children*, a report prepared for the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, spoke to this committee. In regards to the middle school grades, Mr. Doyle made the following recommendation from the Committee for Economic Development research data: "Narrow in on more specific curriculum at the middle school years" (Minutes: Student Preparation and Achievement Committee; May 7, 1986; p. 2).

As a background to their recommendation to the full Commission, this committee on June 24th stated:
Middle school has been the neglected alley-way of education reform. ... For low achievers, middle school is where poor attitudes and performance become firmly established and where potential dropouts can usually be identified. ... Relatively inexpensive computers have been shown to be effective in capturing and maintaining the attention of potential dropouts when used as a learning tool (p. 4).

The recommendation made by this committee, therefore, was a combination of recommendation numbers 24, 27 and 29, and read as follows:

The Department of Education should begin immediately to restructure the middle school program. The personal computer should be used as an additional learning tool to capture the interest and involvement of those hard-to-reach and at-risk students who have not been successful with traditional methods. The Department of Education should conduct training for middle school teachers in the use of computers as a tool for learning to be used in all courses, grades six through eight. Teachers who complete the training should be given a computer and appropriate software to use in their classrooms and to help train others in their school and division. Each school division should have a defined program to identify and intervene with at-risk students (p. 5).

Apparently these three recommendations became separated during the preparation of the Commission's Report.

Dr. Howerton credited Mrs. Lewis for this recommendation.

Dr. Shingleton gave credit to Chapter 3 of Investing in Our Children and Mr. Denis Doyle.

Dr. Finley credited research.
Mrs. Jones credited testimony from parents, teachers, and school divisions concerning dropout prevention as being responsible for this recommendation.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited Mr. Brault, Mr. Lemmon, and the Department of Education.

Two Commission Members remembered Senator Spong referring to the middle school as a "wasteland". They were Mr. DeFord and Mrs. Thomas.

Dr. Rubin, Senator Spong, Mrs. Rochester, and Mr. Lemmon gave credit to the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, with Dr. Rubin adding Ms. Toni Stone.

Mr. White stated that "Testimony and Documentation" was responsible for this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3, <em>Investing in Our Children</em></td>
<td>Dr. Shingleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Toni Stone</td>
<td>Dr. Rubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Research</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: Parents, Teachers and School Divisions</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones and Mr. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Spong</td>
<td>Mrs. Thomas and Mr. DeFord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 28. Virginia set a goal that no school division shall have a dropout rate higher than the present statewide average and that the present statewide average be reduced by one-half.

Dr. S. John Davis claimed that he and Dr. Donald Finley originated this recommendation.

The Funding and Equal Access Committee recommended it to the Commission. Under the title: "Disadvantaged/Minorities", this committee on June 24, 1986 recommended:

Drop out prevention programs should be required in every school division. Where divisions do not currently have such programs, there should be available state-wide models including alternative education and work-study programs and funds sufficient to enable each division to have a program which identifies the potential dropout and youth at-risk and assist those students at the earliest possible stage. This money should be targeted specifically for this issue and should not be used for general operations (p. 10).

Mr. Joseph Roberts credited the Funding and Equal Access Committee.

Dr. Howerton credited Mr. Lemmon.

Dr. Roberts credited Senator Brault.

Mrs. Jones in her interview stated:

Twenty eight is a continuous problem that superintendents told us about. We decided that we needed to force the localities to spend money on that. And so (it was) for (recommendation) 29 (Interview; March 17, 1990).

Mrs. Marston Lampe credited the State Board of Education and Mrs. Rochester gave credit to the Entire Commission.
No one actor or factor was given credit by more than one person interviewed for having developed this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lemmon</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: Division</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 29. Middle school programs provide assistance to students who are potential dropouts.

No one claimed this recommendation as their original idea.

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee recommended it to the Commission. (See the exact wording under recommendation number 27).

Dr. Howerton credited Mrs. Lewis for this recommendation; so did Mr. Burkholder, who included Ms. Toni Stone from New York.

Mrs. Rochester gave credit to the correct committee as did Dr. Rubin. Dr. Rubin, however, stated that Ms. Toni Stone's presentation influenced the recommendation.

Mr. Roberts credited the Funding and Equal Access Committee.
Mrs. Jones' credit to the division superintendents was explained under recommendation 28.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the State Board.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lewis</td>
<td>... Dr. Howerton and Mr. Burkholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Toni Stone</td>
<td>... Mr. Burkholder and Dr. Rubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: Division</td>
<td>... Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents State Board of Education</td>
<td>... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 30. Training programs be required for school board members and division superintendents.

Two people claimed this recommendation: Dr. Don Finley remembered getting this idea from Mary Sue Terry, Attorney General for Virginia; and Mrs. Sandra Vaughan remembered: "Even though I think it might have been initiated by the VSBA, I think I might have put that one in there".

Two committees recommended it to the Commission: Teachers and Teaching and Structure and Organization.

On June 3, 1986 Drs. Thomas Truitt and Renfro Manning presented VASA's recommendations to the Teachers and Teaching Committee. Following their presentation and in answer to the committees questions, Drs. Truitt and Manning suggested: "Resources should be devoted to estab-
lishing a system of inservice for division superintendents". The discussion that followed this presentation revealed that the committee agreed on the value of superintendents' institutes. In order to ensure attendance at these institutes, Dr. Davis suggested setting up a point system to link participation in the institutes with staying on the superintendent's eligibility list. He asked that the superintendents' group develop procedures for putting people on this eligibility list.

 Appearing before the Structure and Organization Committee on June 10, 1986 were: Dr. Thomas Shannon, Executive Director of the National School Boards Association, (NSBA); and Dr. Frank Barham, Executive Director of the Virginia School Boards Association, (VSBA). Dr. Shannon discussed mandated training for school board members in some states and presented arguments for and against this being done. He reported that six states at that time were mandating this training. Dr. Barham emphasized a "positive approach" to public education, asking that the Commission:

   Involve us, don't reform us. He urged that the training programs for school board members be conducted by the Virginia School Boards Association in cooperation with the State Department of Education and with state financial assistance (p. 2).

 Dr. Davis recalled that a Federal Grant entitled L.E.A.D. had been received by the Department for a project
to train division superintendents. He credited this grant for the training of superintendents as being part of recommendation 30.

Dr. Howerton credits VSBA for the school board training and the L.E.A.D. project for the superintendents' training.

Dr. Roberts credited Senator Brault.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) and Mr. White credited VSBA.

Mr. Roberts, Mr. Moore and Mrs. Rochester gave credit to the Structure and Organization Committee.

Dr. Finley's credit to Mary Sue Terry was explained in his interview as follows:

She, in her work, I think had been involved with this and saw a lot of school boards concentrating more on the business aspects, because of their natural inclinations. ... in some cases, individuals who served on school boards ... who were not exposed to some of the research writing being done nationally, it wasn't part of their natural agenda (Interview; March 15, 1990).

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Sue Terry</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Vaughan</td>
<td>Mrs. Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia School Boards</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mrs. Vaughan, and Mr. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The L.E.A.D. Project</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Manning,</td>
<td>From Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; June 3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Dr. Truitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1986.
From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 10, 1986.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 31. The Governor and General Assembly redefine the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and local school boards, superintendents, and principals.

No one claimed to have originated this recommendation.

The Structure and Organization Committee recommended it to the Commission.

At the meeting of this committee held on June 3, 1986, two topics were on the agenda: the relationship among the Governor, the General Assembly, the Secretary of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, local governing bodies, and local school boards; and the length of the school day, year, and summer school programs. Dr. Davis and Dr. Finley were among those present.

Ms. Norma Szakal, Legislative Staff Attorney for the Division of Legislative Services had been asked to present a summary of the "Structure and Responsibilities of State and Local Government in Virginia as they relate to Public Education". Following her presentation, Senator Brault asked Dr. Finley if he felt that clarification was needed in the constitutional and statutory definitions of the roles of the Board of Education, the State Superintendent and the Secretary of Education.
Dr. Finley's response was: "Not in my mind. It might be more a matter of communication than clarification".

Also speaking on this topic that day were: Mrs. Mary Jo Fields, Staff Associate, Virginia Municipal League; Michael Cohen, Director of Policy Planning and Development for the National Association of State Boards of Education, and; Jill Pope, Legislative and County Liaison Officer, Virginia Association of Counties.

Following all presentations, Senator Brault asked Dr. Davis if he felt that clarification was needed in the roles. He said that he did not, but he believed that the superintendent's responsibilities should be updated and he would present his views at the next meeting. These views were presented in writing at the June 17th meeting and only Dr. Davis' written views were included in the committee's recommendations to the Commission.

Interviews with Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Jones provided some insight into why this recommendation became expanded to include the Board of Education, the local school boards, superintendents and principals. As Mrs. Jones put it:

The responsibilities should clearly be defined because of legal liability also. That's not any different, I guess, from the libelous [sic] society in general in which we live. As I recall that was considered very important because it hadn't been done in a long time (Interview;
Mr. Burkholder stated in his interview:

State law, at least at that time, did not properly define these responsibilities as it should. This was a call for the General Assembly to take a fresh look at these duties to determine if they were still appropriate (Interview; March 1, 1990).

Dr. Magill credited the testimony of Ms. Norma Szakal, Ms. Joan Murphy and other "out of state people" at the June 3rd meeting of the Structure and Organization committee for this recommendation. The "out of state people appearing at the committee meeting were: Dr. Chris Pipho, Clearing House Director, Education Commission of the States, and Mr. Michael Cohen, Director of Policy Planning and Development for the National Association of State Boards of Education. Dr. Pipho acknowledged that the educational governance issue was "most difficult to speak on". He discussed the selection of school board members and the length of the school year with the committee. Mr. Cohen, on the other hand, reviewed the role of state boards in sustaining educational reform and suggested that state boards needed to adopt new roles. The new roles, as described by Cohen, would require new orientations as well as new behaviors, becoming more operative among state governance bodies.

Dr. Finley credited Senator Andrews by saying that he wanted these roles redefined "... in part, at least in the codification of the definitions. Most of which date
back ... 30 or 40 years, if not longer and he thought they should be looked at” (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Rochester and Mr. Moore gave credit to the Structure and Organization Committee.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the State Board.

Dr. Howerton and Dr. Roberts credited Senator Brault for being the most influential in developing this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton and Dr. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Joan Murphy</td>
<td>Dr. Magill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Norma Szakal</td>
<td>Dr. Magill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony of Out of State People: Dr.</td>
<td>Dr. Magill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Pipho and Mr. Michael Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Andrews</td>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Legal Liability</td>
<td>Mrs. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>Mrs. Marston (Lampe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Jo Fields, Ms. Jill Pope, Dr.</td>
<td>From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 3, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Mr. Michael Cohen, and Dr. Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 32. Outstanding schools and deficient schools be identified.

Dr. S. John Davis gave himself and Senator Adelard Brault credit for this recommendation.
Two committees recommended it to the Commission. They were: Structure and Organization and Student Preparation and Achievement.

As early as April 22nd, the Structure and Organization Committee chose: "Optimum size of school divisions, including consolidation and optimum size of schools", as one of the topics they would discuss. On June 10th, the committee had Mr. Leonard Gereau, Division Superintendent of Franklin County Schools speak on the New York State's Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), which was created to conduct a program of shared educational services in schools in two or more counties or supervisory districts.

In its final recommendation to the Commission, this committee referred to this recommendation as: "Improving Education in Small School Divisions".

The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, under the heading of "Curriculum" included the recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction should take into consideration curriculum offerings to determine if emphasis has been misguided and to identify educationally deficient school divisions. The Superintendent will report these divisions annually to the Board of Education (p. 3).

Dr. Howerton credited Dr. Davis and Senator Brault.

Mr. Burkholder gave credit to John Fishwick because of his business orientation.
Dr. Magill and Mr. Dyke credited Senator Brault.
Mr. Roberts and Senator Brault credited Dr. Davis.
Dr. Finley gave credit to other states who had implemented similar recommendations.
Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited the State Board.
Mrs. Rochester and Senator Spong credited the Funding and Equal Access Committee.
Mr. Lemmon and Mr. Moore credited the Structure and Organization Committee with Mr. Moore also giving credit to Dr. Davis.
Mrs. Vaughan stated that she voted against this recommendation!

Mrs. Jones stated that number 32 was:

... very painful. It was very painful for us, but we decided we had done a lot of things with funding formulas. No problem identifying outstanding schools, but schools that are deficient, you know, there was ... discussion about whether that would be more destructive than not. But we thought ... to serve the children, school divisions, and they're primarily, maybe exclusively in the southwest, had to be judged by the same standards that school divisions in other places in the state (Interview; March 17, 1990)

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that appear to have been the most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, Mr. Roberts, Senator Brault, Mr. Moore, and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Fishwick ... Mr. Magill and Mr. Dyke
From "Other states ... Mr. Burkholder
who have this" ... Dr. Finley
Testimony: State ... Mrs. Jones
Department of Edu-
cation about deficiencies ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)
of School Divisions
State Board of ... From Minutes: Structure and
Education ... Organization Committee; June
Mr. Leonard Gereau ... 10, 1986.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 33. Funds be established to reward
outstanding schools and to help deficient schools.

Dr. S. John Davis credits himself and Senator
Adelard Brault for this recommendation.

The Structure and Organization Committee
recommended it to the Commission. The June 10th minutes,
including the discussion of this recommendation, may be
found under recommendation 32.

The Commission decided to add to the committee’s
recommendation the following: “We further recommend that
Virginia establish and fund two school grant programs to
reward exceptional schools and to help deficient schools”.

Dr. Howerton credited Jack Davis and Senator Brault
for this recommendation.

Mr. Roberts and Senator Brault credited Dr. Davis.
Mrs. Marston Lampe credited the entire Commission.
Mrs. Rochester and Senator Spong credited the
Funding and Equal Access Committee.

Mr. Lemmon and Mr. Moore gave credit to the Struc-
ture and Organization Committee with Mr. Moore adding that Dr. Davis should be given credit.

Mrs. Vaughan stated that she voted against this recommendation!

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Moore, Senator Brault, and Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 34. The General Assembly revise the statute establishing criteria by which the Board of Education may consolidate school divisions that fail to meet the Standards of Quality.

No one claimed to have originated this recommendation.

Two committees recommended it to the Commission: Structure and Organization and Funding and Equal Access.

Donald McCready, Management Consultant to the State Department of Information Technology, on June 10, 1986 spoke to the Structure and Organization Committee and, according to the minutes of that committee, he: "... discussed some of the pros and cons of consolidating small school divisions and what he called 'regional structure' alternatives to consolidation". Other discussion took place at this same meeting concerning outstanding and
deficient schools as a consolidation issue which has been reported under recommendations 32 and 33 above.

In their "Draft Working Paper", dated June 24, 1986 the Funding and Equal Access Committee recommended to the Commission that:

The Board should indicate its willingness to vigorously monitor compliance with the SOQ and to recommend consolidation of school divisions when necessary to achieve compliance with the SOQ and excellence in the school system. This may mean that a re-examination of current legislative and constitutional directives is needed (p. 14).

Dr. Howerton and Mr. Dyke credited Senator Brault.

Dr. Magill credited Dr. Finley, Dr. Davis and Governor Baliles.

Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Rochester and Mr. Moore gave credit to the Structure and Organization Committee.

Dr. Finley credited Dr. Davis and the Department of Education.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited Mr. Lemmon.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were the most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald McCreary, from</td>
<td>From Minutes: Structure and Organization Committee; June 10, 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Brault</td>
<td>Dr. Howerton and Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Finley</td>
<td>Dr. Magill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Magill and Dr. Finley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Baliles</td>
<td>Dr. Magill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of Education ... Dr. Finley
Mr. Lemmon ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 35. The present continuing contract law relating to school teachers and administrators be reviewed by the General Assembly.

No one among the persons interviewed claimed credit for this recommendation.

The Teachers and Teaching Committee recommended it to the Commission. As early as April 22, 1986 this committee chose: "continuing contracts (follow-up by LEA's, failure to document evaluation for dismissal)", as a topic for their deliberation.

This subject arose at the committee meeting on June 3, 1986, following the VASA presentation made by Dr. Tom Truitt and Dr. Renfro Manning. In response to a question concerning teacher evaluation, the VASA response was:

Teachers should be evaluated during their first and third years of teaching and every three years thereafter. This evaluation should be conducted by their peers and should be done from a positive point of view. If something is not being done well, it should be omitted from the report (p. 6-7).

At this same meeting, and in regard to evaluation, Dr. Davis added:

Many superintendents fear the evaluation process and the termination process. He posited that the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, (BTAP) might be called in to work with teachers who are having difficulty and to work with superintendents during the termination process (Minutes: Teachers and Teaching Committee; June 3, 1986).
Drs. Davis and Howerton stated that the entire Commission was responsible for this recommendation, with Dr. Davis also giving Mrs. Thomas credit.

Mr. Burkholder gave credit to division superintendents' testimony.

Dr. Roberts remembered Senator Spong saying "... that it's easier to move a graveyard than it is to fire an incompetent teacher".

Dr. Elliott and Mrs. Rochester credited the Teachers and Teaching Committee for the recommendation.

Mr. Roberts credited the Structure and Organization Committee.

Dr. Finley credited the Virginia School Boards Association.

Mrs. Jones stated that testimony from division superintendents about needing to remove incompetent teachers was responsible.

Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited Mr. Lemmon, Mr. White and Senator Brault.

Mrs. Thomas stated that she and Senator Brault went to see the General Assembly about this recommendation.

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

Key Actor/Factor: Identified by:
V.S.B.A. ... Dr. Finley
Mrs. Thomas ... Mrs. Thomas and Dr. Davis
Testimony: Division ... Mrs. Jones and Mr. Burkholder
Superintendents ... Dr. Roberts
Senator Spong ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe) and Mrs. Thomas
Senator Brault ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)
Mr. Lemmon ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)
Mr. White ... Mrs. Marston (Lampe)

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER 36. Where appropriate, these recommendations be included as part of the Standards of Quality.

Mr. James Dyke claimed this recommendation.

This recommendation was made by the Funding and Equal Access Committee with Mr. Dyke as Chairman. In its report, this committee reminded the Commission that state funding for local school divisions is determined by the Standards Of Quality, (SOQ).

Mr. Dyke stated in his interview:

And on the funding side, ... I sort of raised those questions as they related to changing the formula to reflect the appropriate recommendations being included as far as the Standards of Quality (Interview; March 15, 1990).

The Commission agreed that to give their recommendations the force of law and to ensure funding, it would be wise to have them incorporated into the Standards of Quality.

Dr. Davis credited the Department of Education for this recommendation.

Mr. Burkholder and Mrs. Marston (Lampe) stated that the entire Commission wanted this recommendation included to give the report the enforcement of law.
Mrs. Jones stated that this recommendation was added to the Commission's "wish list".

In summary, those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing this recommendation were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actor/Factor:</th>
<th>Identified by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dyke</td>
<td>... Mr. Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>... Dr. Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education, twenty-one of them were claimed by either a Commission Member, the Secretary of Education, or the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Recommendation Number 21: Regional graduate professional centers be established, was "partially claimed" by Mrs. Jones, making a total of twenty-two recommendations. These recommendation numbers were: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, and 36.

Four recommendations; 1, 5, 6, and 30, were claimed by more than one person and some people claimed more than one recommendation: Dr. Davis claimed nine; Mr. Dyke claimed three; Mrs. Lewis claimed five; Mrs. Vaughan claimed three; and Mrs. Jones claimed two, including number 21 which was "partially claimed".
In reviewing the interviews, some people were given credit for having initiated a recommendation who apparently did not.

All persons interviewed volunteered information readily. All had trouble remembering each and every recommendation. This may be explained, perhaps, by the fact that each of the four committees discussed individual recommendations; some of which were common to all four committees, some were specific to one committee, and some recommendations were discussed by two or more committees. The time which has elapsed since the work of the Commission may also explain why some of the recommendations may not be remembered.

Excluding the naming of a Commission committee, the State Department of Education, or the Board of Education as a key actor or key factor for a recommendation, eight of the persons interviewed identified over twenty key actors or factors that influenced the recommendations. These persons and the number of key actors/factors were:

1. Dr. Davis ... 40; 35 confirmed by others
2. Mr. Dyke ... 39; 11 confirmed by others
3. Dr. Howerton ... 35; 31 confirmed by others
4. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) ... 31; 14 confirmed by others
5. Mr. Burkholder ... 29; 15 confirmed by others
6. Mrs. Jones ... 27; 20 confirmed by others
7. Dr. Roberts ... 26; 14 confirmed by others
8. Dr. Finley ... 22; 6 confirmed by others

Mrs. Vaughan was next, naming 12 actors/factors, and the numbers decline to Mr. Fishwick, who identified 1.
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CHAPTER 5

PERCEPTIONS OF THE COMMISSION'S REPORT HELD BY THE
COMMISSION MEMBERS, THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, GOVERNOR
GERALD L. BALILES, AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Perceptions of the Commission’s Report Held by the
Commission Members

The second question asked of each Commission Member
in the interview was: "In retrospect, what are your views
of the consequences of the Commission’s report"? It was
expected that the answers to this question would provide
insight into the expectations and intent of those respon-
sible for the report. Their responses were as follows:

1. Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr.

    I feel very good about it. If we can do half
as well with our "new Commission", we'll be in
great shape. (Mr. Dyke was referring to the Com-
mission appointed by Governor Douglas Wilder in
February, 1990, called the "Commission on Educa-
tional Excellence for all Virginians". Mr. Dyke
is the present Secretary of Education for Virginia).
(Interview; March 15, 1990).

2. Mr. Kenneth S. White

    I don't remember anything coming out of that
meeting in Charlottesville that the President
(Bush) had that wasn't in our report. ... I
think the recommendations, most of them that the
State Board had anything to do with, that were
appropriate to the SOQ have been put in there.
At least there was a plan of action to do so when
I left. Of course, that gives the force of law
(Interview; March 20, 1990).

3. Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe)

    They're mixed. It focused a massive educational
system on a set that could be done. It applied
pressure for improvement.
I'm not totally satisfied with what's been done. However, some changes have been made.
If I had to go back and do it again ... I would not have the eighteen hours (limit) for elementary school teachers. This is too little. It is just not enough hours for these teachers. But it was a policy decision to get everyone's attention (Interview; March 15, 1990).

4. Senator William B. Spong

I don't think it's been implemented long enough for anyone to make a judgement. I don't think you can make judgement on these Commis-
sions until the recommendations have been in being for a period of five years or more (Interview; March 16, 1990).

5. Mrs. Sandra A. Vaughan

I believe it helped the Board of Education. It helped set the priorities for the Board. We still have a long way to go, if we just had the money. You superintendents are probably going to kill me for saying this, but sometimes you've just got to make the school systems look good. Don't label the children. Sometimes the bottom fourth gets lost. It doesn't take a Commission to do this, it can be done right there in the divisions. ... There's a lot more we can do with what we have (Interview; April 11, 1990).

6. Mrs. Joan S. Jones

One of the things I think we missed in this is something we talked about and the state and school divisions were picking up on ... is the role of the parent. It is so elementary that you can't believe ... I'm sure if we did this again that would be one of the recommendations that would be added.
In terms of higher education ... numbers 10, 11 and 12; we are very happy now that we think that this is being undertaken ... I think this will greatly impact education in the future. I'm glad that this is happening (Interview; March 17, 1990).
7. Mrs. Frances A. Lewis

... it seems to me that there was a tremendous stalemate to get the report written after we had said what we were going to say. There were all these opinions on how it should be written. This was a compromise, because there could have been a hundred recommendations. There were others who said ... we need three good recommendations so that people would pay attention to them. So we ended up with thirty-six. But they're really many more in here. I don't know how they decided which ones ... In other words, ... how we got from here (pointing to the Report of the Commission), to there (pointing to the State Department's Brochure showing thirty-six recommendations), was simply the staff. The staff did this (the Brochure). So, we could have turned out a hundred and two. The Commission did not intervene between this and that ... But, that's what you need good professional staffs to do ... I think with more time, more of these could have been picked up. You may have had to divide your money up into five-cent batches (Interview; March 14, 1990).

8. Mrs Lois B. Rochester

It was certainly the intent of our group right from the very beginning to come up with recommendations that would not just sit on the shelf, but would be implemented. ... I thought it was very good that the State Board of Education made up the major part of this Commission because they had to take ownership of these recommendations and, of course, it was a lot of extra work for them, a lot of extra work, but their attendance was excellent, (their) commitment was excellent, and they are in the position to move it forward. If it hadn't been for that it wouldn't have moved forward as well as it did, in my opinion. So that was a wise move. And I think it probably was a good idea to have some of us who had the benefit of serving on the previous Commission's Education Task Force there to move that forward because there's definite overlap. ... Because you could see where some of this came from.

... that's what Baliles did, was pick up on that initial commission and set up another commission to carry those ideas forward in a more
practical way which is wonderful, I think.
It's better than I expected. ... Almost all
the recommendations have been moved forward at
least to some extent, and the ones that didn't,
there seemed to be very good reasons why they
didn't.
I was particularly pleased and surprised that
the recommendations that required working with
the Council of Higher Education, meshing the
work on the Teacher Training Programs, Teacher
Certification, etc., had advanced as far as they
had. ... I thought that was a great coup to have
broken down some of those boundaries and to
develop something that seemed to please, if not
everybody, at least develop a cooperative
initiative there.
The other one that I am very excited about,
have very high hopes for (is) the ... technology
recommendation(s). ... I think what they're
doing ... the potential there is enormous.
They've really moved forward pretty fast on that.
I understand the State Department has moved
forward very rapidly on identifying effective
schools and etc., ... I've seen the new document
that clusters schools, looks at all the measures
and looking at outcomes ... that's exactly the
sort of thing we were conceptualizing ... to try
to put emphasis on outcomes rather than just
inputs, and to help schools.
... personally I would have liked to have
seen stronger emphasis on ... community in-
volvelement and parental involvement ... I'm a
strong proponent of that and I kept, wherever
I could, feeding that sort of idea into sub-
committees.
It was a very satisfying experience to work
on that Commission, because, well not only was
it interesting, there seemed to be some hope of
making a difference, a positive difference in
the state, and I'm very honored to have had that
opportunity (Interview; March 21, 1990).

9. Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr.

Well, I would never have thought a report
could come out ... particularly after we met
the first two times; we'd never get a report
of any kind. But we did pull together.
I think it was not by coincidence that it
pretty well outlines what we had done and the
fact that it was held in Virginia, the Pres-
ident's Summit Meeting. (Referring to President

10. Mrs. Suzanne F. Thomas

I'm going to say ... it was a very unusual group of people. Really, the chemistry of that group was extraordinary. They were all free-thinking, out-spoken, thoughtful, but worked well together; really well, wonderful exchanges. It was a very stimulating experience to be part of it and to produce something like this. We were strong-minded people.

Well, he (Governor Baliles) was, in my estimation, the energizing force behind the Commission's work. I think the charge that he gave the Commission was one that energized and got us thinking in broad, conceptual terms to begin with. ... It was a very moving speech. He really was the one that got us going. ... I don't think he meant keep score on how many of these you accomplished, I think he meant keep score ... on how well it happened (Interview; March 29, 1990).

11. Mrs. Dorothy S. McDiarmid

Well, I know that the input was of such importance that a new committee has been set up on Educational Excellence for all Virginians ... with Bill Lemmon as Chairman and I'm Co-Chairman.

Baliles, of course was an outstanding Governor and he cared about this too. And so, he probably was as important as anybody ... the reaction is very definite and I think that we find that certain areas of Virginia are very anxious to have more done in their areas, certain other areas of Virginia won't even pay their taxes for this kind of thing (Interview; June 1, 1990).

12. Senator Adelard L. Brault

... I went off the Board last year and I did not attend the meeting of the Commission Members that took place ... in the latter part of last year. ... As we were progressing, following the final meeting that we had ... my recollection was that the Board of Education followed up on a monthly basis. We were advised that most of (the) recommendations had ben implemented. So, I can't tell you which ones work but I was satisfied that progress was being made (Interview;

13. Mr. T. Justin Moore, Jr.

... I think by and large the thing worked out very effectively. I never had been involved with the school system much ... and I really enjoyed getting a peek inside ... they're [sic] a lot of hard working people there. ... I was impressed by Jack Davis, and I was impressed by a number of the people they brought in to make presentations on those various things like the computers in the classrooms, and those things. They seemed to know what they were doing, so ... But most every one of the presentations, I thought was well done.

... this is one of the few commissions that I've ever seen that was sensible enough to have a sort of postmortem and they got back together here in October of '89, October 17th to be exact. And they reviewed with the Commission Members: what had been recommended; what was underway; and what had been completed; and I was amazed to find that twenty-three of the thirty-six recommendations, some sixty-four percent of them had already been completed; and another eleven underway. That's a pretty good batting average for a commission (Interview; April 3, 1990).

14. Mr. John P. Fishwick

Well, let me say what happens to a commission like this, whether it's appointed by the Governor or any chief executive officer, like the President of the United States; it then becomes involved with the bureaucracy and what comes out of it largely depends upon the extent to which the Governor wants something to come out. And what you have here is a case in which I think Governor Baliles wanted something to come out of it. But, he again was facing the fact that he was controlling the bureaucracy. ... Because, in the first place, when you go into a committee, like a subcommittee, the staff of that subcommittee is the educational bureaucracy. So they let you talk all you want, they basically write the reports and unless they agree with what you say ... it's very hard to get anything accomplished. ... you also have the fact that ... any changes that you recommend in effect is a reflection on what they've been doing, they didn't come forward with these ideas on their own. So you're faced with the
problem of how to get anything done, even if you
get the concurrence of the committee. ... Now at
the same time, the Governor has a lot of clout.
... if he has some particular interest in some
particular area and really wants some help and
is going to push something through, these people
take it seriously.

Now, everything else (other than recomman-
dation number 2, which Mr. Fishwick originated)
just sort of works up, so far as I'm concerned.
But most of these things are points that were
suggested by the bureaucracy....

... the thing I was particularly interested
in and I think they're doing something toward it
is the ... problem ... how to provide really
equal ... educational opportunities to everybody.
... Well there's only one way that I could see
that you could more nearly equalize it, you've
got to use the advantage of technology. You've
got to do more with T V and electronics. ...
That's got to be done at the state level. ...
We ought to really have some sort of net with
them and I think we're coming to it. A network
of television that will take education into the
rural parts of the state.

Basically what the impacts of this study has
been over the last three or four years, I'm not
in a position to say. You'll just have to get
that out of the bureaucracy, as what have you
done with it?

Well, ... what you realistically have to
expect, you make thirty-six recommendations and
if you get three or four of them adopted, and
really implemented, you've done something
(Interview; March 20, 1990).

15. Mr. Willard L. Lemmon

... well, first of all ... a lot of people
wondered if we'd ever get a report out of the
Commission, the Commission's Report. Well, I
can't tell you how personally proud I am of each
of these members of the Commission and how proud
I was to be a part of it myself. ... we were
really determined, all of us that, if possible,
we didn't want this report to gather dust; and
I guess this is probably part of the genius of
the selection of the Commission that the Governor
and the Secretary used, it was the two of them;
that they did choose the Board to sit in on it,
to be part of it; but not all of it, because
that did then allow the Board to really carry on.
What we determined to do, at the Governor’s urgence, ... after the report was finished ... we took every single one of the suggestions that applied to the Board, in other words, those things that didn’t apply to the Council of Higher Education, and we assigned each one of those either to a standing Board committee or to an ad-hoc committee. In every case, very specifically chose a different chairman and a different committee. ... So this, in effect, gave two looks to almost each recommendation and I think a number of them have been fully accomplished. A number will never be fully accomplished, but are working ... I think somewhere in the neighborhood of thirty-two out of thirty-six, or something like that, have received really active work since that time. And to me that ... is one of the things that I feel best about is it did not gather dust and, if in fact, or to the extent that the recommendations were good ones, then it will have an imprint on the educational future of this state. ... The Board, in the last, since before I came on, has been a very active, proactive Board. ... And so I think it took over these recommendations and has done a pretty good job with them. For those that turn out not to be good, they may have to undo some, I don’t know (Interview; April 11, 1990).

Perceptions of the Commission’s Report Held by the Secretary of Education: Dr. Donald J. Finley

In the interview with Dr. Finley only one question was asked: Who or what was responsible for each of the thirty-six recommendations made in the Commission on Excellence in Education’s Report? Dr. Finley gave a great deal of insight into the selection of the Commission Members and a perspective of their report which is stated below:

Let me start form the beginning, tell you how the study got started. There was something close to it in Governor Baliles’ campaign literature. It wasn’t called the same thing, but it was close to it, and so, as soon as he took office, I suggested to him that we take the
Education Committee from the 1984 Commission on Virginia's Future. ... and add to it the State Board of Education and let them constitute the Commission. The reasoning for that was: one, we wanted to get some ... recommendations fairly quickly ... because we knew that our best chance at submitting recommendations was going to be in 1988. So we didn't have time for a two or three year study with people to react to it and all that. ... the Future's Commission, of course had a section on education and they had covered a tremendous amount of territory and done a lot of background and looked at a lot of information and we thought that, since it was relatively fresh in their minds, not but a year or two old, that it would save everybody revisiting that kind of thing. To have these individuals to bring their knowledge and background to the table. Adding the Board of Education in it's entirety was to see if we couldn't develop a strategy that would result in ... somebody there after the Commission reported to carry the ball forward. Too often times Commission members retire and there's nobody left who has any ... investment in the recommendations and, therefore, the recommendations just stay on the shelf.

So the idea was; one, bring that background ... to the table, then, after the Commission had reported, the Board of Education would ... carry forth with the agenda. But they would sit in their separate capacities, the Board of Education would sort of re-think it and take appropriate actions. We were interested in a strategy that would get recommendations on the table quickly, but well thought out recommendations. ... And secondly, that once the recommendations came forth, that we were in a position to implement as many and as quickly as possible. That particular strategy was what I suggested to Governor Baliles and he agreed with that and he went forward.

We were very pleased with how much was accomplished in relatively such a short period of time.

I worked with the General Assembly on this. They were concerned at first about the costs of the Commission's recommendations would break the bank, so to speak.

I got involved with the more controversial ones of these, giving the role of the Governor's office on these, as it became clear to us what the thinking of the General Assembly in some of the areas was going to be.

It was a lot of fun. The Commission Members
were quite an able group. Occasionally we received the criticism of no teacher, superintendent, or a practitioner having served on the Commission, but that's about all the criticism we've gotten (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Perceptions of the Commission’s Report Held by Governor Gerald L. Baliles

On April 4, 1990, I interviewed the former Governor and asked him nine questions regarding the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education. The questions and his responses were as follows:

Question 1. Why did you appoint the Commission on Excellence in Education?

Well, I think the record shows that Virginia made a lot of progress in education during the decade of the 1980's. And I think the records will also reflect that while teachers' salaries were increased significantly, while test scores improved, while greater numbers of students were taking foreign languages and geography, the fact remained that not all of the schools were making the same kind of progress, nor were they pursuing some of the programs of innovation and creativity that could be found in other areas of the state. My feeling was that we should attempt to raise the levels of performance of all schools throughout Virginia and to do so for one good reason: the world is changing, it is a world of accelerated change where technology and other factors are creating a different world than we have known in the past. Accordingly, a premium is being placed on education as never before and unless our society is educated for those challenges, we simply won't be competitive in the world market places in the future. So my goal was to try to create a better level of education in all Virginia schools and to raise the performance to where it could be said by the end of the decade of the 90's that Virginia is in the top ten school systems in the country. So when the Commission was created, I wanted to emphasize action, I wanted them to develop a plan, a program, a series of recommendations which, if implemented, could produce that quality educational system that we all agree we
need. So that was basically the purpose in the creation of the Commission.

Question 2. What selection process did you use to choose the individual members for the Commission?

I felt it was necessary to include the entire membership of the State Board of Education and I added to the Board some key individuals across the state who had backgrounds in education, had perspectives from the corporate higher education sectors, and individuals who not only had the interest of education at heart, but were in the position to devote the time necessary to generate the recommendations within the time constraints that I placed on the Commission. I knew the members fairly well, I knew what their capabilities were, and appreciated their level of commitment. So, I think that’s the response to your second question.

Question 3. What were your expectations from the Commission?

I think I have covered your third question. ... I wanted a set of recommendations that would put Virginia into the top ranks of the school systems in this country. I think that's about as simple and direct as I can respond to that question.

Question 4. Were you pleased/satisfied with their work and their thirty-six recommendations?

The answer is very easy. Yes.

Question 5. What factors did you see affecting the Commission as they were accomplishing their work?

I don't know how to respond to that. My charge, I think I've explained. I did not try to micromanage their study. I did not participate in their deliberations. I made inquiries from time to time about the status of their efforts, about the deadline for filing the recommendations. But I think the factors could really be best explained by the Commission Members. I think I did explain the context in which I established the Commission. And I might also refer you to this so-called Pencil Book which summarizes the work of the Commission, surveys the progress and the accomplishments, especially during the past four years, and then spells out the agenda
for the 1990's based upon the recommendations of the Commission.

But it basically says what I think is required of us in this decade and it's based upon the recommendations of the Commission. And I might refer you to this book again, because questions six and seven would be answered by the material in this book.

Question 6. In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission?

I think the record will reflect that thirty-four of those recommendations have either been accomplished or in the process of accomplishment. The number may be slightly higher now, thirty-five or thirty-six. But I think this publication, which was put together for the White House Summit on Education in Charlottesville last September is based on our recommendations of that Commission and surveys the progress that's been made in the foreign languages, geography, science, mathematics, writing scores, history achievements, etc. And then points out the kind of structural and curriculum changes that we think will be further required during the 1990's.

Question 7. Do you believe that the Commonwealth of Virginia has risen in it's ranking nationally in public education since the issuance of the Commission's Report?

(Governor Baliles did not respond further to Question 7, other than his response to Question 5).

Question 8. Where would you rank Virginia nationally in its public education programs in 1986, and today?

I don't know that I have the basis for that evaluation. I know that in terms of teachers' salaries, Virginia jumped in the decade from the mid thirties to the low twenties. When I left, the gap between teacher salaries in Virginia, average teacher salaries, versus the national average was less than two percent, less than $600.00. I think the educational progress though, represents an even bigger jump, for example; in foreign languages, and just take foreign languages alone, Virginia is now first in the country in the percentage of students taking foreign languages. That was not true a
decade ago. It was not true five years ago. So, I think the emphasis that was placed on the importance of languages and geography and the study of other customs and cultures was understood, appreciated, and adopted by the educational system in Virginia and I think that's all to the good. I think an increasing emphasis on science and mathematics will reveal a similar increase in our ranking and in our reputation over the next three to four years. But in terms of achieving our goal, it is still the same — of having Virginia (recognized as) one of the best school systems in the nation. But the point that is important to remember is that we have to judge ourselves, not just by national standards, but by international competition. It is not enough for us to focus on raising the percentages of students taking science and mathematics or languages and geography for the purpose of determining national ranking. Our competition increasingly is global in nature and we have to recognize that other school systems and other countries are placing far greater attention on these subjects, are giving more time and resources than we are. And we simply have to improve the educational system in this country as well as in Virginia.

Question 9. Would you like to offer any other comments concerning the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education, or in general about public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia?

... and again, I suppose those comments would be reflected in this publication that we prepared for the White House Summit. I was very pleased with this report because I think it accurately and concisely summarized the work of the Commission and the emphasis that our administration gave to education. And I might add that the other Governors quickly snapped up copies of this as did White House Staff Members for the purpose of preparing similar reports in order to evaluate their own educational system.

I think when you take the report of the Commission in '86 and the progress report ... (Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education, Report Card, October, 1989.), plus the so-called Pencil Book, that'll give a pretty good summary of the work of the Commission. The importance that we gave it in funding and the special attention during the last four years.
(Continuing the conversation, Governor Robb's Commission on Virginia's Future came up. I mentioned that some of the same people had served on both Commissions including Mr. Lemmon, his Chairman).

Which was not lost on me at the time that I asked him to serve on the Commission. He represented continuity.

(I named the five members who served both Commissions: Mr. Willard L. Lemmon, Mr. John P. Fishwick, Mrs. Joan S. Jones, Mrs. Lois B. Rochester, and Senator Hunter B. Andrews).

Well in that case, I wanted Joan Jones on because she was also a member of the State Council of Higher Education and understood the legislative process.

I wanted recommendations that were realistic as well as idealistic. Programs without plans for implementation are likely to collect dust on a shelf. My goal was to take those recommendations and to find a way to work them into the budget process for education. I think you will find when you count them up that almost all of those recommendations were implemented or in the process of being implemented when I left office. That was the goal, was to develop an action plan. I think the results will be realized over time. The importance of early childhood education cannot be overestimated but the results won't be seen for some period of time. But that's the view we have to take. We have to take a long term view with respect to these investments in education. We can build a road in four or five years, we can construct a power plant in ten years, but the process of educating a child takes longer. We have to recognize the importance of planning, strategic planning, for education. And the purpose of the plan, The Commission's Report, was to develop an action plan that could begin the process of implementation so that we would realize those benefits as soon as possible over that period of ten to twelve years.

Not all the recommendations were novel or exotic. But they did represent some of the best
thinking that was lying out there in the educational community, corporate community. What I wanted, as I think I remember telling them at the time that I created the Commission was: I'm not interested in any more studies, what I'm interested in is action. Give me a plan that I can begin to implement, and I think that's what they did (Interview; April 4, 1990).

The Pencil Book Governor Baliles referred to in his answer to questions five and six was divided into two sections: section one reported the progress of Virginia’s schools in the 1980's; and section two gave the agenda for Virginia’s schools for the 1990’s. This particular book was published in two forms. The book taken to the White House Summit held in Charlottesville in 1989, the Governor referred to was a small 4 x 8 inch book with a finished cover bearing the picture of a pencil with Virginia Public Schools written on the pencil. This version of the book is referred to as the Pencil Book. The second form of this book is a publication entitled Virginia’s Public Schools: Progress and a New Agenda. Gerald L. Baliles, Governor of Virginia. Both books contained the same material.

The summary for the 80’s included the following:

1. After almost a decade of steady progress, Virginia’s students now take more courses in tougher subjects such as mathematics, science, and foreign languages.

2. Virginia’s students consistently lead the southeastern region and achieve above the national averages in every subject tested.

3. Virginia’s students lead the nation in the proportion of high school students who take foreign languages. Virginia is also a leader in a renewed emphasis on teaching geography.
4. Virginia has significantly increased funding for, and services to, students with special learning needs. State level assistance, monitoring, and dissemination of information to parents have all been expanded.

5. Vocational education has become a cooperative effort between the schools and the community colleges. Formal agreements allow students to move from high school to college without unnecessary duplication, and "2 + 2" programs have been developed to prepare highly skilled workers.

6. Students in Virginia now have extensive choices. They can earn college credit while attending high school. They can take exams to qualify for advanced placement in college. In a majority of Virginia's school divisions, students can go to the school of their choice. State funding follows students to the school division they attend. Almost all school divisions admit students from other divisions, and many do not charge tuition for local costs.

7. Magnet schools providing enriched and more demanding academic and fine and applied programs have been established throughout the state. State-sponsored magnet schools serve almost 6,000 students every year.

8. More Virginia students are taking a rigorous academic program and the percentage of Virginia's high school graduates taking the SAT is among the highest in the United States.

9. Virginia’s SAT score, which ranks 37th nationally in absolute terms, is among the top 20 in the nation after it is adjusted for the very high proportion of students in Virginia who take the tests.

10. While the number of Virginia's students taking the SAT’s increased dramatically during the 1980’s, their average score also improved.

11. The percentage of Virginia’s high school graduates who plan to go on to college or another form of post-secondary education has increased from 60 percent to 70 percent since 1982.

12. Virginia's rank in teacher salaries has risen
from 34th to 22nd among the states, and is now within two percent of the national average (Virginia's Public Schools: Progress and a New Agenda, Gerald L. Baliles, Governor of Virginia; pp. 17, 18).

Nine goals were listed for Virginia's students in the 1990's:

1. Provide early childhood development programs to all "at-risk" children so that all children will be prepared to begin school.

2. Improve student achievement in all subjects and grades, which now exceeds national averages, to levels that equal or exceed the 60th percentile, and to equal or exceed those of other countries.

3. Require that every high school provide advanced placement courses for college credit and, where practical, dual enrollment in college courses.

4. Decrease the school dropout rate by one-half, with the result that nine out of ten students who begin high school receive a diploma.

5. Increase high school graduation requirements to establish a standard of academic excellence for all students by allowing students to choose between only two choices: an advanced academic studies diploma with 24 prescribed course requirements, or the applied (vocational) academic diploma with 24 prescribed course requirements. This would increase the percentage of students who complete a vocational program or an advanced academic studies program from the current 64 percent to 100 percent.

6. Increase the percentage of students taking algebra or applied algebra in grades 8-12 from the current 29 percent to 100 percent.

7. Increase the percentage of high school students taking at least three years of science or applied science from the current rate of about 50 percent to 100 percent.

8. Provide, using satellite transmission where appropriate, all Virginia students with the full range of courses to meet their needs and reach
their potential.

9. Extend to every qualified Virginia student the opportunity to enroll in an enriched full-time or summer magnet school program (p. 20).

The Pencil Book ended with a quote from Governor Baliles:

As our nation was founded, Virginians resolved to make education the first, best hope of collective progress and individual prosperity. Now, in this decade, we have renewed that commitment and made education our first, best means to reach the 21st century. And, though we have seen good results for our efforts, we know there's far more to be done. I, for one, believe we can do it (p. 59).

Perceptions of the Commission's Report Held by the Department of Education

This study was not designed to include the perception of the Commission's Report held by the State Department of Education, however, there have been at least two "Report Cards" issued by this department since the release of the report indicating the progress made on the thirty-six recommendations. One was published in June, 1988, the other was October, 1989. Both were entitled Report Card: The Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education. A copy/overview of these two reports can be found in Appendix F.

The June, 1988 Report Card indicated that a lot of progress had been made on the recommendations. Of the thirty-six, sixteen had been completed or were continuing; numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22, 28, 29.
and 36. Eleven were scheduled for the 1988-90 biennium; numbers 10, 11, 12, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, and 33.
The Department of Education had drafted plans for three recommendations which required public hearings, then State Board action before possible implementation. These three were: 16, 17, and 19. Three recommendations had resolutions prepared by the Department of Education and sent to the General Assembly asking for legislative action. These three were: 31, 34, and 35. Recommendation number 21 had been referred to the State Council of Higher Education for action. Recommendation number 20 had been referred to the University of Virginia for study, and recommendation number 1 had been referred to the General Assembly with a joint subcommittee studying the "four-year-old issue" (pp. 1-6).

According to the 1989 Report Card, twenty-three recommendations had been completed/continuing; eleven were underway; and two were not implemented. Those that had been completed/continuing were numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 35, and 36. Those underway were numbers 1, 16, 17, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Those that were not implemented were numbers 20 and 21. This Report Card also contained a comparison of the thirty-six recommendations to the seven goals set by the governors at the President's Education Summit with Governors at the University of Virginia on September 27-28, 1989. Fourteen of the Commission's
recommendations, according to the Report Card, compared favorably to the goals (p. 1).

The education goals set by the governors were:

1. Ensuring that all children have the health and preschool help to start kindergarten on an equal basis.

2. Improving the performance of students on international achievement tests, especially in mathematics and science.

3. Reducing the drop-out rate while improving the academic performance of at-risk students.

4. Providing more adult education to reduce the illiteracy rate.

5. Upgrading job training to guarantee a competitive work force.

6. Increasing the supply of teachers and up-to-date technology in the classroom.

7. Establishing safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools ("Education Goals", Richmond Times Dispatch, September 29, 1989; 8).

The recommendations reported to have a favorable comparison to these goals were numbers 1, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, and 33. Again, a copy of this Report Card can be found in Appendix F.
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CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In considering educational reform, it is necessary to keep in mind that those changes that take place in the classroom have the greatest potential for raising student achievement. While changes by State reform movements which require more courses, more tests, or more time spent in school or on a particular subject, may have the potential for raising student achievement, it is important to remember that what takes place between the teacher and the student determines the quality of education and the level of achievement. According to John Goodlad, in A Place Called School, the individual school is the unit to bring about improvements in education.

Marsha Levine and Denis Doyle, in their book Investing in Our Children point out that the role of the state in public education is to provide "top-down" guidance and support to the local schools. The state should set clear goals and high standards and develop precise measurements to be used in determining whether the goals and standards are being met. However, the local schools should be given "maximum freedom" to develop and implement the methods to be used to best achieve those goals. In other
words, school effectiveness is associated with strong local control.

Virginia historically has been viewed as a state in which there was substantial state direction and centralized control. The Governor appointing the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board approving the local superintendents, the local governing boards appointing local school boards, the state mandating Standards of Quality and the state's constitution language, all add to the proposition that the structure of public education in Virginia is centralized.

The past three governors; Robb, Baliles, and now Wilder, have added a new dimension to the governance of public education in Virginia by the use of commissions. Each governor, early in his tenure established a commission to study education in the state and bring him recommendations on how to reform it or to make it better.

The present study was designed to look at the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education established by Governor Gerald L. Baliles in March, 1986. Specifically, this study was designed to determine how and why the thirty-six recommendations were made by the Commission in it's report entitled *Excellence in Education: A Plan For Virginia's Future*, submitted to the Governor in October, 1986. Those key actors or decision makers and those key factors that were most influential in developing the
thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission were to be identified. A third purpose of this study was to determine whether the impact of the Commission’s Report had met or exceeded the expectations of those responsible for the report.

The first step in this investigation was to obtain copies of the minutes from each of the Commission’s meetings. Through a member of the State Department of Education, and an assigned staff member to the Commission on Excellence in Education, Dr. M. Kenneth Magill, copies of the minutes, names, addresses, and phone numbers of the members of the Commission and names of the assigned State Department of Education staff members were obtained. A thorough study of these minutes revealed where and when the Commission met, how the Commission organized itself to conduct its work, who attended the meetings, and the topics discussed at each meeting.

The second step in the research process was to determine the procedures to use in gathering and interpreting the data. After discussing the research with the dissertation committee, interviewing "key actors" and document analysis were identified as appropriate procedures.

Interviews with the Governor, each Commission Member, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, staff members of the Department of Education assigned to assist
the Commission, and other identified "key actors" were to be conducted. In conducting these interviews, it was soon determined that the other "key actors" included the Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Virginia, Dr. Donald J. Finley and the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. E. B. Howerton. Both these individuals had attended and played an active role in many of the Commission's meetings.

The final step in this study was to analyze, interpret, and report the data. The research methodology used by Ralph B. Kimbrough, Michael Y. Nunnery, Michael W. Kirst, and others, indicated that interviewing individuals who occupy positions of power has been validated as an acceptable sociometric technique in research for designating individuals as key actors in decision-making decisions. The data were also analyzed by using triangulation for verification. Interview responses were checked against the minutes of each meeting, against responses from other interviews, against newspaper articles accounting for Commission meetings, and against the final report of the Commission.

Findings

In answer to the question why the Commission was formed, it is important to look at the reason given by Governor Baliles for establishing the commission. In his
interview, Governor Baliles stated that he believed Virginia's public schools had made a lot of progress in the 1980's. Teachers salaries had increased, test scores had risen, and a greater number of students were taking courses in foreign languages and geography, however:

... the fact remained that not all of the schools were making the same kind of progress, nor were they pursuing some of the programs of innovation that could be found in other areas of the state. My feeling was that we should attempt to raise the levels of performance of all schools throughout Virginia.... And the purpose of the plan, the Commission's Report, was to develop an action plan that could begin the process of implementation so that we would realize those benefits as soon as possible over that period of 10 to 12 years (Interview; April 4, 1990).

Not all schools were making the progress expected, therefore, may be listed as one response to the question, why.

The Commission's Report echoes the governor's reason as to why the Commission was formed in its introduction:

There is disturbing evidence that Virginia is falling short of its constitutional mandate, that many Virginians will have difficulty competing in the national and international marketplace, and that Virginia's educational system is presently not among the best and cannot be so when many of our schools lag so far behind our good schools and even further behind our best ones (Report of the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education, Excellence in Education: A Plan for Virginia's Future, October, 1986; 5).
The inequality of programs among Virginia’s public schools, therefore, became the stated reason as to why the Commission was appointed.

How the Commission made the thirty-six recommendations in their report may be summarized by reviewing Chapter 3 of this study. On March 26, 1986, the Commission met for the first time. At this meeting the Commission Members were sworn in by Governor Baliles and organized themselves for the task at hand. At this meeting selected staff members from the State Department of Education were chosen by the Commission to serve as their assistants. An "Indicators Committee" was formed to develop a "Plan of Action" for the Commission. Materials that had been prepared by the staff members from the Department of Education were given to each Commission member to study and use as a reference.

The "Indicators Committee" met on April 16, 1986 and developed a plan which was adopted by the full Commission at its second meeting on April 22, 1986.

The Commission divided into four committees, each taking a list of topics to be discussed. Topics came from staff members from the Department of Education and from responses Commission Members gave to a "pop quiz" given by the Department staff at the meeting on March 26. May 28, 1986, was chosen as the date to hold four public meetings across the state. Meeting dates were established for each
committee and staff members were assigned to each committee. Staff members were responsible for keeping minutes and for obtaining "experts" to attend committee meetings to speak on topics chosen for that meeting. These "experts" were chosen by committee members, as well as, staff members. The full Commission set its meetings to hear committee reports on June 24-25, July 30-31, September 5, and September 24-25; the finished report was due to the Governor in October, 1986.

How the recommendations were made, for the most part, took place in the committee meetings. It was in these meetings that most discussions took place. The topics selected to be considered, or not considered; who was to appear at the meetings; where the meetings were to be held; the amount of time given to each topic; and how the committee's report to the Commission was to be made, which eventually determined the Commission's Report itself; happened in the committee meetings.

Key actors appearing before these committees were identified in Chapter 4 of this study. It is important to note the impact these actors had on the recommendations. For example, the teacher panel consisting of five teachers was identified by four persons interviewed as having an impact on nine recommendations: Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton said this panel was to be credited for recommendation number 19; Dr. Roberts included numbers 11 through number
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17; and Mrs. Jones, who served on the Teachers and Teaching Committee hearing the teacher panel stated it was responsible for numbers 10, 17, and 18. The teacher panel was selected to appear before the Teachers and Teaching Committee by the staff member of the Department of Education serving that committee.

Ms. Toni Stone, the Founder and Director of "Playing to Win" from New York, spoke about the use of computers with potential school dropouts to the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee on June 18, 1986. Five persons interviewed gave Ms. Stone credit for originating three of the Commission's recommendations: number 24 was attributed to her by Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, Dr. Rubin, Mr. Burkholder, and Mrs. Lewis; Numbers 27 and 29 were credited to Ms. Stone by Dr. Rubin. Ms. Stone's appearance before the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee was requested by Mrs. Lewis.

The book entitled Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools, by Denis Doyle and Marsha Levine which summarizes the Perry Preschool Program in Ypsilanti, Michigan was also given credit for originating two of the recommendations. Denis Doyle spoke to the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee on May 7, 1986. Six persons interviewed stated that two recommendations resulted from this source: recommendation number 1 was identified by Dr. Davis, Dr. Shingleton, Dr. Roberts,
Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mr. White, and Mr. Lemmon. Number 27 was identified by Dr. Shingleton. Mr. White requested that Mr. Brad Butler appear before the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee to discuss the Ypsilanti study, however, Mr. Butler was unavailable, and Denis Doyle was chosen to speak.

College Deans were also given credit for four of the recommendations presented to Governor Baliles. A combination of two Deans appearing to speak and a "reported empathy" of the Deans toward their college's teacher preparation programs was given credit for the Teachers and Teaching Committee developing four recommendations: numbers 10, 20, and 21 as stated by Mrs. Marston (Lampe); and number 12 reported by Mrs. Jones.

The fact that five of the Commission Members had served on Governor Robb's Commission on Virginia's Future also impacted the Commission on Excellence in Education. In fact, the report of Robb's Commission was stated as the origin of three recommendations by two persons interviewed: Mrs. Rochester stated that recommendation number 1 had its origin there; Dr. Finley stated numbers 1, 11, and 23 originated in the Robb report. A brief comparison of Robb's Commission Report to that of the Commission on Excellence in Education revealed even more similarities. Examples included:

1. The charge Governor Baliles gave to his Commis-
sion: "Virginia should rank among the top ten states in the quality of education it offers", was Goal number 1 of the Robb report.

2. Goal number 2 of the Robb report: "Virginia should increase spending on education to a level commensurate with its fiscal capacity", and "Efforts to equalize opportunity in higher education should continue", was compared to Recommendations: 36, 6, and 15. Number 36 would require the recommendations made by the Baliles' Commission to become part of the Standards of Quality; number 6 and 15 required the state to increase funding in support of college programs for minorities, and to provide forgivable loans for teacher candidates. Other than the references of these recommendations and references to the restructuring of teacher education programs within state colleges and universities, the Baliles' Commission did not address higher education in its report.


4. Goals 4 b. and 4 c. of the Robb report dealt with teacher training and professional growth, as did recommendations 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, and 21 of the Baliles' report.

5. Goal 5 of the Robb report which required every student to become functionally literate before completing the elementary grades, with state funding provided sufficient to accomplish this; were compared to recommendation number 2; the literacy passport test; and numbers 3 and 4; which required the state to support funding for remediation and summer school programs.

6. Goal 6 of the Robb report: "Demographic and economic changes will require greater emphasis on early childhood and adult education", was compared to recommendation number 1 of the Baliles' report requiring a four-year-old program.

7. Goal 7 of the Robb report dealt with technology being provided for Virginia's schools, as did numbers 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the Baliles' report.
8. Goal 8 of the Robb report: "The governance of public education at all levels should be reexamined and reshaped", was compared to recommendations 31 and 34, which asked the Governor and the General Assembly to redefine the duties and responsibilities of educational leaders throughout the state, and revise the statute giving the Board of Education the authority to consolidate school divisions, of the Baliles report (Report of the Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future, Vol. I, Toward a New Dominion: Choices for Virginians, December, 1984; 1-19, and Report of the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education, Excellence in Education: A Plan for Virginia's Future, October, 1986; 1-19).

While many similarities existed between these two Commission reports, each had its own focus and/or purpose. Governor Robb's Commission focused on higher education, adult education and early childhood education in addition to public schools; whereas the Baliles Commission focused on the public schools, K-12.

Another approach in determining how the recommendations were made was to review those presented by the individual committees. Committee minutes reflected the following recommendations were made to the full Commission:

1. The Teachers and Teaching Committee made fourteen recommendations: numbers 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 30, and 35. Of the fourteen recommendations made by this committee: seven dealt with teacher preparation, numbers 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, and 21. Two recommendations dealt with teacher salaries, numbers 13 and 14. Two dealt with the training and evaluation of principals, numbers 16 and 17. One recommendation addressed assistance for teachers number 18. One recommended training for school board members and division superintendents, number 30. Number 35 addressed the continuing contract law relating to school teachers and administrators.
2. The Student Preparation and Achievement Committee made twelve recommendations to the Commission: numbers 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 18, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 32. Recommendations 1 and 8 dealt with providing programs for four-year-old children and special schools for gifted students. Numbers 3, 4, and 7 dealt with remediation for students and smaller classes for English and first grade teachers. Recommendation number 18, which was also made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee, required teacher assistance in the form of aides, volunteers, technology and part-time instructors. Numbers 23, 24, and 27 were technology recommendations requiring microcomputers for middle school teachers, an expansion of the electronic classroom to all schools, and a means through the V.P.S.A. of providing this equipment for the school. Recommendation number 29 required programs to be established in the middle schools for potential dropouts. Number 32, which seemed to be uncharacteristic of other recommendations made by this committee, required that outstanding and deficient schools be identified.

3. The Funding and Equal Access Committee made fifteen recommendations to the Commission: numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 26, 28, 34, and 36. Recommendations 1, 5, 6, and 8 required programs for four-year-old and minority children and special nonresidential schools for gifted students. (Note: recommendations 1, 3, and 8 were also made by the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee). Recommendation number 2, made by Mr. Fishwick, a member of this committee, required literacy tests for children in sixth grade. Number 3, also made by the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, required remediation for students scoring in the bottom fourth on standardized tests. Recommendation 9 required greater cooperation among the agencies dealing with special education students. Recommendations 14, and 15, also made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee, required funding for forgivable loans for teacher candidates and more funds for divisions to keep good teachers. Recommendations 22, 23, and 26 dealt with technology. Numbers 23 and 26 were also made by the Student
Preparation and Achievement Committee. Number 22 required the employment of an Assistant Superintendent for Technology at the State Department level. Recommendation 28 required the state to set a goal to require divisions to bring their dropout rate to the state's level and that the state's present dropout level be reduced by one half. Recommendation 34 asked the General Assembly to revise the statute giving the Board of Education the authority to consolidate school divisions. Recommendation 36 required, where appropriate, for the Commission's recommendations to be included in the Standards of Quality.

4. The Structure and Organization Committee made eight recommendations to the Commission: numbers 1, 19, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Recommendation number 1 was made by three of the four committees and was explained above. Recommendation number 19 was also made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee which changes the teacher recertification plan to a point system. Recommendation number 25 required the Department of Education to establish an electronic communications network with school divisions. Recommendation number 30 was also made by the Teachers and Teaching Committee. Recommendation number 31 asked the Governor and General Assembly to redefine the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and local school boards, superintendents, and principals. Recommendation number 32 was also made by the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee. Recommendation number 33 required the state to provide funding to outstanding and deficient schools as identified by the requirements set forth in recommendation number 32. Recommendation number 34 asked the General Assembly to revise the statute to give the Board of Education authority to consolidate school divisions that fail to meet the Standards of Quality.

Each of the thirty-six recommendations were found in the committee reports to the Commission. Although the exact wording may have been different, it was possible to trace the idea or topic to a committee report. An idea may have been introduced in a Commission meeting, for example
the "Barmitzva Test" was introduced at a meeting of the 
full Commission by Mr. Fishwick, yet the idea was picked up 
by the Funding and Equal Access Committee, and became one 
of the recommendations this committee made to the 
Commission on June 24, 1986.

Of the thirty-six recommendations made by the 
Commission, twelve were made by more than one committee:

1. Recommendation 1 was made by three committees: 
   Student Preparation and Achievement, Structure 
   and Organization, and Funding and Equal Access.

2. Recommendations 3, 8, 23, and 26 were made 
   by the Funding and Equal Access and Student 
   Preparation and Achievement Committees.

3. Recommendations 14 and 15 were made by the Fund-
   ing and Equal Access and Teachers and Teaching 
   Committees.

4. Recommendation 18 was made by the Student Prepar-
   ation and Achievement and Teachers and Teaching 
   Committees.

5. Recommendations 19 and 30 were made by the Struc-
   ture and Organization and Teachers and Teaching 
   Committees.

6. Recommendation 32 was made by the Structure and 
   Organization and Student Preparation and Achieve-
   ment Committees.

7. Recommendation 34 was made by the Structure and 
   Organization and Funding and Equal Access Commit-
   tees.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the 
following conclusions were drawn.
1. Governor Gerald L. Baliles was identified as a key actor responsible for the Commission on Excellence in Education's Report.

Candidate Baliles asked the voters of Virginia to make him the state's "education governor". He promised in his campaign literature that he would pick up where Governor Robb left off with improvements in public education. If elected, the mandated ten-percent teacher raises Robb had initiated, would be supported. Elementary guidance counselors would be placed in schools; one position per one thousand elementary students. The State Board of Education would be asked to draft a "blueprint" for public education that would place Virginia "in the first rank of educational systems in this nation", a quote taken from Robb's Commission Report.

In his Inauguration Address, given on January 11, 1986, Governor Baliles referred to education as being "the greatest public endeavor of our term". He promised to fully fund the Standards of Quality for public education. He saw public education as being the key to economic development and international competition, two other goals he placed great emphasis upon during his term in office ("Baliles Sketches a Broad Outline for 'New Dominion' in His Address", Richmond Times Dispatch, January 12, 1986; 14).
Without Governor Baliles, perhaps there would have been no Commission on Excellence in Education. Certainly there would not have been a "blueprint" developed as described by Candidate Baliles in his campaign.

It appeared to be the governor's intent, therefore, to take the Commission’s Report on Virginia’s Future submitted to Governor Robb in December, 1984, (a commission on which Attorney General Gerald Baliles had served as an ex-officio member); establish his own commission made up of former members of Robb’s Commission, (and State Board members); have his commission draft a "blueprint" plan from the Robb Report which would bring Virginia's public schools into the leading national ranks. The Governor stated in his interview that he selected the members of the State Board of Education and "some key individuals" to serve on his Commission. Six of these key individuals had served on the Robb Commission.

It can be pointed out, however, that during the Governor's tenure, funding for the Commission's recommendations took a back seat to the state's transportation system. Only the low cost items found in the Commission's Report such as the employment of the Assistant Superintendent for Technology; the financing of technology through V.P.S.A. loans; and grants for drop-out programs, remediation, summer schools, minority student's support for college, forgivable loans, etc.; were funded. As reported
by the State Department's *Report Cards*, additional funds in the amount of $134,645,292+ was spent on public education during Baliles' tenure in office to pay for those items initiated by the Commission's Report. This was compared to an additional $400,000,000+ spent on the state's public transportation system during this same period of time. One must speculate on the Governor's motivations or intentions once the Commission's Report was received; were they merely political; a reaction to the national reform movement taking place in public education at that time; or just rhetoric? The total funding needed to support the Commission's Recommendations was not available.

2. Dr. S. John Davis, Superintendent of Public Instruction, was identified as the most influential actor in shaping the recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education.

As early as February 7, 1986, Dr. Davis selected personnel from the Department to begin planning for the "Blueprint Commission", which would soon be appointed by Governor Baliles. This staff, referred to as "Blue Ribbon Staff" was chaired by Mr. William J. Burkholder, Deputy Superintendent to Dr. Davis. This group began collecting materials and planning for the Commission's first meeting which took place on March 26, 1986. At this meeting the
"Blue Ribbon Staff" was selected by the Commission Members to serve as assistants. Also, at this meeting the materials were given to the Commission Members to use as resource. The staff took minutes, typed them, and sent them to the members between each meeting. Dr. Davis periodically met with the staff and kept abreast of each committee's work.

Mr. Joseph Roberts, during his interview, put some of these meetings into perspective:

I was involved in some brainstorming sessions that Jack Burkholder led with the staff members. We tried to take all the stuff from the committees and tried to blend it together, and it was really quite a long way from the initial work of the committee to the final product. (A) lot of things happened. I guess more of it was done after the committees ended their work than there was before (Interview; February 27, 1990).

Dr. Davis attended all of the Commission meetings and most of the committee meetings. He also participated in most of the meetings, serving as a resource to the Commission Members whenever questions or specific data was being sought.

Dr. Davis was given credit by persons interviewed for having originated eleven of the thirty-six recommendations, numbers 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 19, 28, 32, 33, and 34. He claimed credit for nine: 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 28, 32, and 33. Exactly how many more recommendations came directly or indirectly from Dr. Davis and/or his staff was impossible to determine. For example, during the interview
with Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton, Dr. Howerton pointed out "Well a lot of these came internally ..." with Dr. Davis agreeing "(Yes), a lot then came from staff members" (Interview; February 27, 1990).

Dr. Davis and his staff prepared the State Department Brochure indicating there were thirty-six recommendations in the Commission's Report. Mrs. Lewis pointed out in her interview that one could easily have chosen one-hundred-two recommendations, yet the Commission was satisfied to let the staff choose the thirty-six. Mr. Fishwick somewhat cynically made his point. The staff is "the educational bureaucracy, ... they let you talk all you want, they basically write the reports and unless they agree with what you say ... it's very hard to get anything accomplished" (Interview; March 20, 1990).

3. Many individual Commission Members, and their four subcommittees were identified as key actors and key factors responsible for the Commission’s Report.

Mrs. Suzanne F. Thomas, Chairman of the Teachers and Teaching Committee, was given credit by nine people interviewed for fourteen of the recommendations: 1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 35. Mrs. Thomas was identified by: Dr. Roberte, Dr. Shingleton, Mr. Dyke, Mr. Burkholder, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Mrs. Lewis,
Senator Spong, Senator Brault, and Dr. Davis. Mrs. Thomas did not claim any recommendation.

Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr., Chairman of the Funding and Equal Access Committee, was given credit for twelve recommendations: 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 32, 33, and 36. Mr. Dyke was identified by ten people interviewed: Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Roberts, Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Rochester, Mrs. Vaughan, Mr. Lemmon, Dr. Davis, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Dr. Howerton, and Senator Spong. Mr. Dyke claimed three recommendations: 5, 6, and 36.

Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe), Member of the Teachers and Teaching Committee, was also given credit for twelve recommendations: 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. However, Mrs. Marston (Lampe) was identified by only one person interviewed: Mr. Dyke. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) claimed recommendation number 8.

Mrs. Frances A. Lewis, Member, Student Preparation and achievement Committee, was given credit for eleven recommendations: 4, 8, 10, 12, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 29. She was identified by five people interviewed: Mr. Dyke, Dr. Howerton, Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Davis, and Mr. Lemmon. Mrs. Lewis claimed credit for the five recommendations on technology: 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Senator Adelard L. Brault, Chairman, Structure and Organization Committee was identified by seven people interviewed for originating eight recommendations: 1, 15,
27, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. He was identified by: Mr. Burkholder, Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Dr. Howerton, Dr. Roberts, Dr. Davis, Dr. Magill, and Mr. Dyke. Senator Brault did not claim any recommendation.

Mr. Willard L. Lemmon, Chairman of the Commission was given credit for originating seven recommendations by four persons interviewed. Recommendations 7, 12, 25, 26, 28, 34, and 35 were identified. Mrs. Marston (Lampe), Dr. Finley, Mr. Burkholder, and Dr. Howerton were the individuals giving credit. Mr. Lemmon did not claim credit for originating a recommendation.

Both Senator William B. Spong and Mr. John P. Fishwick, members of the Funding and Equal Access Committee, were given credit for six recommendations. Senator Spong received credit from Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Mr. Burkholder for number 10. Number 11 was credited by Dr. Davis, Dr. Howerton, and Dr. Finley. 12 was credited by Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton. Dr. Finley gave him credit for number 23. Mrs. Thomas and Mr. DeFord credited 27, and Dr. Roberts, number 35. Senator Spong did not take credit for a recommendation.

Eighteen of the persons interviewed gave Mr. Fishwick credit for recommendation number 2. Mr. Dyke added numbers 23, 24, 25, and 26. Mr. Burkholder, Dr. Finley and Mr. Dyke included number 22. Mr. Fishwick claimed number 2.
Three members of the Commission were credited for five recommendations. Mrs Joan S. Jones, member of the Teachers and Teaching Committee, claimed number 1 and 21. Mr. Burkholder gave her credit for numbers 10 and 12. Drs. Davis and Howerton credited her for number 19; with Mr. Dyke joining them in crediting her for 21.

Mr. Kenneth S. White, Chairman of the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, received credit from Mr. Dyke for number 4 and 24. Mrs. Marston (Lampe) credited him for numbers 22, 35, and number 1. Dr. Davis and Mr. Lemmon also added number 1. Mr. White claimed number 1.

Mrs. Dorothy S. McDiarmid, member of the Student Preparation and Achievement Committee, was credited for four recommendations by Dr. Davis and Dr. Howerton: 13, 14, 15, and 16. Mrs. Jones and Mr. Dyke gave her credit for number 1.

Mrs. Sandra A. Vaughan, member of the Structure and Organization Committee claimed credit for three recommendations: 5, 6, and 30. Dr. Roberts supported her claim for numbers 5 and 6.

The remaining three members of the Commission Mr. T. Justin Moore, Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr., and Senator Stanley C. Walker did not claim or receive credit for any recommendations. (Senator Walker was not interviewed, how-
ever, and he did not attend any meetings with the Commission).

4. Speakers appearing and reports being presented to the committees were also identified as key actors and key factors influencing the thirty-six recommendations.

Ms. Toni Stone, the Teacher Panel, Denis Doyle, College Deans, Secretary Eva Tieg, Dr. Thomas Truitt, Dr. Renfro Manning, Mrs. Mary Futrell, Dr. David Mandel, Dr. Richard Flanary, Dr. David Lepard, Dr. Burnett Joiner, Ms. Pat Storino, Dr. Michael Sullivan, Attorney General Mary Sue Terry, Dr. Frank Barham, Dr. Thomas Shannon, Ms. Joan Murphy, Ms. Norma Szakal, Mrs. Mary Jo Fields, Michael Cohen, Ms. Jill Pope, Mr. Leonard Gereau, and Donald McCready were individuals given credit as key actors in the evolution of the recommendations.

Reports such as Robb’s Commission Report; the Missouri Plan; the Ypsilanti, Michigan Pre-school Program reported in Investing in Our Children; the Accreditation Standards for Virginia’s Schools; Project Discovery; the Governor’s Magnet Schools; the Electronic Classroom; the National Commission Report; the Carnegie Forum on Education; the Holmes Consortium; and the CATS Study were identified as key factors in developing the thirty-six recommendations.
5. Dr. Donald J. Finley, Secretary of Education was also identified as a key actor in the development of the recommendations made by the Commission.

Dr. Finley or his Assistant, Dr. Gary Henry, attended most meetings held by the Commission. As Mr. Joseph Roberts stated in his interview:

I think Don Finley was at most of them. Somebody was there. Gary Henry or Don Finley or both, or maybe also (sic) David Temple, the other Deputy was involved too, somewhat ... They kept pretty close touch on what was happening on the Commission. ... Finley was very actively involved in everything about education. In the Department ... he was really quite involved in what was going on. ... He was the most active Education Secretary we've ever had. ... I went to Atlanta with Jack Davis, (and) Jack Burkholder to meet with Mark Musick about writing this thing and Finley was there. And Finley called the shots. He pretty much told Mark Musick what he wanted (Interview; February 27, 1990).

Dr. Finley was very active in public education. This apparently was the intent of Governor Baliles. In his state-of-the-state message, the governor stated that he had directed his Secretary of Education to visit each school division in the state during his tenure; to visit classrooms, attend Board meetings and "carry throughout Virginia our united commitment to a quality educational system from top to bottom" ("Excerpts From the State-of-the-State Message", Richmond Times Dispatch, January 14, 1986; 6).

Mr. Lemmon, in his interview on April 11, 1990, stated:
You know ... the Secretary of Education is really an unusual position. It is statutorily the weakest Secretary that there is. ... you have a Constitutional provision for a Superintendent of Public Instruction; you have a Constitutional provision for a Board of Education; each of them have certain Constitutional duties. ... the General Assembly (could) really set back the Secretary of Education, at least as far as K-12 is concerned. ... The Secretary of Education really is just as strong as the Governor decides to give him (Interview; April 11, 1990).

Mr. Lemmon further gave Dr. Finley credit for assisting in the formation of the Commission:

I guess this is probably part of the genius of the selection of the Commission that the Governor and the Secretary used, it was the two of them, that they did choose the Board to sit in on it, to be part of it, but not all of it, because that did then allow the Board to ... carry on (Interview; April 11, 1990).

In his interview, Dr. Finley took credit for this assistance:

... as soon as he (Governor Baliles) took office, I suggested to him that we take the Education Committee from the 1984 Commission on Virginia's Future. ... and add to it the State Board of Education and let them constitute the Commission (Interview; March 15, 1990).

Dr. S. John Davis, Superintendent of Public Instruction at the time of the Inauguration of Governor Baliles had not, reappointed by the Governor, and was not reappointed until after the Commission on Excellence in Education had been formed. There was some speculation that a power struggle on educational governance existed between Dr. Davis and Dr. Finley in their respective positions.
This "struggle" became a topic at the June 3, meeting of the Structure and Organization Committee. At this meeting Senator Brault asked Dr. Davis if he thought that clarification was needed in the roles of the State Superintendent, State Board, and the Secretary of Education. He also asked Dr. Finley if he felt that "clarification is needed in the constitutional and statutory definitions of the roles of the Board of Education, the State Superintendent, and the Secretary of Education" (Minutes; June 3, 1986).

What eventually became recommendation number 31, until this meeting on June 3, contained the "duties of the Secretary of Education" in it's wording along with the other positions mentioned in the final recommendation.

Dr. Davis' response to Senator Brault was that he did not see the need for clarification, however, he would bring an updated list of superintendent's duties to the next meeting for consideration. Dr. Finley's response was "Not to my mind, it may be more a matter of communication than clarification" (Minutes; June 3, 1986).

Implications

The implication of governance of education through commissions at the state level is, in fact, a topic that deserves a separate study from this one. Commissions have, without question, had an impact on public education in Virginia.
The Baliles report had an immediate impact on programs throughout Virginia's schools. The recommendations' impact, according to Commission Members and Governor Baliles was reported in Chapter 5 of this paper; it's impact according to the State Department's Report Card, dated October, 1989 was:

1. Although recommendation number 1 was recommended by three of the committees and supported by the Commission unanimously, the four-year-old program has yet to begin in the state. This program is presently being studied by a state-level Council with a prediction that by 1995, the 18,000 "at risk" children will begin receiving the benefits of this program.

2. The Literacy Passport Test began its first administration in the 1989-90 school year. Test results were published by the media in the spring of 1990, and were less than impressive. At least thirty-five percent of Virginia's sixth graders failed this test.

3. Remedial education funds budgeted for 1988-89 amounted to $21,100,618 and for 1989-90 the amount was $23,339,760.

4. Funds for summer school for the past two years were: 1988-89; $1,593,505, and 1989-90; $2,957,799.

5 and 6. The Board of Education requested an appropriation of $490,000 to revise the accreditation standards to "improve learning opportunities for disadvantaged students"; $22,000 to assist middle schools in identifying minority students with college potential; and $1,582,650 for Project Discovery that helps low-income and minority students prepare for college.

7. The Board of Education revised the Standards of Quality in the 1988-90 biennium to reduce the pupil teacher ratio for grade 1 and English classes to 24 to 1. The request for the 1990-92 biennium will be for 23 to 1. Total funds requested for the 90-92 biennium was $5,289,100.
8. More than $40.7 million was the recommended budget for gifted education for the 1990-92 biennium. This would support: 5 residential Governor's summer school programs, 20 regional Governor's school programs, and 5 academic year Governor's school programs.

9. The state plan adopted to ensure greater cooperation among the agencies concerned with special education students became an "Interagency Plan for Prevention", which was presented to the Board for consideration prior to the issuance of the Department of Education's Report Card in October 1989. No report of the status of this plan was available.

10 and 11. State colleges and universities' teacher preparation programs now require a degree in an arts and science discipline with limits of 18 semester hours for professional education courses.

12. As stated under 10 and 11 above, in June 1989, the Board of Education approved 37 institutional plans for restructuring teacher preparation programs.

13. As of 1989, the average classroom teacher salary in Virginia was $29,056, which was within two percent of the national average.

14. The Department of Education reported that it had established mentor teacher programs, held recruitment job fairs, produced alternative routes to certification, and established FTA clubs at middle, high school and college levels to implement this recommendation: "the state provide financial incentives to school divisions to help them develop ways to keep effective teachers in the classroom".

15. In the provision of forgivable loans, as of 1989, the Department reported a current funding of $800,000 for 300 nominees.

16. Restructured programs for the certification of principals will become effective in the 1990-91 school year, according to the State Department's Report Card.

17. A greater emphasis on instructional leadership and personnel evaluation was being requested of the local divisions by the Department of Education in response to this recommendation.
18. To provide more aides, volunteers, part-time instructors, and technology, in accordance with this recommendation, the Department reported that an implementation plan had been adopted which would: add a requirement for their use; to study the possibility of doing a projected survey on aides and part-time instructors; and the Department was having sessions at regional meetings for principals and supervisors on the use of these personnel.

19. The State Board of Education revised the recertification regulations to a point system in June, 1989. The new regulation became effective for employees on July 1, 1990.

20. This recommendation requiring a graduate degree for all teachers in Virginia was commissioned as a study to the University of Virginia. The recommendation from this study-group was that the requirement of the graduate degree was not warranted. The requirement was dropped.

21. The recommendation requiring regional graduate professional education centers was assigned to the State Council of Higher Education for implementation.

22. This recommendation was the first to be implemented. The Department hired an Assistant Superintendent for Technology in the spring of 1987. The six-year technology plan for Virginia's schools was adopted by the Board of Education in June, 1989.

23. Electronic classrooms becoming available to all schools was implemented by satellite-receive dishes which were installed in all high schools for the 1989-90 school year.

24. 6,647 microcomputers and 1,501 printers were distributed to middle schools with sixth grades in 1988-89. Software subsidies, teacher training subsidies, and regional Train the Trainer workshops were conducted by the Department.

25. The 1988-90 budget provided funds (unidentified by the Report Card), for equipment and software for 133 school division central offices and schools with the least ability to pay for the communications network. The 1990-92 budget asked for
$6.05 million for this purpose.

26. The 1988-90 Appropriations Act funded $290,065 the first year, and $2,359,795 the second to help school divisions buy technological equipment. $20.77 million was requested for the 1990-92 biennium.

27. Vanguard schools, identified by the Department of Education in 1989, were to serve as examples to other middle schools of the "best practices" in middle grade education. Additional schools will be identified in 1990-91 to assist schools as they go through the restructuring process.

28 and 29. $6.9 million was appropriated by the 1989 General Assembly for grants to 68 school divisions to establish dropout prevention programs. These programs are to start with students in the middle school years.

30. Training programs for school board members and division superintendents are now required in the Standards of Quality. The training for school board members is being provided by the Virginia School Board Association.

31. Price Waterhouse, a consulting firm, was commissioned to do a performance audit and evaluation in response to this recommendation. Their report was due to the Board in November, 1990.

32 and 33. The Educational Performance Recognition Program was developed by the Department of Education in response to this recommendation. This program was organized around seven objectives for schooling. Each objective had six to thirteen indicators of outcomes of schooling. Examples given included: indicators of preparing students for college include: percent of graduates receiving the advanced studies diploma, and the percent of students in the upper quartile of the standardized tests given at grade 11. In preparing students for work, the examples included: the number of students who complete vocational educational programs, and the graduation rate of vocational students.

34. A resolution asking a joint subcommittee of the General Assembly to revise the statute establishing criteria by which the Board of Education may consolidate school divisions that fail to meet the
Standards of Quality, was sent to the Secretary of Education. No decision had been reached as of the printing of the Report Card in October, 1989.

35. A joint subcommittee of the General Assembly did study the present continuing contract law relating to teachers and administrators and recommended no changes be made.

36. Recommendations that have been included in the Standards of Quality are: 2, 3, 4, 7, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 36 (Virginia Department of Education, Report Card, Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education, October, 1989).

Total funds requested for the 1989-90 biennium to support the recommendations of the Commission on Excellence in Education as reported above were $61,836,192. For the 1990-92 biennium the total was $72,809,100. These totals do not reflect teachers' salaries, which were increased (recommendation number 13), nor does it reflect the Assistant Superintendent's salary (number 22), the Price Waterhouse study (number 31), or other incidentals mentioned in the Department's Report Card.

In regards to the question asked by Charles Cox in his article appearing in the Richmond Times Dispatch on January 12, 1987: "Will bold action follow proposals in education?", $134,645,292 + was bold for consequences of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in Education, looking at them from a monetary viewpoint, however, in comparison to the state's additional funding for transportation during this same period, the question should be asked, was it bold enough?
Recommendations

In 1987, the National Conference of State Legislatures asked Dr. Michael W. Kirst, a professor of education at Stanford University, and the Co-director of PACE, a state education policy research group, to do an evaluation of state education policies and evaluate the impact of recent educational reform. Answers to the following questions were to be found: Are the reforms being implemented?, Are they effective in improving teaching and learning?, What are reasonable expectations in upgrading student achievement?, and, How can lawmakers sustain the public's commitment, and their own, for improving education over time? (Kirst, Michael W., Evaluating State Education Reforms: A Special Legislative Report, 1987: 1).

I would suggest that these same questions should be asked and answered of the recent educational reforms in Virginia, specifically the recent changes in programs due to commission reports.

In response to the evaluation, Dr. Kirst pointed out that: "... implementation and assessment of these reforms should be a top priority for educational research and state policymakers" (Kirst; 2). Many of the state initiatives and reforms have not been tried or tested. Dr. Kirst cautioned state legislators that evaluation is of most importance because not all reforms can be expanded state-wide or maintained over a long period of time.
Sustaining the reform movement's momentum, according to Kirst, becomes even more urgent when considering that national enrollments will grow by 2.1 million students by 1990 (p. 3).

Evaluation of these reforms, according to Kirst, should explore the local school district from many different directions. The evaluation should be sequential, starting with whether a program has even attracted the attention of the local authorities, and moving to whether the authorities have implemented or institutionalized the state's intent with the reform. Next, several, diverse school districts should be studied to determine the impact of the reform in each district.

Kirst gave seven different types of evaluation approaches that a legislature might select from in evaluating state education reforms. These types were: performance indicators, studies of the financial impacts of reforms, analysis of cost-effectiveness of various state interventions with the same specific objectives, program evaluation, impact of several state interventions with the same general goal, studies of the cumulative effects of all state reforms in omnibus bills, and research that isolates cause-and-effect relationships (Kirst; 11-18).

To conduct the evaluation, Kirst recommended the use of: the state education agency; a contract with a nongovernment third party, such as local universities or
nonprofit research organizations; a special committee of
the legislature itself; a pilot or demonstration program;
and federal grant money to support surveys and/or site
visits by selected legislators or their designees.

It is ironic, ... that although education has
so much at stake concerning the public's perception
of these state reforms, so few resources are devoted
to assessing their outcomes (Kirst; 4, 19-20).

More and more educational decisions are being made
at the state level as pointed out by Arthur Wise in his
1979 book, Legislated Learning, and by Roald F. Cambell and
Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr. in their book published in 1976, State
Policy Making for the Public Schools. These authors agree
that the trend in today's society is for state governments
to exercise an increasing role in the governance of the
public schools with state reforms becoming more and more
popular. They also agree that the more educational
policies are promulgated from the higher levels of govern-
ment, the more bureaucratic the school will become. As
Arthur Wise put it:

If a policy-making system persistently adheres
to an idea, eventually the operating system will be
forced to conform, and education will change. ... Schools ... can become more efficient and effective. However, the two questions to be asked of every edu-
cational policy are: will it have the intended
effect? and what other effects will it have (Wise; 211-212).

The same questions need to be asked of the thirty-
six recommendations made by the Commission on Excellence in
Education. As of this date no formal evaluation has been
conducted by the state on the programs initiated by the Commission's recommendations. Will the degree in arts and science, instead of education, increase learning in the classroom, for example? Will the establishment of gifted schools, residential or nonresidential, with the results of pulling these students away from their peers, who may be benefiting from their presence, eventually prove to be the mirror of the special education situation witnessed in the 60's and 70's, when it eventually became necessary to enact Public Law 91-142 placing those students back into the public schools? Is it possible for the state's dropout rate to be cut into half without a major change in the high and middle school curricula?, and at what expense? Are all middle schools "wastelands", if so, what research was done to support this statement? If some of Virginia's schools were not making the progress expected, as Governor Baliles stated in his interview, was it necessary to "reform" the entire state's educational system? These are just a few questions that should be added to those Dr. Kirst was asked to research for the National Conference of State Legislators.
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APPENDIX C

LETTER TO COMMISSION MEMBERS
1471 King William Woods Road
Midlothian, Virginia 23113
March 6, 1990

Dear Sir:

I presently am writing a dissertation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University on Governor Baliles' Commission on Excellence in Education Report dated October, 1986.

I am aware that you served as a member on the Commission and would like very much to interview you concerning the report at your earliest convenience. I will call you within a week to establish a time that is convenient for you.

The interview should take no longer than an hour to conduct and your input to this project is vitally important. Information gained in the interview will be used to describe the process by which the recommendations were developed and to provide a retrospective view of the consequences of the recommendations.

A copy of the results will be available to you, upon request, at the completion of my dissertation.

Thank you very much in advance for your anticipated cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Maynard K. Bean
APPENDIX D

FIRST LETTER TO GOVERNOR GERALD L. BALILES
The Honorable
Gerald L. Baliles
Hunton and Williams Law Firm
P. O. Box 1535
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Sir:

I presently am writing a dissertation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University on the Governor's [your] Commission on Excellence in Education Report dated October, 1986. You might remember that I spoke to you about wanting to interview you in the future at the Aide-de-Camp reception on December 5, 1989 at the Governor's Mansion.

The interview should take no longer than an hour to conduct and your input to this project is vitally important. Information gained in the interview will be used to describe the process by which the recommendations were developed and to provide a retrospective view of the consequences of the recommendations. I will call you within a week to establish a time that is convenient for you.

A copy of the results will be available to you, upon request, at the completion of my dissertation.

Thank you very much in advance for your anticipated cooperation and assistance.

Very truly yours,

Maynard K. Bean
APPENDIX E

SECOND LETTER TO GOVERNOR GERALD L. BALILES
Governor Gerald L. Baliles
Hunton and Williams Law Firm
P. O. Box 1535
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Dear Governor Baliles:


To accomplish this, I am interviewing each Commission Member, members of the State Department of Education staff who served the Commission, the Secretary of Education at that time, and hopefully you.

The interview should take no longer than an hour to complete and I have enclosed the questions I will ask in the interview.

Sincerely yours,

Maynard K. Bean

Enclosure
QUESTIONS

1. Why did you appoint the Commission on Excellence in Education?

2. What selection process did you use to choose the individual members for the Commission?

3. What were your expectations from the Commission?

4. Were you pleased/satisfied with their work and their thirty-six recommendations?

5. What Factors did you see affecting the Commission as they were accomplishing their work?

6. In retrospect, what is your opinion of the consequences of the thirty-six recommendations made by the Commission?

7. Do you believe that the Commonwealth of Virginia has risen in it's ranking nationally in public education since the issuance of the Commission's Report?

8. Where would you rank Virginia nationally in its public education programs in 1986, and today?

9. Would you like to offer any other comments concerning the work of the Commission on Excellence in Education, or in general about public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia?
APPENDIX F

REPORT CARDS, JUNE 1988 AND OCTOBER 1989: GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
June 1988

Report Card

The Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education
Report Card
Governor's Commission on
Excellence in Education

June 1988

The Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education recommends...

1. ...that Virginia's school divisions provide voluntary developmental preschool programs for four-year-old children.

   **Status:** Funding methods and delivery options for programs for four-year old children have been developed. Plans are based on a three year phase-in, starting with "at-risk" four-year olds. Study programs in eight school divisions are being evaluated.

   The General Assembly has established a joint subcommittee to study the four-year-old schooling issue. The Department of Education has put plans on hold pending the subcommittee's report.

2. ...that Virginia establish literacy tests in reading, writing, and arithmetic for all students in grade 6.

   **Status:** The testing at grade six occurred on schedule in April. Guidelines for testing special education students are being developed. An additional series of tests is being developed, with a tryout scheduled for October.

   More than $600,000 has been included in the 1988-90 biennium to implement this recommendation.

3. ...that remediation be provided for students scoring in the bottom fourth of standardized tests.

   **Status:** This item has been included in the revised accrediting standards and the Standards of Quality. In addition, remediation guidelines have been developed and distributed to the local school divisions.

   More than $44.3 million is provided for remedial education in the 1988-90 budget.

4. ...that state funding be provided for summer school programs.

   **Status:** The Standards of Quality provide for summer school as part of an overall remedial program. The 1988-90 budget provides $4.75 million in funding for this program.

5. ...that the state support programs to reduce the performance gap between black and white students.

   **Status:** The revised accrediting standards require each school to work to improve the learning and aspirations of culturally disadvantaged students.
6. ...that the state support special
college preparation programs for
minority students.

Status: The revised accreditation standards
require each middle and high school to identify
minority students with college potential.
Special college preparation programs are
required to motivate disadvantaged and
minority students to attend college.

Project Discovery, which has
received a $1.37 million dollar appropriation
from the General Assembly, is a statewide
program that helps low income and minority
students prepare for college.

7. ...that smaller classes be
required in the first grade and in
English classes.

Status: The revised accreditation standards
and the Standards of Quality require teacher-
student ratios of 24:1 in first grade and English
classes. This goal is to be implemented in the
second year of the 1988-90 budget; funds are
to be included in basic aid.

The goal is to reduce ratios to 18:1 in
these classes by the year 2000.

8. ...that the state expand its support
for division and regional
nonresidential special schools and
programs for gifted students.

Status: The Board of Education has been
appropriated $332,000 for special programs for
the gifted. Plans are to create two additional
summer regional programs and to expand the
seven current programs to serve additional
students.

9. ...that the Department of
Education develop a state plan to
ensure greater cooperation
among the agencies concerned
with the welfare and education
of special education students.

Status: The Department of Education is
helping the Interagency Coordinating Council
to develop a plan for the delivery of services to
handicapped children.

In addition, the Department is
involved in several interagency projects
involving the transition of handicapped
students from school to adulthood.

About $1.18 million in funds have
been appropriated to support this recommenda-
tion.

10. ...that an undergraduate degree in
an arts and sciences discipline be
required for all teachers educated
in Virginia.

Status: Colleges and universities have
submitted plans for restructuring teacher
education. These plans require a limit of 18
semester hours of professional study and an
undergraduate degree in the arts or sciences.

Restructured plans will be
implemented statewide by June 30, 1990.

11. ...that Virginia's approved
program standards for prospective
teachers be revised to limit
professional education course
requirements to 18 semester hours.

Status: See # 10 above.
12. ...all colleges and universities review and restructure their programs for educating teachers.

Status: See # 10 above.

13. ...that Virginia have competitive teacher salaries that will attract and keep highly qualified teachers.

Status: A new state law requires that teacher salaries be reviewed every two years to see if the compensation matches other occupations requiring similar education and training. This review will be conducted by the Department of Personnel and Training and the results reported to the Governor, General Assembly, and Board of Education.

State mandates for salary increases have been tied to basic aid funds.

14. ...that the state provide financial incentives to school divisions to help them develop ways to keep effective teachers in the classroom.

Status: Department of Education staff have examined several actions to meet this recommendation, including mentor teachers, recruitment, merit pay/career ladder, and establishment of Future Teachers of America Clubs in high schools and colleges.

State mandates for salary increases have been tied to basic aid funds.

15. ...that the number of forgivable loans for teacher candidates be increased.

Status: The forgivable loan program has added foreign languages and special education to the shortage areas funded. Current funds in the amount of $600,000 will provide loans for at least 300 nominees.

16. ...that more emphasis be placed on leadership in the training of principals.

Status: A plan for accomplishing this recommendation has been drafted. The plan calls for more emphasis on leadership and teacher evaluation in the training of principals.

The plan is to be implemented in two phases. The first phase would address the quality of the 14 programs which currently train principals.

The second phase of the plan would address implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for Principal Preparation and Professional Development.

Responses to the plan will be sought in public hearings. Final Board of Education action will follow the public hearings.

17. ...that school divisions evaluate and compensate principals on the basis of performance.

Status: See # 16 above.

18. ...that more aides, volunteers, part-time instructors, and technology be used to assist teachers.

Status: Requirements for community involvement and volunteers have been added to the revised accreditation standards. The use of technology to assist teachers is addressed in #24 below.
19. ...that individualized recertification plans, based on a point system, be required for each teacher.

**Status:** A point-based recertification program is being developed. The system will provide several options for recertification, including graduate course work. Responses to the plan will be sought in public hearings. Final Board of Education action will follow the public hearings.

20. ...that all teachers should have, or be working toward, graduate degrees.

**Status:** This item has been studied by both the Teacher Education Advisory Board and the General Assembly. These groups have recommended that the Department study the financial impact of graduate degree requirements and if such requirements would result in better teachers.

21. ...that regional graduate professional education centers be established.

**Status:** This recommendation is the responsibility of the State Council of Higher Education in consultation with the Department of Education.

22. ...that the state employ an Assistant State Superintendent for Technology to develop and direct a detailed five-year plan to make educational technology an integral part of public school education.

**Status:** An assistant state superintendent for technology has been hired. The Department of Education is developing a five-year technology plan for implementation in 1988-90 and the following biennium. Funding was received for Phase 1 in the 1988-90 budget.

23. ...that electronic classrooms be available to all schools.

**Status:** Statewide broadcast of the Electronic Classroom will begin in 1988-89. Plans are to begin to provide satellite downlink equipment to each secondary school in 1989-90. Approximately $5 million has been included in the 1988-90 budget to get the electronic classrooms on line.

24. ...that teachers in the middle school grades be provided with microcomputers for the classroom and with instruction in their use.

**Status:** Funds have been included in the 1988-90 budget for microcomputers to enhance and assist instruction in grade six. An additional $818,000 has been provided to train middle school teachers in computers.

25. ...that the Department of Education establish an electronic communications network with school divisions and develop a standardized database.

**Status:** A simple communications network has been operating since March, 1987. This network permits 11 school divisions to communicate electronically. This network also is used to distribute Superintendent's Memos. $1.75 million has been provided in the 1988-90 budget to expand the network to include all school divisions.
26. ...that the Virginia Public School Authority provide loans to help school divisions buy technological equipment.

Status: The 1988-90 budget contains nearly $300,000 in the first year and more than $2 million in the second year from the Literary Fund to subsidize an equipment financing program for local school divisions through the Virginia Public School Authority. An additional $200,000 of funding from the general fund has been secured to administer this program.

27. ...that the Department of Education restructure education in the middle school grades.

Status: A plan for restructuring education in the middle grades has been presented to the Board of Education. Funding of $423,375 is included in the budget for one model middle school in the 1988-90 biennium. A middle school institute for approximately 90 principals, counselors, and teachers is planned for July 1988.

28. ...that Virginia set a goal that no school division shall have a dropout rate higher than the present statewide average, and that the present statewide average be reduced by one-half.

Status: To help local school divisions combat dropouts, the Department of Education has conducted workshops, provided technical assistance, and administered a grant program. The revised accreditation standards and the Standards of Quality contain specific dropout prevention requirements for schools and local school divisions.

29. ...that middle school programs provide assistance to students who are potential dropouts.

Status: The revised accreditation standards require that all schools implement programs, provide counseling, maintain close contact with parents, and take other actions. Local school boards will be required, in the Standards of Quality, to provide programs to reduce the number of students who drop out of school. Approximately $1 million in state funds are being used to prevent school dropouts.

30. ...that training programs be required for school board members and division superintendents.

Status: Plans are underway to establish an academy for school leaders in the Commonwealth. State funds to support academy programs have been included in the Department of Education's 1988-90 Budget Addendum. In addition, the Standards of Quality include a new requirement that superintendents and school board members participate in training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>that the Governor and General Assembly redefine the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and local school boards, superintendents, and principals.</td>
<td>A resolution was prepared and sent to the Secretary of Education requesting a joint subcommittee of the General Assembly to review and make recommendations to revise duties and responsibilities of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, school boards, superintendents, and school principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>that effective schools be identified.</td>
<td>This recommendation has been included in the accreditation standards and Standards of Quality. The Board of Education is expected to adopt criteria for identifying effective schools throughout the Commonwealth. The program is expected to begin in the 1990-91 school year and has received $450,000 in funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>that funds be established to reward outstanding schools and to help deficient schools.</td>
<td>The revised accreditation standards include a program for identifying outstanding and deficient schools. However, the program will not begin before the 1990-91 school year; therefore, no funds are included in the 1988-90 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>that the General Assembly revise the statute establishing criteria by which the Board of Education may consolidate school divisions that fail to meet the Standards of Quality.</td>
<td>A resolution was prepared and sent to the Secretary of Education requesting a joint subcommittee of the General Assembly to study this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>that the present continuing contract law relating to schoolteachers and administrators be reviewed by the General Assembly.</td>
<td>A 1987 General Assembly Joint Resolution established a subcommittee to study the continuing contract laws for teachers. Additional meetings were scheduled prior to the 1988 session of the General Assembly, but no legislation was introduced as a result of these meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>that where appropriate, these recommendations be included as part of the Standards of Quality.</td>
<td>The following recommendations have been included in the proposed Standards of Quality: 2, 3, 4, 7, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 36.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education

October 17, 1989

## Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Completed/Continuing</th>
<th>Under Way</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Summit Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preschool Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Literacy Testing Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summer School Remediation Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State Funding for Summer School Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support to Reduce Performance Gap between Black and White Students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. College Preparation Programs for Minority Students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smaller Classes in Grade 1 and English</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nonresidential Special Schools and Gifted Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interagency Cooperation for Special Education Students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Degree in Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 18 Semester Hours in Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Restructuring Teacher Education Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Competitive Teacher Salaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Incentives to Keep Effective Teachers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Increase Number of Forgivable Loans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Leadership Training for Principals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Performance-Based Compensation for Principals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Use of Aides, Volunteers, and Part-time Instructors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Individual Recertification Plans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Graduate Degrees for Teachers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Establish Regional Graduate Education Centers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Employ an Assistant Superintendent for Technology and Develop Six-Year Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Electronic Classrooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Microcomputers in Middle Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Establish Communications Network</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. VPSA Loans</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Restructure Middle Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Decrease Dropout Rate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Middle Schools Assist Potential Dropouts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Training for School Board Members and Division Superintendents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Redefine Duties</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Identify Effective Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Establish Funds to Reward and Help Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Consolidation of School Divisions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Review of Continuing Contract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Include Recommendations in SOQ and SOQ Funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 23
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APPENDIX G

TABLE 1

WHO OR WHAT WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR EACH OF THE THIRTY-SIX RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION AS IDENTIFIED BY THOSE PERSONS INTERVIEWED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 1</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 2</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 3</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 4</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 5</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 6</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 7</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 8</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SANDRA A. VAUGHAN</td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE &amp; I, SANDRA VAUGHAN</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE &amp; I, SANDRA VAUGHAN</td>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. T. JUSTIN MOORE, JR.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. DOROTHY S. McDIARMID</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN FISHWICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLARD L. LEMMON</td>
<td>KENNETH WHITE &amp; PERRY PRESCHOOL PROGRAM</td>
<td>JOHN FISHWICK</td>
<td>I, BILL LEMMON, FOR ONE</td>
<td>I, BILL LEMMON, FOR ONE</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEARINGS &amp; AGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ROBERT H. DEFORD, JR.</td>
<td>TESTIMONY: KIDS WITH A VOCABULARY OF 75 WORDS OR LESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN FISHWICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SANDRA A. VAUGHAN</td>
<td>I VOTED AGAINST IT!</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I VOTED AGAINST IT!</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I VOTED AGAINST IT!</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES DYKE AND I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. T. JUSTIN MOORE, JR.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. DOROTHY S. MCDIARMID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLARD L. LEMMON</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ROBERT H. DEFORD, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Cont'd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SANDRA A. VAUGHAN</td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. T. JUSTIN MOORE, JR.</td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. DOROTHY S. MCDIARMID</td>
<td>I SUPPORTED THIS ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLARD L. LEMMON</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ROBERT H. DEFORD, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SANDRA</td>
<td>I, SANDRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. VAUGHAN</td>
<td>VAUGHAN,</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOWEVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.S.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. T.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIN</td>
<td>&amp; ORGANIZ-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, JR.</td>
<td>ATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; JACK DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. DOROTHY S.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHANNID</td>
<td>&amp; ORGANIZ-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLARD L.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMMON</td>
<td>&amp; ORGANIZ-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ROBERT H.</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPORD, JR.</td>
<td>&amp; ORGANIZ-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Cont'd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lois S. Rubin</td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph Roberts</td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>James Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Donald Finley</td>
<td>Governor Robb's Future Commission</td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr.</td>
<td>Lois Rochester &amp; Dorothy McDermid</td>
<td>Frances Lewis &amp; Kenneth White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Frances Lewis</td>
<td>Three of the Four Committees</td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Joan S. Jones</td>
<td>Dorothy McDermid &amp; I, Joan Jones</td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From testimony that the gap was widening
State's writing requirement & attention to 1st gr.
Governor's Magnet Schools
Testimony: Division Superintendents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR. LOIS S. RUBIN</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOSEPH ROBERTS</td>
<td>GOVERNOR ROBB'S FUTURE COMMISSION &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. DONALD FINLEY</td>
<td>J ACK DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JAMES W. DYKE, JR.</td>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS &amp; MARGARET MARSTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. FRANCES LEWIS</td>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. JOAN S. JONES</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE: TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE: COLLEGE DEAN'S EMPATHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION VISITED THE U.V.A. CENTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESTIMONY &amp; COMPROMISE ON PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Interviewed</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lois S. Rubin</td>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Preparation &amp; Achievement Committee &amp; Toni Stone</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Preparation &amp; Achievement Committee &amp; Toni Stone</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph Roberts</td>
<td>Structure &amp; Organization Committee</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Dyke</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Dyke</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure &amp; Organization Committee</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Donald Finley</td>
<td>Jack Davis</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor Robb's Futures Commission</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Spong</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Anderson</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Research</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Research</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James W. Dyke, Jr.</td>
<td>Suzanne Thomas &amp; Margaret Marston</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suzanne Thomas &amp; Margaret Marston</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fishwick</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. Frances Lewis</td>
<td>I, Frances Lewis</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I, Frances Lewis</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I, Frances Lewis</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I, Frances Lewis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. Joan S. Jones</td>
<td>Testimony &amp; Other States Are Doing This</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testimony: Parallel Commonwealth Centers in Higher Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testimony: Parallel Commonwealth Centers in Higher Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Reduce Disparity &amp; Provide Better Instruction</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testimony: Parents, Teachers, &amp; School Divisions</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. LOIS S. RUBIN</td>
<td>STUDENT PREPARATION &amp; ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE &amp; TONI STONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOSEPH ROBERTS</td>
<td>FUNDING &amp; EQUAL ACCESS COMMITTEE</td>
<td>FUNDING &amp; EQUAL ACCESS COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JACK DAVIS</td>
<td>JACK DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. DONALD FINLEY</td>
<td>I GOT IT FROM MARY SUE TERRY (ATTORNEY GENERAL)</td>
<td>HUNTER ANDREWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FROM OTHER STATES WHO HAVE THIS</td>
<td>JACK DAVIS &amp; THE DEPT OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JAMES W. DYKE, JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE BRAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. FRANCES LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABE BRAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. JOAN S. JONES</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT'S TESTIMONY</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT'S TESTIMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR LEGAL LIABILITY</td>
<td>TESTIMONY: STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION ABOUT DEFICIENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESTIMONY</td>
<td>THIS WAS ON OUR &quot;WISH LIST&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. MARGARET MARSTON (LAMPE)</td>
<td>PERRY PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM, KEN WHITE, LOIS ROCHESTER, &amp; I</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR ADELAARD L. BRAULT</td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. LOIS B ROCHESTER</td>
<td>EDUCATION TASK FORCE OF GOVERNOR ROBB'S FUTURES COMMISSION</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOHN P. FISCHICK</td>
<td>I, JOHN FISCHICK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SUZANNE F. THOMAS</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. KENNETH S. WHITE</td>
<td>PERRY PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM &amp; I SHARED IT WITH THE BOARD OF ED</td>
<td>JOHN FISCHICK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Cont'd
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Interviewed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator William B. Speng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Thomas &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Marston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lampe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Repop &amp; College Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E. B. Howerton &amp; The Dept. of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entire Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe Brault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: National Reports to the Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony: Teachers, V.E.A., &amp; Parents' Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Adelard L. Brault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lois B. Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure &amp; Organization &amp; Teachers &amp; Teaching Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee &amp; Equal Access Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John P. Fishwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee &amp; David Mandel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Suzanne F. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee &amp; David Mandel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Teacher Time Was Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenneth S. White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee &amp; the &quot;Pedagogy Debate&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entire Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entire Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Principal is the &quot;Key to the Success of a School&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Principal is the &quot;Key to the Success of a School&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>STUDENT PREPARATION AND ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. MARGARET MARSTON (LAMPE)</td>
<td>NATIONAL COMMISSION &amp; THE MISSOURI PLAN</td>
<td>BILL LEMMON &amp; THE DEPT. OF EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR ADELARD L. BRAULT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. LOIS S. ROCHESTER</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>STUDENT PREPARATION AND ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOHN P. FISHWICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. SUZANNE F. THOMAS</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>BILL SPONG CALLED THE MIDDLE SCHOOL &quot;A WASTELAND&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. KENNETH S. WHITE</td>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
<td>TESTIMONY AND DOCUMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator William B. Spong</td>
<td>Funding and Equal Access Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Marston (Lampe)</td>
<td>The State Board of Education</td>
<td>The Entire Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Adelard L. Brault</td>
<td>Jack Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lois B. Rochester</td>
<td>Structure &amp; Organization Committee</td>
<td>Teachers &amp; Teaching Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John P. Fishwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Suzanne F. Thomas</td>
<td>ABE Braault and I went to the General Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenneth S. White</td>
<td>V.S.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Interviewed</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. S. JOHN DAVIS</td>
<td>KENNETH WHITE &amp; PERRY PRESCHOOL PROGRAM</td>
<td>JOHN FISHICK</td>
<td>I, JACK DAVIS</td>
<td>I, JACK DAVIS</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>I, JACK DAVIS &amp; STATE'S WRITING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S MAGNET SCHOOLS &amp; FRANCES LEWIS</td>
<td>FLORIDA STUDY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT SPECIAL ED PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. E. B. HOWERTON</td>
<td>STRUCTURE &amp; ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. CALLIE SHINGLETON</td>
<td>PERRY PRESCHOOL PROGRAM</td>
<td>JOHN FISHICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT DISCOVERY</td>
<td>STATE'S WRITING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S MAGNET SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLIAM BURKHOLDER</td>
<td>SENATOR BRAULT</td>
<td>JOHN FISHICK</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS &amp; STATE'S WRITING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS</td>
<td>LEGAL SUIT AGAINST STATE BOARD AT THAT TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. MARGARET ROBERTS</td>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS &amp; PERRY PRESCHOOL PROGRAM</td>
<td>CAME FROM NUMBER 2</td>
<td>CAME FROM NUMBER 2</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE &amp; SANDRA VAUGHAN</td>
<td>JAMES DYKE &amp; SANDRA VAUGHAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. M. K. MACILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. S. JOHN DAVIS</td>
<td>1, JACK DAVIS in 1981 &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>1, JACK DAVIS in 1981 &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>1, JACK DAVIS in 1981 &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. E. B. HOWRITON</td>
<td>JACK DAVIS &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>JACK DAVIS &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>JACK DAVIS &amp; BILL SPONG</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>DOROTHY McDIARMID</td>
<td>COMPROMISE on the PERFORMANCE of TEACHERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. CALLIE SHINGLETON</td>
<td>BILL SPONG</td>
<td>JOAN JONES</td>
<td>FRANCES LEWIS &amp; JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER &amp; STUDENT TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER &amp; STUDENT TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLIAM BURKHOLDER</td>
<td>BILL SPONG</td>
<td>JOAN JONES</td>
<td>FRANCES LEWIS &amp; JAMES DYKE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER &amp; STUDENT TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER &amp; STUDENT TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE; TEACHER TESTIMONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. MARGARET ROBERTS</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. M. K. MAGILL</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. S. JOHN DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN JONES &amp; TEACHERS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. E. B. HOWEITON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN JONES &amp; TEACHERS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. CALLIE SHINGLETON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLIAM BURKHOLDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. MARGARET ROBERTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. M. K. MAGILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Table 1 Cont'd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. S. JOHN DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON FINLEY &amp; I, JACK DAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.A.D. PROJECT FOR SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. E. B. HOWERTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL LEMMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCES LEWIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.A.D. PROJECT FOR SUPERINTENDENTS &amp; V.S.B.A. FOR SCH. BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. CALLIE SINGLETON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WILLIAM BURKHOLDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCES LEWIS &amp; TONI STONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ASSEMBLY NEEDED TO TAKE A FRESH LOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. MARGARET ROBERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR ABE BRAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR ABE BRAULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. M. K. MAGILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN MURPHY NORMA SZAKAL &amp; TESTIMONY: &quot;OUT OF STATE PEOPLE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON FINLEY &amp; GOVERNOR BALILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUZANNE THOMAS &amp; THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTIMONY OF DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ENTIRE COMMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATOR SPONG SPOKE ABOUT &quot;MOVING A GRAVEYARD&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS &amp; TEACHING COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

MAYNARD K. BEAN

Home Address 1471 King William Woods Road
               Midlothian, Virginia 23113

Phone: 804-794-9222

Personal
   Born: March 10, 1938
   Married: Doris J. Clapp of Evergreen, Virginia; graduate of
            Longwood College, and received her Master's from the University
            of Richmond
   Children: None

Educational Background

Diploma - Appomattox High School, 1956

B.S. in Education - University of Richmond
   Major: Chemistry  Minor: Biology  1966

M.Ed. - University of Richmond
   Major: Secondary Administration  1971

C.A.G.S. - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
           State University
   Major: Educational Administration  1980

Ed.D. - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
         State University
         Blacksburg, Virginia
         Major: Educational Administration  1990

Educational Work Experience

Powhatan High School
   Biology, Chemistry, and General Science Teacher  1966-68

Powhatan, Virginia

John Marshall High School
   Biology and Earth Science Teacher  1968-70

Richmond, Virginia
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East End Middle School
Richmond, Virginia
Assistant Principal 1970

Benjamin A. Graves Middle School, Richmond, Virginia
Assistant Principal 1970
Principal 1971-72

Elkhardt Middle School
Richmond, Virginia
Principal 1972-77

Central Office,
Richmond City Schools
Richmond, Virginia
Program Auditor 1977

John F. Kennedy High School, Richmond, Virginia
Assistant Principal 1977-80

Powhatan High School
Powhatan, Virginia
Principal 1980-81

Powhatan County Schools
Division Superintendent 1981-89

Military Service
Virginia Army National Guard, 1961 - Present
Rank: Lieutenant Colonel

Religious Affiliation
Baptist

Educational Organizations
Richmond Association of School Administrators
President-Elect, 1979-80
President, 1980-81

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1970-80

Virginia Association of School Superintendents
1981-89

[Signature]

Maynard K. Bean
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