

Approved by the Charlotte-  
Mecklenburg Board of Education  
June 8, 2010  
Regular Board Meeting



Charlotte, North Carolina

March 23, 2010

**REGULAR MEETING  
of the  
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION**

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education held a Regular Board Meeting on March 23, 2010. The meeting began at 4:05 p.m. and was held in Room 267 of the Government Center.

Present: Eric C. Davis, Chairperson, (District 5);  
Tom Tate, Vice-Chairperson, (District 4);  
Trent Merchant, Member At-Large;  
Kaye Bernard McGarry, Member At-Large;  
Joe I. White, Jr., Member At-Large;  
Rhonda Lennon (District 1);  
Richard Allen McElrath, Sr. (District 2);  
Dr. Joyce Davis Waddell (District 3); and  
Timothy S. Morgan (District 6)

Absent: There were no absences.

Also present at the request of the Board were Dr. Peter Gorman, Superintendent; André F. Mayes, Acting General Counsel/Deputy General Counsel; Hugh Hattabaugh, Chief Operating Officer; LaToya Walker, Executive Director to the Office of the Superintendent; and Nancy Daughtridge, Clerk to the Board.

**Upon motion by Dr. Waddell, seconded by Mr. Tate, the Board voted unanimously of those present for approval to go into Closed Session for the following purposes:**

- **To consult with the Board's attorneys on matters covered by the attorney-client privilege concerning a pending workers' compensation claim by Rosa Cox and personnel matters and legal implications related to departmental reductions in force and reorganizations.**

**The motion was made pursuant to Section 143-318.11(a) of the North Carolina General Statutes.**

The Board held a Closed Session meeting from 4:05 p.m. until 5:50 p.m. in Room 267.

Chairperson Davis reconvened the Regular Board Meeting at 6:00 p.m. in Room 267 of the Government Center. CMS-TV Channel 3 televised the meeting.

Present: Eric C. Davis, Chairperson, (District 5);  
Tom Tate, Vice-Chairperson, (District 4);

Trent Merchant, Member At-Large;  
Kaye Bernard McGarry, Member At-Large;  
Joe I. White, Jr., Member At-Large;  
Rhonda Lennon (District 1);  
Richard Allen McElrath, Sr. (District 2);  
Dr. Joyce Davis Waddell (District 3); and  
Timothy S. Morgan (District 6)

Absent: There were no absences.

Also present at the request of the Board were Dr. Peter Gorman, Superintendent; André F. Mayes, Acting General Counsel/Deputy General Counsel; Members of Executive and Senior Staffs; Judy Whittington, Manager of Board Services; and Nancy Daughtridge, Clerk to the Board.

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Davis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Chairperson Davis welcomed everyone to the Board's second meeting of the month which was held in a Work Session format.

### A. Adoption of Agenda

Chairperson Davis called upon Dr. Gorman to amend the agenda.

Dr. Gorman asked the Board to pull Action Item III.A. (Recommend approval of one citizen appointment nomination to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission) because there has been some conversation among Board members that they would like to review the process that the Board uses for recommending appointments to Board committees. CMS staff discussed delaying the recommendation with the City and they indicated that it is not a time sensitive item. This item will be scheduled on an upcoming meeting agenda following the review by the Board. Chairperson Davis said the Board would like to develop a more thoughtful approach because many of the Board members do not know these candidates. A more thoughtful approach would be for the Board to form a Nominating Committee of the Board of Education to review the candidates and qualifications, interview the candidates, and present a nomination to the entire Board for consideration. This would be a more effective approach and solution for our community. Chairperson Davis said the recommendation for this appointment will be presented at a Regular Board meeting in the near future.

Chairperson Davis called for a motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

**Mr. Merchant moved, seconded by Dr. Waddell, that the Board adopt the agenda as amended, and the motion passed upon unanimous Board vote.**

### B. Public Hearing on Exhibit BA-EI, Board of Education Vision, Mission, and Core Beliefs and Commitments

Chairperson Davis said this item is the first of two Public Hearings on revisions to Exhibit BA-EI, Board of Education Vision, Mission, and Core Beliefs and Commitments. The

next Public Hearing and Board vote is scheduled for the April 13<sup>th</sup> Regular Board meeting. Chairperson Davis said there are no speakers signed up to speak to this item and he called the Public Hearing closed.

## II. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Recommend approval to relocate and install mobile and modular units for various schools.

*Board approval for all relocation and setup of mobile units at various schools for a variety of vendors. Fiscal implications: \$2.9 million*

Chairperson Davis called for a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda.

**Mr. White moved, seconded by Dr. Waddell, that the Board adopt Consent Item A., and the motion passed upon unanimous Board vote.**

## III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Recommend approval of one citizen appointment nomination to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission

*Action Item III. A. was deleted with the adoption of the agenda. This item will be on a future agenda for a Regular Board meeting.*

The Board of Education has two seats on the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission which consists of one appointment to the Charlotte City Council and one appointment to the Board of County Commissioners. The term for the Charlotte City Council appointment ends June 30, 2010. The Board of Education will be asked to approve a nomination to fill the Charlotte City Council seat. The person nominated will be placed on the City Council's agenda for approval at a future meeting. The term of the new appointment will be July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2013.

B. Recommend approval of criteria to be used for reduction in force and demotions impacting certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale and assistant principals due to an anticipated reduction in funding for the next school year

Chairperson Davis called for a motion to approve the criteria to be used for reduction in force and demotions impacting certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale and assistant principals due to an anticipated reduction in funding for the next school year.

**Mr. Tate moved, seconded by Mr. White that the Board approve the criteria to be used for reduction in force and demotions impacting certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale and assistant principals due to an anticipated reduction in funding for the next school year, and a discussion followed.**

**Ms. McGarry made a substitute motion that the Board direct the Superintendent to bring to the Board a report on the 2010-2011 budgetary impact of up to a 10% across-the-board reduction in salary for all CMS employees and Board members and the legal issues associated with such action. This information shall be provided to Board members as soon as possible and a presentation made at the next scheduled**

**meeting of the Board of Education. The Board will delay approval of the need for and criteria to be used for a reduction in force and demotions impacting certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale and assistant principals pending the opportunity to hear and act on this report. The substitute motion was seconded by Mr. McElrath, and a Board discussion followed.**

- Ms. McGarry discussed her motion. She believes the Board must change direction and this would be an opportunity to follow the new economic era in which organizations are implementing pay cuts. This pain is felt throughout the whole country and Mecklenburg County. This is an opportunity to halt the reduction in force (RIF) and utilize, with caution, the reduction in pay (RIP) across-the-board from the Superintendent to the Board of Education. At this point, CMS does not know what the state funding will be and the Board should wait until the state reveals their budget before implementing reductions. In the meantime, the Board can methodically review all items for reduction consideration and may be able to reduce other items so that a 10% reduction may not be necessary. A 1% salary cut would equate to \$6.8million and a 10% reduction would equate to \$68 million, and this method would share the pain throughout the district. She expressed concern regarding the layoff of teachers because they are essential to the Board's Core Beliefs and Commitments and having an effective teacher in the classroom. She said Dr. Gorman has the authority to terminate the employees who are not performing and a reduction in force is not needed. She expressed concern regarding the reduction in force process last year because it was unprofessional; the evaluation process was unfair; resulted in losing a lot of good people; and she does not want to do that again this year. She encouraged the Board to find other methods to reduce funding rather than making teachers suffer. She encouraged the Board to retain teachers and principals so they can continue to work with students because they make the critical difference in student achievement. She said salary cuts are not pleasant but it does retain the teachers and will not impact the classroom.
- Dr. Waddell said she would support the substitute motion. These are difficult economic times that are worst than the depression in 1939 and the Board should wait for the State to reveal their budget information first. Regarding teachers and administrators, something is better than nothing because if they are terminated they have nothing and if they take a reduction in salary at least they have something. If we all share and take a little less, we all are better off. Making pay cuts across the board will be consistent, we all would share equally, and no one would be singled out. She encouraged the Board to take time to review other reduction options and to focus on the Board's Mission and Vision of ensuring an effective teacher instructs every classroom. She encouraged the Board to protect those who directly impact students because that would maximize student learning.
- Mr. McElrath will support the substitute motion because the Superintendent said this is something we can do and it is hard to approve putting over 850 people in the unemployment line. This would be an opportunity to have a shared sacrifice of no more than 10% of your salary. CMS and all its employees must step up during these tough economic times. This will help other people and will be a great lesson to the children. CMS told the public that with these teachers, support services, and environment we will be able to educate your children. Now, CMS is saying they are going to take this away but still educate your children. Mr. McElrath is concerned that this generation of

children will pay for the mistakes of this decision because there will be children who suffer. The substitute motion will alleviate eliminating teachers, support services, and programs, and directs the Superintendent to take time to work out no more than a 10% salary cut. This option will help this community and the children of this community.

- Mr. Morgan said he would not support the substitute motion. At the last Budget meeting, Mr. Merchant discussed the need for operational flexibility from the State. He believes the Board must provide operational flexibility for our staff. The substitute motion unnecessarily ties the hands of our staff but as we move forward there is no reason why we cannot also consider a 10% salary reduction. If the Board decides to move forward with the reduction in force, there are certain statutory requirements and timelines that must be met. While the reduction in force is unpleasant and the Board may decide they do not want to do the reduction in force but, at the same time, we must begin to move forward with that process. Mr. Morgan encouraged the Board to provide staff the flexibility to start moving forward with this process and to continue to review other options to include salary cuts across-the-board.
- Ms. Lennon agreed with the comments of Mr. Morgan. She believes it is counterproductive to tie the hands of the Superintendent at this point in the budget crisis and the Board should keep all options on the table.
- Ms. McGarry encouraged the Board to support the substitute motion. She believes the Board and the Superintendent should go to Raleigh and demand flexibility and urge the State to immediately reveal their budget for this year. She encouraged the Board to wait until the State has given CMS their budget because otherwise staff is spinning their wheels and speculating on the amount of funding reductions needed. She asked the Board to use the reduction in force as a last resort.
- Mr. Tate said he would like to see the results of this type of study but he does not believe this is an either or proposition. He expressed concern that a reduction in force would result in the termination of 800 employees but that does not mean only 800 employees would need unemployment services because a 10% salary reduction for all employees would result in a greater number of people needing financial assistance. He encouraged the Board to take the necessary steps to ensure the reduction in force requirements are met should that become the best method to make budget reductions. He does not want to cut teachers and staff but without following the statutory requirements, the Board will effectively remove the option of a reduction in force and he wants to ensure the Board has all options at its disposal.
- Chairperson Davis said we would like to have as few staff reductions as possible and as little pay reductions as possible. At a time in which the Board does not know what the County and State budgets will be, it behooves the Board to have as many of the few tools we have at our disposal.

Chairperson Davis called for a vote on the substitute motion.

**The Board voted 3-6 and the substitute motion failed. Board members McGarry, McElrath, and Waddell voted in support of the substitute motion. Board members Davis, Tate, Merchant, White, Tate, and Morgan voted against the substitute motion.**

Chairperson Davis called upon Dr. Gorman to review the Reduction in Force criteria. Dr. Gorman called upon Landis Wade, attorney with McGuireWoods, LLP and counsel

advising on this issue, and Hugh Hattabaugh, Chief Operating Officer, to be available to answer questions. Dr. Gorman provided an overview of the Reduction in Force document as outlined below.

- Introduction: The Superintendent is required to make a recommendation to the Board regarding the need for a reduction in force and the criteria to be used in the reduction in accordance with Board Policy GCQA, Reduction in Force for Career Employees. The reduction in force will also include demotions and is necessary as a result of the anticipated decrease in funding for the 2010-2011 school year. A separate criteria for reductions applicable to other employees in various departments was developed in accordance with Board Policy GCQB, Reduction in Force for Non-Career Employees, and it does not require Board approval. The recommended criteria includes reductions in pay of assistant principals and reduction in force of classroom teachers and other certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale. This applies to both Career and Non-Career.
- Board Policies GCQA and GCQB. The Board is required to approve a process for Career employees as outlined in Policy GCQA. Policy GCQB impacts Non-Career employees.
- Recommended Criteria for Assistant Principals: This is not a reduction of individual or particular assistant principals. The criteria is for a reduction in work and pay for all assistant principals, reducing this position from work and salary from eleven month to ten month employees. Assistant principals are employed under contracts that extend two or four school years. There are some individuals whose contract will end this year and we are recommending those individuals who are “At-Standard performance be renewed with new contracts that are ten months in length. Individuals whose contracts are not ending are Career employees at this point in time and according to the official criteria it would be considered a demotion and staff is recommending a demotion to ten months work and employment for each of the remaining years on their contract.
- Classroom Teachers in Retained Categories: Some positions are retained within this classification and some are excluded. Individuals rated as a “poor performing” in the these categories would qualify for participation in the reduction in force process. Classroom teacher positions to be retained and excluded from the reduction in force include the following areas:
  1. Teachers in math, science, Career and Technical Education-Health Occupations, Career and Technical Education-Project Lead the Way, Exceptional Children, English as a Second Language, Montessori-trained teachers currently serving in a Montessori school, and teachers who currently teach unique foreign language programs where replacement may be difficult (e.g. Chinese).
  2. Teach for America Teachers who would be coming to the end of their first year of their two year commitment.
  3. Strategic Staffing principals.
- Poor Performance and Other Criteria for Non-Career Teachers: The criteria involves the reduction of Non-Career teacher positions before the reduction of Career teacher positions and poor performance will be the first criteria used in the process. Non-Career teacher positions will be eliminated in the following order, as necessary to meet required reductions:
  1. Includes individuals in years one through four of their employment and based

upon summative performance evaluation for this school year. Any individual with “Below Standard” or “Unsatisfactory” ratings on any function of the appraisal would be the first individuals selected for the reduction in force. Performance is priority in all areas and the information must be supported by at least one evaluation to ensure fair treatment of all individuals.

2. Any Non-Career teachers with licensure deficiencies will be non-renewed (even if a Retained Category).
  3. Any Non-Career Interim teachers will be non-renewed (even if in a Retained Category).
  4. Any Non-Career teachers with end-of-year contracts will be non-renewed (even if in a Retained Category).
- **Criteria for Non-Classroom Employees Paid as Teachers:** This process also includes departmental reductions in force involving at will and other employees. Approximately seventeen employees will be included in this reduction in force. These individuals will be placed in the district pool for reassignment if they have an “At Standard” performance evaluation.
    - **District Reorganization Process and Criteria:** The process will also include reorganization and will impact the district office. The purpose of departmental reorganization is to create better operational effectiveness with fewer employees. Although, some positions will be eliminated as part of the reorganizations, some new positions will be created. This process will include the following:
      - Identification of the positions to be impacted within departments.
      - Create new job descriptions for the new positions.
      - Provide an overview of the staff for the process to follow and outline the reorganization.
      - Meet individually with employees who are specifically impacted by their position being eliminated, provide them a letter of explanation of the process, and invite them to apply for newly created positions for which they meet minimum qualifications if they have an “At-Standard” performance evaluation.
      - Post positions available on the CMS Intranet for staff only to apply first. Positions will be posted for a minimum of three days.
      - A selection team will be established consisting of a minimum of two managers and a minimum of one Human Resources representative.
      - Review, screen, and selection of individuals.
    - **Strict Elimination Process and Criteria:** Some departments, including some reorganized departments, will have circumstances where it will be necessary to terminate employees based on strict position eliminations (i.e., where positions are being totally eliminated or are being maintained with fewer employees in a given position). Some cost savings will come from not filling vacant positions that exist in some departments. However, where positions identified for the strict elimination process are occupied by employees, such employees will be selected using criteria as outlined in the document.
    - **Reductions in Pay of Certain Teacher Positions:** If any of the above non-classroom employees are paid as teachers on an eleven or twelve month teacher work and pay scale, they will be demoted to a ten month teacher work and pay scale if they are transferred to another teaching position through the District-wide

process. In addition, approximately five teacher resource positions in several departments will be demoted from a twelve month teacher work and pay scale to a ten month teacher work and pay scale, such that all state and locally funded resource teacher positions in the District will be ten month positions.

- Relative Performance Criteria for Elementary Teachers: Elementary Non-Career regular classroom teachers (1 to 4 years teaching) in elementary schools who are not in a Retained Category will be subject to non-renewal on a school by school basis as outlined in the document.
- Relative Performance Criteria for Secondary Teachers: Middle and High School Non-Career teachers (1 to 4 years teaching) and Career Teachers in middle and high school who are not in a Retained Category will be subject to non-renewal or dismissal by subject areas on a school by school basis as outlined in the document.
- Criteria for Psychologists: The District currently employs ninety-one psychologists, most of whom are Career Employees. It is recommended that the District eliminate nineteen psychologists due to the anticipated reduction in funding. Non-Career employees who are psychologists would be non-renewed.
- Teacher and Psychologist Eligibility for Rehire.
- Miscellaneous Provisions.

Board members were invited to ask questions and make comments.

- Mr. McElrath asked clarifying questions regarding the reference to following a dual path. Dr. Gorman said this process follows two paths simultaneously: Budget and Human Resources. Should the Board put this criteria in place staff will have the flexibility to follow the path to implement a reduction in force. However, that does not mean if there is not a change in what occurs with the budget process or a different budget recommendation comes forward from the Board that there could not be a change to the reduction in force process. It can be stopped and individuals can be brought back but if this process does not start by a particular date we lose the ability to have it as a tool to use. Mr. McElrath expressed concern regarding the impact on elementary non-career teachers in years one through four because the recent reports indicated that advanced degrees and experience do not count, and this criteria could be leaving many ineffective teachers in the foundation of education which are the elementary schools. Dr. Gorman said this process will review positions at individual schools and the process will not eliminate the entire staff at the school. Non-performers outside of the process will be evaluated and hopefully, at some point in the future, CMS will migrate towards a situation in which we have performance-based comparative data for all employees and that will be another tool that can be brought to the Board for consideration in future reductions in force. CMS has two types of contracts required by State law: Career and Non-Career. The focus of this process is an attempt to move towards dismissal of non-performers who are Career or Non-Career status, and in the future we hope to have better data to make those judgments. Mr. McElrath asked why the process would not cut the salary for teachers but would cut the salary for assistant principals with a reduction in time which allows them the opportunity to continue to work? Dr. Gorman said in the past with a reduction in pay for an individual we have had a commensurate reduction in time or duties such as a reduction from an eleven to ten month schedule and that is not an option with the teacher schedule.



- Ms. McGarry asked will this process use the same evaluation tool as last year and has it been improved? Dr. Gorman said the performance evaluation form used last year was the State mandated evaluation tool and that form will also be used this year. Ms. McGarry expressed regarding the evaluation tool used last year was vague and open to subjective input, and she asked clarifying questions regarding the evaluation process. Dr. Gorman reviewed the criteria of the reduction in force and the evaluation process. Ms. Clark said North Carolina is in the final year of a pilot for a new teacher evaluation process and it is anticipated to be in full implementation in fall 2010. Principals and teachers are in the process of training and the transition to the new process will occur in August. For this year, CMS is utilizing the State mandated Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument that is currently in place for this school year.
- Mr. Merchant said no one is excited about a reduction in force and no one thinks this is a great document. He thanked Dr. Gorman and his team for developing a document that is based upon the tools available. Mr. Merchant wished there were more tools available to compare relative performance and he is pleased that the State is developing a new evaluation form. He said the Board is continuing to work strategically even though it is necessary to act tactically now. He thanked Dr. Gorman for improving the reduction in force process from last year. Mr. Merchant said this is painful and he will support the recommended criteria. In reality, CMS has cut \$160 million over the last four years and we will need to cut another \$75 to \$80 million this year. Next year, we will need to cut another \$47 million or more. Cuts to the CMS budget are difficult because eighty-four percent of the budget is in people, salary, and benefits. This process is painful but Dr. Gorman has helped the Board to keep its eye on its commitments which is to operate a school system that is fiscally sound and responsible, and this recommendation will help best advance the Board's Mission to maximize achievement.
- Mr. Tate said some form of reduction in pay across-the-board is worth pursuing. Mr. Tate asked staff to review that as an option to mitigate some parts of a reduction in force. He said should the reduction in force be implemented but more funding became available and teachers were rehired, he is hopeful that staff will make every effort to return those teachers back to the school where they were previously teaching. Mr. Tate asked with the reductions in psychologist, will CMS still be within the State allotments for psychologists? Dr. Gorman said, yes, and the number will be slightly above the State allotment. Mr. Tate said psychologists and social workers provide a variety of services that are vitally important to educating students. Mr. Tate said the services of assistant principals are also vitally important to students and schools and he expressed concern that their positions were reduced from an eleven-month to a ten-month position. He does not want this to reflect they are less important or being demoted because in reality this is a technicality of the law.
- Mr. White thanked Dr. Gorman and staff for their hard work. This is an unpleasant process for the Board and a difficult process for Dr. Gorman because he is the face of the school system and he gets the ugly comments from the community. Mr. White said Dr. Gorman is not in this alone because the Board will have to make the final decision. He commended Dr. Gorman for representing the school system and doing what the Board thinks is the best we can do with the available resources. Mr. White said there are no simple answers for the situation that this nation finds itself in economically at this point. There are consequences and unintended consequences. He said unfortunately, this

process will cut assistant principals to a ten-month position but they will still have to do the same amount of work that they previously did in eleven-months. The principals at those schools will have to get that work done without them and that will not be easy. There is no perfect procedure for implementing a reduction in force but this is a good and fair process. It is important to understand that once the Board adopts the criteria, it becomes a Board policy that must be followed. The new teacher appraisal instrument being developed will not be a panacea because it will continue to follow the same process of being completed by people for people. The current performance evaluation instrument is a good instrument that has been used fairly. Mr. White said a 10% salary cut gives him heartburn for several reasons. One reason is it will negatively impact the retirement of employees and could result in an unintended consequence of causing people to retire early before their salaries are reduced. A salary cut is a State responsibility and this Board would have difficulty overriding State money. Mr. White expressed concern that next year as the federal stimulus money disappears, funding could get worse. He said the Board will continue to work and do its best to educate every child in the school system.

- Ms. McGarry discussed her opinions. She believes CMS is at this point as a result of spending out of control for too many years and now realizes it must be more efficient and effective. A salary reduction would be a good option and she encouraged Dr. Gorman to continue to review that process. At the least, this should include a salary reduction at the Superintendent and top staff levels, and Board members if necessary, because this would be a morale booster to the teachers that we understand what they are going through. Ms. McGarry expressed concern that the Board is in a status quo mentality, reform is overdue, and the Board should set priorities in a reform method. Ms. McGarry shared an e-mail from a citizen in the community that encouraged the Board layoff other employees in the school system before implementing teacher and teacher assistant layoffs. Ms. McGarry said she does not support teacher layoffs and she would not support the reduction in force.
- Ms. Lennon said the reduction in force is a downer to the community, the taxpayers, and to the staff, and the economy is a morale downer to the entire country. We are all working hard and she is not willing to do anything to teachers that she is not willing to do to herself. The Board does not want to eliminate jobs, she believes in teachers, and this is not a step that she finds easy. She discussed the importance of the teachers at all schools and in all programs because they play an important role for the different groups of students in CMS. Unfortunately, CMS cannot make the drastic budget reductions necessary without impacting personnel because 80% of the CMS budget is in salaries and benefits. She encouraged the Board to fight for State changes but that will not impact the present situation and budget crisis. The Board should also encourage changes to zoning in Charlotte so that affordable housing can be spread throughout the County. That would be a long term fix to a problem that must be dealt with today. Ms. Lennon said she would support this recommendation as long as staff is working on a parallel track reviewing other budget reduction options.
- Mr. McElrath asked would it be necessary to go to the State to implement a 10% salary cut across-the-board? Dr. Gorman said this could be challenging because it involves local funds and supplements but based upon the best information that he has of today it would not require State approval.

- Dr. Waddell said this document has a great impact on the school system and she feels for the teachers. She wants to ensure that CMS takes the time and the necessary steps to properly communicate this information to staff and a line of communication will be available to answer their questions. She expressed concern that the reduction in force will result in people being out of a job and she hopes this process will include compassion for them. She hopes things will change for the better.
- Mr. Morgan said during the election in November, a number of Board member candidates heard the need for this Board to make rational decisions and to establish rational processes. Mr. Morgan said although this is a difficult decision, it is rational, fair, and performance-based which is one of the priorities of this Board. Mr. Morgan thanked Dr. Gorman and staff for their work, recognizing that the process will be painful, and making it as professional as possible. He thanked Board members for suggesting areas to cut and encouraged them to develop additional budget reduction options.
- Mr. White said the State has no authority over the local funding and local supplement for CMS. Mr. White asked Dr. Gorman could this Board cut State salaries by 10%? Dr. Gorman said he does not believe this Board can cut State salaries but that was not what he was asked earlier.
- Chairperson Davis said regarding the timing of the process, recently there were changes to the State law which impacted the timing to center around May 15<sup>th</sup> and he asked staff to provide clarification on the statute changes. Mr. Landis provided clarification to the statute regarding Non-Career teachers in which the Superintendent must provide notice to those teachers by May 15<sup>th</sup>. Those teachers have certain rights with respect for that notice. The Board then must consider, vote, and notice must be given to those Non-Career teachers who are non-renewed by June 15<sup>th</sup>. The statute includes an opportunity for them to be provided rights and to ask for information as a part of that process. The new statute moves the timetable up for providing notice and the steps needed to be implemented by the Board before the notice can be given. Chairperson Davis said a reduction in force is distasteful but delaying this decision could jeopardize the rights of teachers under the statute as well as impact the ability of staff to effectively execute the plan in as fair and objective manner as possible. The new statute creates a time pressure that must be met. Chairperson Davis said whether it is eliminating a job or reducing salaries, none of those are good choices. For many of our staff, even a 5% reduction in salary could make the difference of a mortgage payment, a child going to college, or some other part of their future. Chairperson Davis said while the Board will have to continue to consider a salary reduction, he is aware of the impact that even a relatively small reduction would have on staff. Eliminating a teacher's job is not being anti-teacher because CMS exists because we have students and teachers to teach them. What we are striving to achieve is high performing teachers. CMS has many high performing teachers and that is one of the assets that make this a great District. We are seeking to raise the game of those who are not contributing and while that is not a part of this process, that is the direction in which CMS is moving towards. Dr. Gorman is challenging his leadership team to continually perform constructive, critical, and effective staff evaluations. This is a movement to raise our game. Chairperson Davis commended Dr. Gorman for including the performance criteria in the document and for leading CMS in the right direction. Chairperson Davis said there is the notion that those

who sit in the headquarters do not work but that is not the case with the Central Office staff at CMS because he knows they are working hard and late hours to provide support to keep CMS operating effectively. Chairperson Davis said while there have been significant reductions in the Central Office staff the work load has not lessened and he commended staff for continuing to do more with less people. Chairperson Davis said these choices are difficult but we are striving to make the choices that will move CMS further in accomplishing our goals of an effective education for every child in Mecklenburg County. Chairperson Davis said he would support the recommendation.

Chairperson Davis called for the Board vote on the original motion to approve the reduction in force criteria.

**The Board voted 6-3 in support of the motion to accept the criteria to be used for reduction in force and demotions impacting certified employees paid on the teacher pay scale and assistant principals due to an anticipated reduction in funding for the next school year. Board members Davis, Tate, Merchant, White, Tate, and Morgan voted in support of the motion. Board members McGarry, McElrath, and Waddell voted against the motion.**

#### IV. REPORT/INFORMATION ITEMS

##### A. Report on End-of-Grade and End-of-Course Retests and review of Procedures of the North Carolina Board of Education

Chairperson Davis called upon Dr. Gorman to introduce the report. Dr. Gorman said the report will review the End-of-Grade and End-of-Course retests and review procedures of the North Carolina Board of Education. Dr. Gorman said he has very strong feelings about the area of retests and the more he knows about retests the stronger his feelings become. Dr. Gorman called upon Robert Avossa, Chief Accountability Officer, and Dr. Chris Cobitz, Director of Assessment, to present the report.

Dr. Cobitz reviewed the following information regarding retests.

- Federal Context: The Elementary and Secondary Schools Act 2001 revision to (*No Child Left Behind Act*) requires Reading and Math testing in grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> and in one grade 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup>; Science tested in either 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, or 5<sup>th</sup> grades and either 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, or 8<sup>th</sup> grades and either 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, or 12<sup>th</sup> grade; and the State must set baseline goals leading up to 100% proficiency in the 2014 school year.
- State Context: The State of North Carolina began testing many years prior to the *No Child Left Behind Act*.
  - End-of-Grade (EOG) testing began in the mid 1980s and includes Math and Reading in grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>. In 2006 the Math standards became more rigorous and in 2008 the Reading standards become more rigorous.
  - End-of-course (EOC) testing began in the early 1990s and began with test in ten courses and that has been reduced to tests in eight courses. In 2008 the standards were changed and the standards for both sets of tests were set using the first test administration.
- CMS Context:
  - Administer over 300,000 State tests per year.

- Tests are used for performance measures.
- Impact State and Federal accountability for schools.
- Office of Accountability charged with managing the tests.
- Schools need a second adult in the classroom for each test administration. Often schools must beg parents and others to volunteer. School operations basically stop for State testing. In high school, four days of exams are needed for each semester. In May, there are four days of exams in grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Uncertainty: All tests have error or a certain amount of uncertainty. There are three common measures that States or schools allow for the uncertainty.
  - Standard Error of Measure (SEM): Determine how much uncertainty is associated with a given score. This is an automatic calculation that allows a score to fall within the realm of error.
  - Confidence Interval: Estimate how many students should have passed the test based upon how the students actually performed. This is a calculated number that the State currently uses in making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations under *No Child Left Behind*.
  - Retest: If the student does not pass the test the first time, they are given a second attempt.
    - Impact of Retesting:
      - Labor intensive process requiring twice the time and twice the effort. With many students failing the first attempt, the schools almost have to stop school to administer the second test; more proctors are needed; more people needed to score the tests; the process is confusing to parents and teachers; and reteaching occurs but under a limited time schedule (usually within a few days).
      - Results: Approximately 9 percentage point improvement based upon EOG mandatory retesting in 2008-2009 for schools across the District; lower performing schools get more of a boost than higher performing (compresses differences because there is a cap at the top in which schools cannot go above 100%); and 41% of the schools performed worse on the original test in the 2008-2009 school year than in the previous school year but based upon the retest it appeared they performed better.
- 2005-2006 through 2008-2009 Math Results in grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> and composite score: Composite score 2005-2006 64% proficient; 2006-2007 66% proficient; 2007-2008 68% proficient; 2008-2009 without retest 72% proficient; and 2008-2009 with retest 79% proficient. Without the retest CMS improved its proficiency rate by 8 percentage points over a three year period.
- Math Gap Trends Grades 3<sup>rd</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>.
- 2008-2009 Reading Results: Less comparative data because the standards changed in the 2007-2008 school year. Composite score 2007-2008 55% proficient; 2008-2009 without retest 59% proficient; and with 2008-2009 retests 67% proficient.
- Reading Gap Trends Grades 3<sup>rd</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>.
- 2008-2009 EOG Retests: Student Level:
  - 44,281 EOG retests administered.
  - 25% of the students taking Math and Reading retests passed.
  - 64% of the students who passed the retest had scored within 1 SEM on the first attempt of the test.

- 50% of the students who were in that 1 SEM measure passed on the retest.
- The Upside of Retesting:
  - Students are given another opportunity to meet the standards. This is especially important for high school exit standards for EOCs because students must meet that standard to graduate from high school.
  - Makes schools look better.
  - Easier to make 100% proficient by 2014.
- The Downside of Retesting:
  - Takes time.
  - Costs money.
  - Takes effort.
  - Makes the schools look better even if they have not improved.
  - Confuses the differences of performance and gap measures.
  - Allows for potential false messages about the performance of students and schools.
  - Questionable veracity of the process.
- Policies:
  - State Board Policy GCS-C-031 was passed by the State Board in December 2009 and requires all school districts to automatically retest all Level II students even if they were in the SEM. This policy conflicts with several other State policies that are already authorized.
  - Policies such as this require authorization through the North Carolina Administrative Procedures Act. The North Carolina State Board of Education is normally given thirty days to begin this process but as of March 3, 2010 the process had not begun.
- Options Around Retesting:
  - SEM: Count the SEM students as proficient. This does not require any additional time because it is using the original test score; no additional resources used; the score is student-based and not an estimate; and maintains a measure of differences in performance. To use this option would require State and Federal approval because these tests are used for *No Child Left Behind* determinations.
  - Portfolios: Instead of given another test, use a Portfolio process by collecting evidence of student knowledge. This will give a read on student ability but may not be acceptable for use in school and District results. This option would put CMS on an unequal footing with other school districts in North Carolina who are retesting their students. The students who would pass on Portfolio would not be counted as proficient for State or Federal purposes.

Dr. Gorman said he has strong feelings about retesting which put him at odds with CMS staff because they disagree with his belief. He believes senior staff supports retesting because there are so many variables and challenges that come into play in which they support. Dr. Gorman said he has not supported retesting because the system, as it is, lacks veracity and it gives a false message of being prepared to a certain group of students. This is evident by the results when the standards for Reading and Math were raised and the students who disproportionately did not do well. The students who live in poverty and the African-American and Hispanic students were told they were on grade level but when the standards were raised they were not on grade level. Dr. Gorman believes retesting disproportionately gives some students a false measure of being ready for the next level.

He is concerned about sending this message and the consequences of not using multiple measures. He understands staff's support of the retest because there are an equal number of items that they can point out such as you are proficient at the taking of the test. Dr. Gorman asked if a student is within one SEM should there be a policy that the student must retake the test to prove proficiency? He understands the viewpoint of staff and he would like to hear the viewpoints of the Board members.

Board members were invited to ask questions and make comments.

- Ms. McGarry said she supports Dr. Gorman's posture on retesting because there are only a few days between the first and second test, it is not worth the time and expense, and a test only measures what is occurring at that particular time. She commended Dr. Gorman for writing the letter to the State sharing his concerns regarding retesting.
- Mr. Merchant asked clarifying questions about the 2008-2009 EOG retest results and Dr. Cobitz provided clarification. Mr. Merchant expressed concern that the retest pass rate is only 25% of those tested. Mr. Merchant asked clarifying questions regarding retesting, the benefits of retesting, and the difficulties of retesting. Mr. Avossa and Dr. Gorman responded. Mr. Merchant said this is a component in the big picture that we must keep working on even while we are in the tactical and operational elements of an annual operating budget.
- Mr. Tate asked clarifying questions regarding the before and after retest results and impact on closing the gap. Dr. Cobitz provided clarifications. Mr. Tate commended staff on their internal and external dialogue regarding the benefits of retesting and he hopes this will be pursued further because he wants to ensure students do well on the tests and are ready to advance to the next grade.
- Ms. Lennon asked what are the budgetary implications of the retests? Mr. Avossa said this is complex because the majority of the costs are associated with staff's time and effort. Another cost factor includes this summer CMS will incur costs for temporary workers to do scanning. An estimated cost is between \$20,000 and \$25,000. Ms. Lennon expressed concern that this may give students and parents a false sense of security of being on grade level when in reality they are not ready for the next grade.
- Mr. McElrath believes it is important to find out if a student is proficient or not proficient and he hopes steps will be taken to ensure accuracy.
- Ms. McGarry expressed concern that the tests are a gateway to go to the next grade and if those students are pushed to the next grade they may be at the bottom of the level because they are not prepared. Those students may need additional help to meet the needs of the grade and if that is not provided they may get lost in the system. She encouraged staff to ensure there are supports at the next level to strengthen the confidence of the students and urge them to apply themselves. Mr. Avossa said this is a complex process and staff will continue to review the test results, trends, and students meeting thresholds. Dr. Gorman said there are supports in place that include assigning students to smaller classes, tutoring, as well as other support services.
- Dr. Waddell thanked staff for the report and answering the questions. She is encouraged that the results show the gap is improving. Dr. Waddell asked clarifying questions about the need for multiple measures and the option of using portfolios. Mr. Avossa said the tests are summative in nature and the state of North Carolina does not provide how students do but only whether they pass or fail. The test results do not

provide enough information to help teachers change what is happening in the classroom. The work in the Office of Accountability provide teachers formative snapshots throughout the year so they will have a sense of how their students are tracking towards making performance goals at the end of the year. Dr. Gorman said as a State, we should provide a report back to parents based upon the State assessment on the areas that were strengths and weaknesses for students. This is accountability from a standpoint that does not allow people to make improved decisions. He encouraged the Board to include this item on their Legislative Agenda to ensure that the State provide accurate, fair data on the status of student proficiency.

- Mr. White agreed with the viewpoints of staff and Dr. Gorman. He does not want to eliminate any opportunity for a student to do better or any opportunity for schools to look better. He also does not want to build false hope for students and he encouraged staff to determine the best method to move forward to make this better. He urged the Board to discuss how they can help make this better.
- Mr. Merchant suggested staff consider tracking students who barely passed the first test (within 1 SEM) and compare their performance over the next four years with the students who passed the retest to determine a comparison of how those students progressed. He believes this would be useful data and there may be a foundation that would fund this type of study. This type of data could help transform state policy.
- Mr. McElrath believes the quarterly tests would be helpful in determining the proficiency of students. Mr. Avossa said the work over the last several years indicated that there was no predictive value in how quarterly tests aligned to how students may perform. Staff is working hard to ensure that alignment exists even though the quarterly test was not intended to be predictive in nature.
- Chairperson Davis expressed concern that the retest is out of trend. We are so focused on testing that we train students how to take multiple choice tests rather than teach them how to do critical thinking. He believes emphasizing retesting is adding to the trend of encouraging staff to do what it takes to get that student to pass the test rather than think critically. He would prefer to not invest in retesting but to invest in a broader array of measures that provide a better indication of student performance through the course of the year rather than a two hour period at the end of the year.

#### B. Report on Performance Management: Managing for Performance Project

Chairperson Davis called upon Dr. Gorman to introduce the report on Performance Management: Managing for Performance Project. Dr. Gorman called upon Robert Avossa, Chief Accountability Officer; Michael Davis, Director of Performance Management; Farrah Santonator, Assessment Analyst, Office of Accountability; and Chuck Nusinov, principal at David Cox Road Elementary School, to present the report.

Mr. Avossa said he is pleased to share a series of tools that he believes will take the CMS to the next level. It has been exciting to watch this project evolve because it has the potential of transforming the way we teach and how we manage the District. The Managing for Performance Project focuses on improving three fundamental areas that will lead to improved student performance. The three-legged stool approach includes the following:

- Identify and align success measures across the District.



- Determine data and system requirements, and develop system and data management processes to effectively turn data into information.
- Transform information into action and outcomes through collaborative planning with data.

Mr. Avossa provided an overview of Managing for Performance.

- Context (background Information):
  - Aligned with the Theory of Action. Built on the foundation and continues the great work regarding Managed Instruction. The Performance Management Initiative is intended to increase effectiveness and efficiency by holding schools and staff accountable. It provides information needed to be innovative, build capacity, and empower staff to manage for performance.
  - Funders: Through a \$4.8 million grant awarded to CMS in 2008 by the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation and The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, CMS began strategic efforts to enhance performance management systems district-wide.
  - Partners helping with technical capacity: the Parthenon Group (a strategic management advisor firm helped to set up the planning phase, development of the grant proposal, and development of many performance reports), Mariner, LLC (a local business in Charlotte that helped with the development and draft of technical sections of the project and grant), and the Harvard University Data Wise Project (helped to support and manage the process). At this point, all CMS schools have been trained.
  - Project Objectives:
    - To develop a series of new data tools for schools, learning communities, and other staff members.
    - To empower staff members to use this data to essentially drive student performance and other key performance indicators on other business factors to drive efficiencies in order to invest those dollars in the classroom and to decrease the variability between schools.
    - Develop a formal process for data usage.
    - Ultimately, create a data culture in which to make informed decisions.

Mr. Davis provided an overview of the system and access to information.

- System: Access to Information: Create a tool to serve three key functions:
  - Goal-setting tool: Allow individuals to plan for the upcoming school year.
  - Daily Management Tool: Provide data on progress towards goals.
  - Evaluation Tool: Provide information to inform the evaluation process.
- Use Case:
  - Ensure alignment with *Strategic Plan 204*. A high priority of the District is to increase graduation rates and the system includes tools to focus on that effort.
  - Arm staff with relevant and timely information.
  - Accessibility.
- New Data Tools developed:
  - Web-based Portals: Teacher Portal provides a classroom perspective of student performance, Principal Portal provides a school level perspective of student performance, and Area Superintendent Portal provides a learning community

perspective of student performance. Target completion for the Teacher Portal is summer 2010 and the completion for the Principal Portal and Area Superintendent portals is fall 2010.

- Performance Reports: Convened a series of focus groups with principals and teachers, and received feedback regarding the Data-views or the prototypes for the creation of the Web Portals and Performance Reports.
- Risk-factor Scorecard: This is an attempt to provide information to help identify students that are high risk for dropout. Through a series of meetings with representatives from Community in Schools, Achievement Zone, and Graduation Task Force, fifteen measures that have a high correlation with dropout were identified. Point values were assigned to the fifteen measures in order to identify students in each grade level.
- End-user Training: The rollout of the new data tools will include mechanisms to ensure staff understands how to use the new tools effectively.
  - The rollout will be phased by leveraging the learning community structure.
  - Train-the-trainer: Individuals in each school will be trained and they will be responsible for supporting their colleagues.
  - Camtasia software will be used to create help videos with audio to support the training model.

Ms. Santonator provided an overview of Data Wise: Using the Information.

- Data Wise: Data Wise is not a computer program or a silver bullet to fix all the woes of a school. Data Wise is an eight step improvement process, developed by researchers and faculty at Harvard University, designed to turn schools into learning organizations capable of continuous introspection. This process has brought a magnitude of change to help school teams to analyze multiple data sources to acquire, plan, and access change around targeted instructional practices that improves student learning outcomes. Both administrators and teachers are inundated daily with data. Through this process along with the portals, schools have the processes to work collaboratively to identify what in teaching practices is causing outcomes with learners. It is difficult to wait until the end of the year to determine where students are in their learning. This cycle will include essential assessment components with periodic check points to evaluate ongoing student learning.
  - Core Value: Accountability must be a reciprocal process.
  - Accomplishments:
    - School Level Data Teams: All 176 schools have a Data Team that has had initial training. The School Data Team consists of the principal, assistant principal, facilitator, and at minimum two teachers.
    - Learning Community Ownership: Played a major part in continuing the work and support of the Data Wise implementation. Each community had one or more staff members to participate on the District Support Team.
    - District Integration/Support Teams: Consisted of fifty-five members (cross-sectional representation) designed to continue building the capacity in the district, control the clarity of messaging, and sustain impact of the work. At any time a teacher interacting with these groups is hearing a consistent message in understanding the impact of the work.

- University Partnership with Winthrop College with the *Leaders for Tomorrow* group who are continuing the work as they build administrators to take future leadership roles in CMS.
- Sustainability: For success of the Data Wise process, it will be the way that we do business in CMS and there is shared ownership with purposeful integration throughout the culture of the organization. For Data Wise to be successful in the schools, it must be aligned with their bold, instructional vision. It is not a process that the schools can fit into their school but their school must fit into the Data Wise process.
- Practitioner Perspective: Chuck Nusinov, principal at David Cox Road Elementary School, shared how the school has embraced Data Wise and how he knows his students are learning. This process began about one year ago and has moved the school forward. Data is used to drive the instructional decision planning. The School Leadership Team conduct data dives and parents are a part of the training process. The School Leadership Team uses data to decide where to allocate money, staff, and what and when to teach next. Staff of the school is excited about the direction in which CMS is moving; the access to real time information in order to make real time decisions; and the use of data to establish best practices. Mr. Nusinov shared charts that he and his staff use on a daily basis for reporting purposes. Charts are also used to provide real time data that is used to make daily, weekly, and monthly decisions to impact the instruction for individual students in the classrooms.

Mr. Davis presented a video demonstration of Data Wise, using the Camtasia software, to pull information and drive instruction. Mr. Avossa said this has been a sample of the work that can be accomplished using this process. There is still work to be done and staff will continue to work with the CMS partners. CMS staff has worked side-by-side with Mariner and are embedded in the project. When that partnership ends, CMS will have the capacity in-house to continue this work, accelerate it, and create ways to adapt it to the nuances of CMS. In keeping with the beat of the Board's Theory of Action, we want to release the potential of the CMS educators. They cannot do the initiatives they want to do in the classrooms and as leaders without formative data, and formative data tools will be provided to teachers on an ongoing basis. Staff believes this is an innovative platform that teachers and principals can access to find the key performance indicators that matter to them. Mr. Avossa said this process will start in the classroom but, ultimately, we hope it will serve all job functions.

Board members were invited to make comments and ask questions.

- Ms. McGarry said she is excited about this project and she hopes it will be in all schools soon. Mr. Avossa said the target date is to be in all schools by August 2010.
- Dr. Waddell said this is valuable information and she thanked everyone for their hard work. Dr. Waddell said many of the indicators are also included in the cumulative folders and she asked will this take the place of some of the areas in which data is already being collected? Mr. Avossa said we must have data points somewhere in the district and pull them together. This process will facilitate efficiency. For example, for a teacher who needs to know what happened in a student's past to understand what is going on, this will provide a one stop shopping environment in which they can check e-

mails, student information, and teacher and principal comments as opposed to spending hours searching through a cumulative folder collecting those information points. This method will provide more efficiency. Dr. Waddell said teachers are asked to do many things throughout the day and she hopes the process of Train-the-Trainer will not cause the teachers to feel overwhelmed. Mr. Avossa said the process has maintained throughout the project an interface with teachers (those who use the tool) and the process has become more intuitive in which teachers have been drawn into the data. Dr. Waddell hopes the process has incorporated accountability so that information cannot get into the wrong hands. Mr. Avossa said the information is password protected to ensure confidentiality.

- Mr. Merchant said this is so cool and exciting, and he thanked staff for the great information. Mr. Merchant said we have been discussing anything that has a dollar value and translating that into the new currency of teachers. He said this is an area in which that currency cannot apply because it will help every teacher to become better. He hopes staff will keep this strategic focus. Dr. Gorman said staff began working on the grant proposal over three years ago and we are very excited about receiving the grant for approximately \$5 million. Mr. Merchant said at some point CMS will have to fund this and he hopes we will maintain this commitment to these types of tools as a Board and as a District. Mr. Merchant asked clarifying questions regarding work team dynamics. Mr. Avossa said CMS needed to be purposeful about embedding CMS staff with the outside partners because they have their own culture and specialties. CMS worked hard to ensure our staff was working side-by-side with those groups to make certain they were providing professional development and support to the CMS staff. When those partners are no longer a part of this initiative, this will facilitate all responsibilities being absorbed by the CMS departments so the work can be continued. Mr. Merchant asked clarifying questions about the development of the new formative assessment tool and how critical is that to the rollout of the portals? Mr. Avossa said it is essential and staff has thoroughly discussed the need to get quality information and data in the hands of teachers. This level of support cannot be provided to teachers without quality measures and in order to do that we must have a tool that provides that information. For years, CMS has created their own evaluations and they are good but their psychometric value is not at the level that a person would need in order to have a predictive value and a sense of validity in the work. Dr. Gorman said this is included in this year's budget under Request for New Initiatives. Mr. Merchant said this is one of the biggest achievements that CMS has accomplished and he commended staff for its ability to communicate between the various systems.
- Mr. Morgan is also excited about this initiative and believes it will be helpful for teachers and administrators. Mr. Morgan asked after this has been in place after a few years will teachers have the ability to review information for students from the previous years to prepare themselves for the challenges of the students for the next school year in order to adjust their teaching style to accommodate the needs of the students? Mr. Avossa said a part of that is embedded in the work and teachers can review some of the previous summative data but we can only work with data that we have currently. Staff members have discussed embedding work samples so that teachers could review the work sample of a student in first grade. In three to five years, we hope to be able to use Camtasia to provide video clips of a master teacher

- teaching a particular concept in which a student may be struggling.
- Ms. Lennon thanked staff for the great information. She also thanked Mr. Nusinov for his leadership and doing a great job that he is doing at David Cox Road Elementary School. Ms. Lennon believes this will be a great process to share information with the Board of County Commissioners and the community on the progress of CMS and how students are being tracked. Mr. Avossa said this tool will be used as a management tool, an indicator of success for efficiency or effectiveness in each of the departments, and provide academic measures which will provide a balanced approach.
  - Chairperson Davis thanked staff for their great work.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Davis called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**Dr. Waddell moved that the Board adjourn the Regular Board meeting, and by consensus, the Board agreed to adjourn the meeting.**

The Regular School Board Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

---

Eric Davis, Chairperson

---

Nancy Daughtride, Clerk to the Board