`Note: A full recording of the meeting is on file in the Clerk's Office and on the School Division website.

A Regular Work Session of the Albemarle County School Board was held on January 22, 2009 at 6:00 p.m., Room 241, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902.

PRESENT: Mr. Stephen Koleszar; Mrs. Pamela Moynihan; Mrs. Diantha McKeel; Mr. Brian Wheeler; Mr. Jon Stokes; Mrs. Barbara Massie Mouly and Mr. Ronnie Price.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Pam Moran, Superintendent**;** Dr. Bruce Benson, Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning; Mr. Josh Davis, Director of Transportation; Mr. Don Vale, Principal on Special Assignment – Instruction; Ms. Sandy Richardson, Community Public Charter School; Mr. Chad Sansing, Lead Teacher at the Public Charter School; Mr. Billy Haun, Principal of Monticello High School; Ms. Carrie Neeley, Principal of Stony Point Elementary; Dr. Matthew Haas, Principal of Albemarle High School; Ms. Kathryn Baylor, Principal of Jack Jouett Middle School; Dr. Bernard Hairston, Executive Director of Community Engagement/Strategic Planning; Ms. Annie Kim, Senior Assistant County Attorney; and Mrs. Jennifer Johnston, Clerk.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call Order.

At 6:08 p.m., Mr. Wheeler called the Albemarle County School Board meeting to order.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Agenda.

Mrs. McKeel offered a **motion** to approve the agenda. Mr. Price **seconded** the motion, **and the motion passed with Mrs. Mouly absent.**

Agenda Item No. 5. Consent Agenda.

5A. Minutes: December 17, 2008 Superintendent's Budget Presentation
5B. Donation to Brownsville Elementary
5C. Donation to Monticello High School
5D. School Bullying Awareness Month Proclamation
5E. Appropriation of Fund Balance – Transportation
5F. Personnel Action

Mrs. McKeel offered a **motion** to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Price **seconded** the motion, **and the motion passed with Mrs. Mouly absent.**

Mr. Wheeler noted there was a typographical error in the spelling of a person's name in the minutes on the consent agenda which the Clerk corrected.

Mr. Wheeler read the School Bullying Awareness Month proclamation recognizing the month of January, 2009 as Virginia School Boards Association Bullying Awareness Month.

Agenda Item No. 6. Announcements.

Director of Transportation: Dr. Benson introduced Mr. Josh Davis, Director of Transportation. Mr. Davis said that he is honored to have been appointed to the Director of Transportation. He received a very warm welcome at the Department of Transportation and spent time meeting people. He said that there are some issues that need to be resolved in the department and the priorities will be safety and efficiency.

Agenda Item No. 7. School Board and Superintendent Business.

Stimulus Package: Dr. Moran shared an email from the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA) regarding the stimulus package that is being advanced at the federal level. One of the components is related with public schools and if it was to pass Albemarle County would receive approximately $5,000,000 spread over two years. Some of the money is targeted towards construction, special education programs, and Title I. She suggested that Mrs. Kegley Scott prepare a letter of support to send to the local legislators.

Mr. Wheeler said that there would be another opportunity to lobby legislators in Congress at the Federal Relations Network Conference in the first week in February.

There was Board consensus for Mrs. Kegley Smith to prepare a letter of support to send to the local legislators and for Mr. Wheeler to lobby legislators in Congress at the Federal Relations Network Conference.

VASS Press Conference: Dr. Moran summarized her attendance at the Virginia Association of School Superintendents press conference on the Governor's budget held January 22, 2009 in Richmond, Virginia.

Agenda Item No. 8. Initiation of Strategic Plan Discussion.

Dr. Benson summarized the staff report which is on file in the School Board Office. He asked the Board to use the guiding questions included in the staff report and enter into a dialogue.

Mr. Koleszar said that he is pleased with the current strategic plan; he thinks it is effective. As it is revamped it should be addressed as revamping and improving, not creating a new strategic plan; build on what the division has and not start over from scratch. Mr. Wheeler said that the sentiment of the Board at the retreat last summer was not to make major changes on the goals; focus on the hedgehog concept. Dr. Moran asked if Mr. Koleszar was saying to look at the work that occurs below the vision, mission, and goals and keep that work more in tact. Mr. Koleszar responded that was correct but it may have to be tweaked; it is not where the Board and staff need to spend most of their energy.

Mr. Stokes said that he was not a Board member when the strategic goals were established but he does not think it was the intention of the School Board to revisit those every two years and viewing it from the outside it seemed like a long and thoughtful process of establishing those for the long term. Mr. Koleszar said the past goals were in place for six to eight years. At that time it was appropriate that they be revamped to make a major change in the strategic plan to reflect all that was learned of the past eight years. He feels the Board needs to continue on the hedgehog as the fly wheel is starting to move.

Mr. Wheeler said that there are a number of things that he would like the Board to discuss; one of them relates to question #5 with the stakeholders; that is a key question that staff will have to think about.

Mrs. Moynihan said the Resource Utilization Study (RUS) comes into play since the strategic plan was completed and there have been some changes made based on the recommendations that were in the study. It would be helpful to get stakeholder and community involvement and set up focus groups to see what the community thinks is good about what has been done in terms on how the division managed to change things after instituting some of the objectives from the study and get some opinions on where the division is today. This does not mean a redoing of the strategic plan; just getting some idea on where the community and stakeholders think the division is today, how far the division has come in the strategic plan, and how far the division has come in utilizing the results of the study. It would good to keep the framework currently in place and work within that framework, but also realize that there have been changes made.

Mrs. McKeel agreed and said that she did not want it to be opened up with large focus groups with everyone from the beginning. She remembers that there was a focus group with the African American and minority community. There were some alarming things that came out in those conversations and that is a group that the Board should go back to, given the achievement gap issues, and ask if they think that it is a better system in dealing with the concerns that they had when the strategic plan was started. Mrs. Moynihan said that same issue should not be revisited, look at current issues. Mrs. McKeel said that it might be very helpful if the reports from the focus groups were provided to the Board because of Mr. Price and Mr. Stokes not being involved in the past. There are reports and minutes from those focus groups.

Mr. Price said that the Quality Council is going to be working on these issues. He said that the Quality Council is collecting data from stakeholders for what the division is doing with SPQA and Baldrige. He suggested the Board look at the data and give the council guidance with respect of what the Board would like to see come back for what they are doing with Baldrige and the strategic plan. He agreed with doing forums around specific topics with some of the topics being strategic goals. He does not think the Board is prepared to have the discussions in light of giving information with respect to what has been done. There is an education component in a community forum in respect to telling them what the division has done and then there is a listening component. Dr. Moran asked if what he was suggesting that the data in the back of the Annual Progress Report that shows graph by graph what the demographics look like in terms of the gap issue. Mr. Price said there is more to it; some of it is the narrative that Dr. Brown and Dr. Benson would share. The Board is still looking for the numbers to change because of some of the things that were newly implemented and having information in respect on what the division is doing and what has been done is pertinent because the community is going to want to talk to the Board but they are also going to say that the division has had this wonderful goal and they are going to want to know what is being done since statistics are out for three to five years before there is a return. Dr. Benson said that the staff needs to talk to some folks on how the division has been spending their time and focusing their efforts. If there is data that would be relevant in showing that the division is moving in the right direction that would have to be connected to those stories. He agreed with Mr. Price in needing to explain what the work has looked like since the strategic plan has been implemented, where the division has focused their resources, the expectations on what is occurring in the classrooms, and in the assessment model. The areas where there is no gain need to be in there as well.

Mrs. McKeel said she would like to get the results of the achievement gap, but also some of the softer issues too. Some of the issues that came out and were more subtle were about how people feel about how welcome individuals feel in the schools, how they are being treated, which is a different than what Mr. Price is looking for. She would like to broaden it a little bit and not look just at scores but also the social issues. Mr. Price said that he and Dr. Brown have been doing mentoring exercises with Burley Middle School where they pull African American male students out of class and ask them those specific questions; sometimes their answers are shocking. Some of the conversations are misleading because some of those conversations are about what some students feel about other students. The Board could instruct Quality Council to include some of these questions in their surveys to the parents, businesses, administrators, and local people. Dr. Moran asked if the Board was suggesting that the division have Quality Council do the facilitation of some of the stakeholder feedback, whether it is qualitative, face time, focus groups, or the quantitative survey rather than bringing in an outside consultant. Mr. Price said that the Quality Council could also use this information in their current work. This goes hand in hand with what Quality Council is doing and where they are in respect to seeking stakeholder feedback; their questions and what they are doing with respect to the work is directed towards the strategic plan. They can be utilized and given some visibility in respect to the division's own community.

Mr. Wheeler asked who the outside stakeholders are involved in the work of Quality Council. Dr. Benson said that each subcommittee of Quality Council is reaching out in to communities in various ways. Staff would have to go to each individual committee to speak on how they are reaching out to their various stakeholders. That could be part of the process to insure the division is getting the stakeholder input from people that the division does not have the opportunity to hear from.

Mr. Price said that there are people who thought the Tele-Town Hall was something that the division normally does. Maybe the division should consider it as one of the open forums for people who can not make it to the meetings. The Tele-Town Hall is another tool that the division has in seeking this kind of input and it would be interesting to see how it would work. Mr. Price asked if there are plans to do another Tele-Town Hall on a different subject rather than the budget. Dr. Moran said that she is not sure about that and she does want to make sure that the Board understands that the division has not budgeted for multiple Tele-Town Halls. Mrs.

McKeel asked if the money that was budgeted for the last Tele-Town Hall was in the School Board Office budget. Dr. Moran said that one meeting was put into the communications budget so anything beyond one was not budgeted. Mr. Wheeler stated that last meeting was the second. Dr. Moran said that it has to be worked out on where the funding is coming. Mrs. McKeel said that there is money in the School Board Reserve. Mr. Wheeler said that the last meeting is going to cost approximately $2,500. Mrs. Johnston informed the Board that the cost was more than $2,500 for the second Tele-Town Hall meeting. Dr. Moran said that she asked Mrs. Johnston to prepare the analysis of the cost for the last meeting.

Mr. Wheeler said that he would benefit from feedback from Quality Council and how they see that fitting in and is what staff is hearing from the Board connected with what they have been thinking. Dr. Benson said one of the things staff is expecting to hear from Quality Council is how the division is doing against world class benchmarks in educational organization; that will provide staff with direction to where the division needs to focus their energy and strategies in moving toward accomplishing division goals. He added that the Quality Council's assessment on how the division is doing is an important part of the mix.

Mr. Stokes asked if there was an initial charge to look at the strategic plan. Dr. Moran said in the assessment one of the things staff is expected to assess is the work of Quality Council and the effectiveness of the strategic planning process. What is going to be seen through the work of Quality Council would become a way to both monitor and reform shifts that need to be made in the strategic plan. Mr. Price said the work of the Quality Council is directly related to the Board's work and they frequently ask what the Board wants from the standpoint they are looking at. When you go through the Baldrige process the first thing is mission, goals, and strategic plan; Baldrige is looking at the mission and strategic plan to see if the work that the division has organized itself to do is fitting back to the strategic plan. The first thing that will be discovered is the work that is being done does not match with what the division is saying needs to be done; the work then needs to be realigned. Quality Council is assessing the data sets, the stakeholder feedback, and a variety of things that answer the Baldrige questions which will result in data points from Quality Council. Mr. Stokes said that he understands that Quality Council is assessing if the division is meeting the strategic plan, but are they assessing the strategic plan or is it beyond what Quality Council should be doing. Mr. Price said that Quality Council is not assessing if the division has the right strategic plan, they are assessing all of the pieces that fall under the strategic plan to see if they match and because of all the work that goes into submitting a Baldrige application, it is going to be difficult for each school to submit an application. There should be discussion on whether that is the model the division wants; the division needs to think about doing one application for all high schools, one for all middle schools, and one for all elementary schools or one application for the division.

Dr. Benson said there has been considerable discussion with the Board on whether or not the division's strategies identified in the strategic plan are impacting the metrics. Quality Council cannot do this work without looking more deeply into the strategic plan and looking at the strategies that are going to make a difference; looking at whether the division is reassessing, looking to see if the data is changing, and are there modifications being made to positively impact the various metrics that are included in the strategic plan. If the strategies are not directly connected to a key metric or are not making a change in the metric, that is a strategy that needs to be abandoned and see what can be done differently. There are a number of cross functional people involved in Quality Council looking at how the division is doing as an organization and the potential for impact and transparency can be accomplished through Quality Council. They would not be the group to say that it is not working and there is a new strategy that should be followed; they need to help the division monitor whether the metrics are being impacted. Dr. Moran said they would identify gaps.

Dr. Moran said that this has not been about the Baldrige award. The award would be a signature that states Albemarle County Public Schools is a distinguished school division. The division is getting kudos from different directions but one of the things Baldrige is about is continuous improvement and there has been discussion on whether to do multiple applications or have the entire division do one make more sense. The most critical piece that comes out of Quality Council, in regards to the strategic improvement work that is done, is the identification of where the division is on approaching attainment of the goals and what are the metrics used to measure that.

Mr. Stokes suggested a discussion on how to apply for Baldrige would be better for another time and focusing on the strategic plan now. Mr. Price said the Quality Council keeps coming back to the Board for that direction; the leadership will have to make that decision as part of the topics being looked at for the balance score card, continuous improvement, Quality Council, and strategic planning. Next week's agenda for Quality Council includes division survey comment summaries by subcommittees, leadership, strategic planning, student stakeholders, market focus, measurement, analysis, knowledge management, work focus, and process management and results. Some of these reports should start coming back to the Board from Quality Council. Dr. Benson said what the Board would be interested in seeing is the gap analysis report as that would inform what needs to be changed in the strategies and in the key metrics that are included in the strategic plan. Mr. Wheeler stated that the Board never said that every unit would apply individually; the Board said that a unit would apply. Dr. Moran said that it was a prototype pilot and she and Dr. Benson need to make sure that staff is articulating with Quality Council and work with them before a recommendation is brought forward to the Board.

Mr. Koleszar suggested that there be a work session with Quality Council to talk about where in the work they see gaps, weaknesses and opportunities in the analyses that they have conducted so far. The Board needs to let the Quality Council know what things need to be corrected and what things are working.

Mr. Wheeler said he did not know the answer to question 2, what should the role of Quality Council in assisting the Division's progress in meeting strategic goals? The discussion at the meeting has helped him see how it is viewed and helps him see what Quality Council would do. He asked if the Board felt that question 2 had been answered.

Dr. Benson wanted to make sure that it is understood that staff is interested in the Quality Council's sub-committee gap analysis of where the division is as an organization which would inform a change in strategies or key metrics in the strategic plan. Dr. Moran added Quality Council should be the facilitating group for when stakeholder and community feedback is collected on vision, mission, and goals.

Mr. Stokes said that it is important to go out to specific stakeholders and it would be easier to do that directly in a work session geared toward the achievement gap as work sessions are designed to bring in different stakeholders; there should not be a limit on the stakeholders attending the work sessions. As he was not part of the strategic planning process, he asked if the vision, mission, and goals were established through the work of a consultant. Dr. Moran said a consultant facilitated a steering team that involved community stakeholders, parents, teachers, principals, and they spoke with students and individuals who were in specific stakeholder groups. Mr. Stokes said that was done to establish the vision, mission, goals, not the strategic plan. Dr. Moran said that work was directly with the vision, mission, and goals work. Then the focus group feedback was brought to the steering group which was also a representative group that brought perspectives to the table and that group worked with the facilitator to craft the language of the vision, mission, and goals which was discussed in length. There are two ways to approach this; the Board could devote meetings to different stakeholder groups or Quality Council could do the work and provide the information to the Board.

Mrs. McKeel said that the Board would get better information if the Board devoted meetings to different stakeholder groups. Mr. Wheeler said that the discussion is touching on question 1, what role does the Board want to play? and question 5, How does the Board want to get the stakeholder feedback? To follow-up on Mr. Stokes question on the strategic plan process, the Board was involved up front when the process got kicked off, but was not involved as it was being developed. Mrs. McKeel said the Board had a proposal for the vision, mission, and goals, but the proposals came to the Board from the group. The Board did not look at information and then craft them, they were already crafted and the Board did some editing. Dr. Moran said that staff brought forward recommendations from the steering team and the Board edited them. The facilitator focused on how much time was to be used on word smithing versus talking about the big ideas to be categorized.

Mr. Stokes said that since the division approves of the vision, mission, and goals it would be interesting to target a few interest groups to see where the concern is. Mr. Koleszar said when talking about focus groups you have to be careful who gets selected for those groups because you can select two different minority focus groups and get two completely different results. Mr. Stokes said that because it may be problematic to choose a focus group saying that the Board does not want to hear what teachers have to say. Mr. Koleszar said that care needs to be taken in selecting focus groups. The reason why there was a good minority focus group is because the minority community was not being heard or being represented by other focus groups and the consultant advised to create a focus group that could be heard. Mrs. McKeel added that the consultant brought in minority facilitators and the Board was not part of those groups. Dr. Moran said the Board or Superintendent was not invited to sit in on any of the focus groups because of the concern that the context of what the group felt comfortable saying was going to change. One of the reasons why focus groups are run in a private forum is to be able to give people the opportunity to feel free to discuss whatever they choose. Mr. Stokes said the work of the Quality Council is going to be important to informing the Board on status, but the only voice that the Board hears should not be that of the Quality Council. Mr. Wheeler said the last time it was addressed the Board made sure that they got the raw material from each focus group. Dr. Benson said that has been tried to be carried forward through the work session format by making sure people are not always in agreement with the work going on in the division. The Board gets perspective from people on the areas that need to be improved, depending on the work session topic; it is a balanced perspective to insure that all voices have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Price said the Board needs to make sure they have access to the survey information that Quality Council has from the stakeholders. First, know that there is work occurring with Quality Council, teachers, parents, and community members being surveyed and the Board should have access to the summary data and the hard data; second, pull a couple of goals from the strategic plan and ask Quality Council to do focus groups around those particular topics to get face-to-face time and answers with the community. This may solve the question of the survey data and give an opening for the Quality Council to invite different groups to talk. Dr. Benson said that he is hearing that there is a third area of interest of the Board wanting to hear from some focus groups directly. The work session on the achievement gap would be an opportunity to get direct input to the Board from various stakeholder groups. Mr. Stokes said a great part of that discussion should be on the strategic plan and in relationship to Goal 3 and finding out from the stakeholders how it works and what their opinion is on closing the achievement gap.

Mr. Wheeler stated that when there is a specific work session topic there may be direct stakeholder input. **There was Board consensus to direct staff to have Quality Council facilitate the stakeholder piece with the assumption the Board will not be involved.**

Dr. Benson said he will summarize the discussion of this meeting and put it into a series of next steps as staff goes through the next few months and make sure it is brought back to the Board in advance of the next board meeting so it can be affirmed that it is how the Board wants staff to proceed.

Mr. Wheeler referred to Question 1, what is the Board's role in the strategic planning review/revision process? He said the reading material from *Five Habits of High-Impact School Boards* is not seen as something that is done as a Board as a whole. He noted there is not a government structure in place for the Board to effectively revise the strategic plan.

Mrs. Moynihan said the Board should not be getting fully involved in the minutia of the details of the strategic plan. Staff should do the ground work and give the Board a framework. She prefers the Board manage the process and make sure everyone's concerns are addressed, the plan is updated, and everything in the plan is what the division wants to achieve in the future.

Mr. Wheeler referred to Question 3, what differences are there between strategic planning and implementation? He said the information on the strategic plan on the web site is an improvement from what was there before but it is still a static document. One of the things that came out of the Darden School work last summer was the intention to make this a Balanced Scorecard by taking the current strategic plan and putting it into an online scorecard that can be shared with the Board and community. The Quality Council is going to need the Balanced Scorecard in place when having stakeholder conversations. He suggested staff speak to that goal and how they see having the Balanced Scorecard and taking the current strategic plan and fitting it into this process. Dr. Moran said the concept of progress management, Balanced Scorecard, Quality Council, and strategic planning is a level of congruency being developed. A Balanced Scorecard is the way that anyone in the division and community is able to see the progress the school division is making toward its attainment of its goals as measured by the specific performance indicators that are set in place; this gives a formative and summative way to see where the division is. The concept of project management fits because it states the big key work the division is investing in to move forward, what is the division doing to deliver what is being done in a timely manner, and being able to tie those deliverables to the performance indicators that are being measured. Quality Council forms a multi-user cross functional team which includes both stakeholders that work inside and outside of the system, and in the community; that helps the division stay honest and continue to improve in the areas of the Baldrige indicators, which are the critical variables that occur inside organizations that improve; she sees Quality Council assuming that role. The strategic plan can become a document that becomes static, outside and parallel to the real work, so the strategic work that is documented inside the plan needs to be the work of the division and brought under the umbrella with an Assistant Superintendent charged with systems planning; there will be a person who is in a monitoring role across each piece of the puzzle.

Mr. Koleszar said someone has to carefully monitor what the division's outcome measures are to make sure the outcome measures are those that accomplish the strategic goals. Mr. Wheeler said that Doug Eadie describes it as having the Board focused on the innovation piece and in the metrics this is at the top of the Board and Superintendent's priority; the measurements and strategies are the work of the Superintendent. As staff has been reflecting on the Darden work and trying to put this into a Balanced Scorecard, there has been discussion on whether the division has the right measurement indicators. Mr. Koleszar said not getting the numbers that are not driving behaviors is what needs to be seen. Mr. Wheeler stated that when this is discussed again in depth staff needs to recommend what needs to be changed and influenced by Quality Council's work. Dr. Benson said that moving to the Balanced Scorecard model is the means for the division to measure their progress in accomplishing the strategies to support the goals in the strategic plan. In order for the community to assess how the division is doing they need to see how the division is doing against the metrics. The red light, green light, and yellow light needs to be put in each of the strategies to see whether or not the division is positively impacting the metrics.

Mr. Price said that even though the Balanced Scorecard is a complicated tool it may be the best tool to use to visually show that. He asked who the owner of the Balanced Scorecard becomes as he does not see that fitting in with the Quality Council piece; he sees it being owned by the Superintendent or the School Board as it needs to be updated. Dr. Benson stated that as part of what staff is trying to accomplish in the restructuring of Central Office, staff is moving towards a model where there will be a Chief Information Officer who will be in charge of accountability for the division; not just student achievement but accountability for the division meeting all of the goals in the strategic plan across various departments. He said there is an independent arm responsible for the metrics the Board is interested in looking at in the course of the year.

Mr. Wheeler pointed out that he did look at the Human Resources SPQA application to see how well Goal 3 was aligned to the application. In discussion with Ms. Suyes, she stated that there is a challenge of having an application that reflects both local government and the school division. There are a few key measurement indicators that are on the school division's list and not on the SPQA application. This is the kind of alignment the School Board needs to be focusing on. He is confident that Ms. Suyes has them in other places and is focused on them, but the Board wants to look for that alignment to see how well Goal 3 is aligned to the application. He said that this comes into Question 6, How should department and school-level improvement planning be connected to the Division's strategic planning process? He said there is alignment at the school level with principals presenting school information to the parent community and that is the kind of alignment that needs to be seen in all of the departments. It is difficult for one school or unit to take the Baldrige SPQA application and cover all the bases. Mr. Price asked which application Human Resources was riding with when local government is submitting the application along with the school division. Dr. Benson said there could be metrics that would look different when there is a department serving more than one organization. The metrics for teacher retention could look different than what is trying to be accomplished with law enforcement recruitment and retention. He suggested there be measures for both of those things.

Mr. Wheeler said as he looks through the planning document, some of the Board/Superintendent Priorities that had been agreed upon will have different opinions come summer. He added that everything that is being done as part of this plan leads to a well informed review of the priorities.

Dr. Moran said that this conversation should be a small part of every meeting to make sure that staff is in the loop of the feedback from the Board. She suggested that staff come back to the Board with an outline of what was discussed to assure that the communication was correct. She asked Mrs. Johnston to make the notes taken at this meeting be more verbatim in order for staff to know where to go in their next steps.

Mr. Wheeler stated that five of the seven Board members voted on work session topics and number three of the rankings is SPQA and Baldrige. He suggested that staff think about the appropriate timing for that work session. Dr. Moran suggested bringing in the co-chairs from the group as that it is approximately eighteen people. (There was a break from 7:25 p.m. until 7:39 p.m.)

Agenda Item No. 9. Budget Work Session.

Dr. Benson summarized the staff report, which is on file in the School Board Office. He reviewed with the Board the set-up for the work session.

Community Public Charter School

Mr. Vale reviewed the budget information for the Community Public Charter School, which is on file in the School Board Office. Ms. Richardson informed the Board where the Community Public Charter School is presently and the future plans of fundraising for the school. Mr. Vale stated that there is a current commitment of $36,000 from an anonymous donor due to come to the school on February 1, 2009.

Mrs. McKeel asked that the Board be notified of the fundraisers taking place.

Mr. Vale highlighted the critical challenges which are as follows:

1. Literacy and numeracy which prepares the students to be successful members of the global community.
2. Funding.
3. Building space needs.
4. Administrative support.

Mr. Stokes asked for the operational costs. Mr. Vale said $11,000 is division funds for operating and grant monies provide the supplies and materials along with furniture and fixtures. The private donations allow the art infusion. He said the total of the grant monies and private donations is significant but he did not have the actual figure. Mr. Stokes asked when the initial $400,000 is expected to be spent. Mr. Vale said that with the extension recently granted, it will have to be spent by the end of next year. The purchase of the furniture for all three grade levels will be able to be put into storage. Mr. Stokes asked if that also covers the additional staffing. Mr. Vale responded that it did.

Mrs. Mouly asked if the principal's salary would come out of county funding. Mr. Vale said that was correct. Mrs. Mouly asked the population of the school. Mr. Vale said that the present population is twenty-three students and the target is thirty-six students per grade level. Mr. Stokes asked what the principal's salary would be.

Mrs. Moynihan asked if there was a principal position in the original plan. Mr. Vale said that there was a principal position planned for the third year. Mrs. Moynihan said that she thought the plan was to piggy back on the administrators at Burley Middle School. Ms. Richardson said that initially the principal at Burley Middle School would be the principal on record, but would not be required to do the daily administrative duties. Mrs. Moynihan asked who is presently doing the administrative duties. Mr. Vale said that he was. Mrs. Moynihan said that she is curious to know how much administrative duties are necessary for thirty students. Mr. Vale invited Mrs. Moynihan to visit the school. He added that there is no clerical support and he is doing that as well. Mrs. Moynihan asked if it was possible to piggy back off of Burley's clerical staff. Mr. Vale said, as stated in the charter, there was to be little impact on the Burley staff as the relationship with having a school within a school is being something that is being built, he added that the Charter School utilizes Burley's nurse and psychologist. Mrs. Moynihan expressed concern that they are coming to the Board and asking for a principal for thirty students. Ms. Richardson noted at the first year of Murray High School there was a full staff of ten for thirty six students and fully funded by the county. There are demands on the staff for a start-up school in terms of implementing new processes and tweaking programs that by the time the school has been in existence for ten to fifteen years, those processes and programs run like clockwork. She said that it is demanding on the staff that is currently in place to take care of those things. Mrs. Moynihan asked if Murray High School was created in a separate building. Dr. Moran said that it began an old elementary school which had been closed, and opened as a self-sustaining school. Mrs. Moynihan said there is no comparison because in essence Burley is an established school building with an established administration that had room for the Charter School.

Mr. Stokes asked if the additional needed space for the Charter School is going to be at Burley. Mr. Vale said that has not been determined and there is discussion with Building Services to determine what will be the best fit for the school. Mr. Stokes asked if there is a possibility that the Charter School will be at another location. Dr. Moran stated that Mr. Letteri was asked to look at the existing Murray High School as there is potential of making a shift for the additional space needed. Mr. Letteri is working on a plan that might involve minimal CIP work.

Mrs. McKeel asked if the transportation for the Charter School is working out. Mr. Vale responded that it is with the shuttle service that transports students to Murray High School.

Mr. Sansing commented on the progress and needs of the Community Public Charter School.

Mrs. McKeel asked for information on the curriculum at the Community Public Charter School. Mr. Price asked if it could be aligned on where the students are with respect to the standard curriculum. Mr. Sansing said there has been time spent with the mastery learning but the students are acclimating themselves to what the Charter School does. The Charter School is conscience to aligning to the standard curriculum but look at it through arts infusion with enough literacy support for the students to succeed. Mr. Sansing summarized a typical day of learning at the Charter School which includes the students having a choice on what subjects they would like to study that day.

Mr. Wheeler said that he is looking forward to his visit to the Charter School and spoke of his visit to Murray High School for their 20th Anniversary and listening to the stories told by the teachers at Murray High School. He said these are special students and it takes time to build the culture and staff.

Dr. Benson said the Charter School does have unique challenges and will continue to seek solutions. It is important that the Board understand what the present challenges are. He added that the school population is growing significantly and there are wonderful opportunities.

<u>Principals Perspective on the Superintendent's Funding Request</u>

Dr. Benson stated that there will be representation from multiple feeder patterns and school levels to share their perspective on the Superintendent's Funding Request. There will also be discussion from the Design Committee that has been working on the instructional coaching model. Dr. Moran added that Ms. Neeley brings two hats to the table in perspective of central and school based.

The following are principal's perspective of the Superintendents Funding Request and the Instructional Coaching Model:

<u>Mr. Haun</u>

- Likes that there is no increase in class sizes
- The budget supports the School Board's goals

- Retaining teachers
- Reorganization in Central Office is working
- It gets us to where we need to be while protecting what is important.

Ms. Neeley

- Literacy Specialists being reorganized were originally coaches in schools
- It will be difficult for schools who rely on their literacy specialists primarily being their reading teachers
- The coaching model is an opportunity to implement the three leavers that are going to move the students forward

Mrs. Moynihan asked if there will be students who will lose achievement as a result of not having access to targeted reading specialists. Ms. Neeley, speaking for Stony Point Elementary School, said that it is going to be a challenge, but overall her preference will be first best instruction as it is the most significant aspect to consider. Research states that students who are challenged in the area of literacy need intense instruction. She added Title I schools have the advantage of having reading specialist in the schools.

Mrs. McKeel asked for clarification on first instruction. Ms. Neeley said that one of the most important things is the relationship piece where students have a strong relationship with their classroom teachers. Teachers are always asked what intervention they can give internally first.

Dr. Moran said that it has been heard from folks over the years that when a literacy specialist is a coach it helps classroom teachers get better at using good reading teaching practices. Some of the issues that emerge for students, that cause them to need additional reading support, might not have happened if they had a teacher who effectively knew great reading strategies. She said an elementary teacher can go through a training program, graduate from a university with a degree and a license, and have only three hours of a reading course going into teaching. This teaching model instructs and assists teachers on the job with good reading teacher practice.

Mrs. Moynihan asked how this would affect the middle and high school levels. Mr. Haun said that the coaching model is the way to go. It will give the division the opportunity to go back and get more unified across the district; schools will learn from each other on how each is doing different things.

Dr. Haas

- The ownership of students that are struggling should be assigned to one person
- More technology where teachers can do their pre-assessments
- Students work with teachers that are teaching them reading
- Getting teachers involved in the reading program will increase with the coaching model

Ms. Baylor

- Schools will start sharing their best practices
- The needs of the students will still be met
- Rigor can be encouraged because of the opportunities the coaches meet vertically

Mr. Koleszar said that the coaching model is going to work out better but he does have concern with having less full time employees (FTEs) doing the same amount of work. He suggested not reducing the FTEs. He asked if there are going to be too many staff for the first year of implementation making it ineffective. Ms. Baylor said if staff does their job correctly they will be working in a cooperative fashion and get better value out of the staff on hand.

Mrs. McKeel asked what is going to sustain this new model. Dr. Benson responded that the design team has developed a model that looks at consistency in implementation across schools such that staff will be hired by a collaborative and there will be a division role in the management piece resulting in greater consistency in implementation. Dr. Moran added that what the division has learned is that the literacy specialists and Curriculum and Technology Integration Partners (CTIPs) were assigned to schools with twenty-five schools working to develop that model. The reality is that those positions have a blended perspective in terms of central consistency with building based support.

Mrs. Mouly asked when and where does the coaching occur. Mr. Haun said coaching will happen in many different ways. It is not one set model and has to be a cooperative piece with teachers with creditability who have done the work to be able to go into a teacher's classroom and coach them. Mrs. Mouly asked what the difference is between fixing it and coaching. Mr. Haun said the fix-it model is when a teacher has issues with classroom management which is part of the Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA) model which the principal should be working with; coaches are there for instructional purposes.

Mrs. McKeel asked if there will still be an endorsed reading specialist on the instructional coaching team. Dr. Benson said that staff has met with all the specialists for feedback on critical functionality that should be preserved going into the new model. Expertise is needed in a variety of areas with literacy being one of those areas. Mrs. McKeel asked if the teams will have reading specialist. Dr. Moran stated that the division has not necessarily had literacy specialists who have master's degrees in reading. Mr. Haun added that schools may have a literacy specialist but not a reading specialist. Dr. Benson said that expertise is across a variety of areas, so how these teams are formed will need to have a collaborative that will span multiple areas. There will be areas that are looked at with both vertical and horizontal collaboration in order for staff to share and connect across grade levels and schools. The feedback from the design team and the specialists is being used to draft the job descriptions that will be shared with the leadership team on January 27th in the K12 business meeting.

Dr. Moran stated that it is expected that strong math specialists, literacy specialists, new teacher advisors, CTIPS, and other possible classroom teachers are going to compete for the new coaching positions. She said it has been heard from constituents, parents, and teachers that the most important area to preserve in the budget was class size. The division saved $1,000,000 in staffing by going to the coaching model; that could have come at the expense of class size. She added it is believed that great coaches will be a support to the best teachers in the division and continue to grow professionally.

Dr. Haas said this is going to take instruction to the next level. Effective coaches and teacher leaders will attract energy and take them beyond the supervision mode where staff is going to look forward for their coach to come in and work with their Professional Learning Community (PLC) team and see results beyond the Standards of Learning (SOL) scores.

Ms. Baylor stated that there is no hierarchy in teachers to allow them to help others besides becoming an administrator which makes this coaching model a great opportunity for the teachers.

Mrs. Moynihan said that the idea of keeping students in their classrooms with their peers is a good one. She noted the enthusiasm from staff members with this new model working and being able to learn from each other.

Mr. Stokes said this model is a creative way of saving money. He added that the whole concept of the PLC is having teachers who are master teachers but not labeled as such. He asked how this is different in theory than PLCs. Dr. Haas said that is helps with the transfer across schools. Ideas that have been working well in one school can be brought to the content teams of other schools and help pollinate the work being done and take it to the next level. He said so much trust has been developed that when the coach comes in the teachers are working in an environment of trust, they are used to looking at each other's work, and making suggestions that the new coaching model is ready to fly. All the work that has been done has made it possible to streamline and go with a different model. Mrs. Mouly noted that it allays her concern that the rank and file might feel that it is one more instance of someone looking over their shoulder.

Mr. Haun said that there are twenty-five PLC teams within Monticello High School; some are stronger than others and know how to look at the data and do the instruction and some don't, which makes is possible that some of the PLC teams could use some coaching. He added that the coaching model would be a great help to close the achievement gap with having communication throughout the schools so each school could see what the others are doing to achieve closing the achievement gap.

Mrs. McKeel commended the educational leaders for being confident enough to take on a new model and be willing to implement it in the classroom. Dr. Moran noted that the educational leaders came together quickly along with their peers and did yeoman's work in building the framework for this concept. She said there are communications issues that need to be addressed and to stay on top and it should be a project charter with specific outcomes that will be monitored and focused on.

Mr. Koleszar said that the division is using these tools so everyone can improve and if it does that and keeps focus on the students it has a good chance to succeed.

Mr. Stokes said that trust is built through good communication which means anything new and different; the division needs to be communicated early and often. Dr. Moran stated that Dr. Benson has talked to each group directly to make sure that everyone who has been touched by this is being heard and given opportunity for feedback.

Mrs. Mouly stated her concern of the rank and file having time to process the change. Ms. Baylor said that there is concern but once staff sees that strong people will be hired for the teams and that it is going to run smoothly they will adapt.

Mrs. Moynihan commended staff's can do attitude and their cooperation as a team to make this new model a success.

Extended Day Enrichment Program (EDEP)

Mr. Koleszar asked if the extended day program at Yancey Elementary School is having a material effect on the achievement gap. Dr. Moran said that she would have discussion on this program after Dr. Hairston summarizes his report as the Yancey program runs outside of the model that the school division has.

Mrs. Moynihan asked what is being done in a self-sustaining fund to afford this kind of program with special needs. Dr. Hairston said that the statement in the report is not accurate as work has taken place in the past two months where the Special Education department is providing services to the staff on the writing of and the services rendered through IEPs. In terms of the economics and staffing; because of many part-time staff, it is difficult to retain them over an extended time period which results in staff turnover. Mrs. Moynihan asked for clarification on how the program affords to have one-on-one support with special needs students and still have a program with regular education students. Dr. Hairston said the funding for the services for the special education student comes from the Special Education Department. Mrs. Moynihan noted that the school division is supplying funds to the program even though it is self-sustaining. Dr. Hairston stated that by law the school division is required to fund for special education services.

Mr. Stokes asked about the cause of the difficulty in retaining the part-time staff. Dr. Hairston said that it a combination of salary, hours, and lack of benefits. Mr. Stokes asked if there is any information on students attending the EDEP and where they fall in the achievement spectrum. Dr. Hairston stated that information is not available at this time; he will get the information and provide it to the Board. Mr. Stokes said that this is an opportunity to address achievement issues. This is an area where the division needs to look at programs that do not work and considering programs that do work. He suggested the information brought back to the Board include who is in these programs and where they fall in the achievement spectrum. Dr. Hairston stated that the EDEP leadership is doing an exceptional job implementing the Framework for Quality Learning concept as part of their performance. Mr. Reid has worked with his leadership staff to acclimate them to writing the learning lessons and implementing those as part of instructional execution through the after-school program. Staff is trying to establish partnerships with the principals to articulate what they are doing and connect it to with the pacing guides that classroom teachers use.

Dr. Moran said that through intervention/prevention funding many of the elementary schools offer tutorial time where students that need intervention/prevention services are working with trained teachers after school. She added that another thing that has been built in as a consistent part of the after-school programming is a homework help time, so students have a block of time after school where they can work on their homework and get assistance.

Mr. Price said that it would cost more to get trained educators working for EDEP. It would be interesting to see the data to see if the students are being affected by EDEP. The in-school programs are the real gains for students because the staff is directly connected to the frameworks and the model. He suggested exploring how to make EDEP a stronger program.

Mrs. McKeel asked what happens to the students whose families cannot afford to send them to EDEP. Dr. Hairston said the tuition is a sliding scale and there are strict rules, in terms of payment. Dr. Moran added that it is a pre-pay schedule opposed to a post-pay. Dr. Hairston said that there has been an increase in people asking for assistance. Dr. Moran noted that there are times that groups associated with social services have contributed to scholarship funding for individual students in addition to the built in cushion. She pointed out that the Launch Program is a summer program for students who are potential leaders in middle school but had at-risk factors associated with their profile in school.

Dr. Moran noted a concern of the gap for the middle school students who do not get the support that is offered to the elementary students with EDEP.

Dr. Benson stated that EDEP does carry a fund balance to protect the services being provided and ensure payment to staff employed by the division.

Mr. Koleszar asked for information on the affect on achievement of students attending after-school programs to be provided in *Superintendent's Letter*. Dr. Moran said that data on this issue will be provided to the Board and she noted that the division is no longer able to have staff in these programs track students individually in terms of economic status. That information has been blocked from principals, teachers, and staff such as community education through the No Child Left Behind Act.

Agenda Item No. 10. Public Comment. None.

Agenda Items No. 11. Other Business by Board Members/Superintendent.

Mr. Koleszar said that the Audit Committee met and received the final audit. There were no qualifications and one of the constant sore points has been corrected through Access Albemarle. The Board of Supervisors will approve the report and the School Board will receive a copy in *Superintendent's Letter*.

Mrs. McKeel reminded the Board of the CATEC kick-off being held January 23rd at Fashion Square Mall at noon.

Mr. Stokes asked for more information on the Charter School budget. Dr. Benson said that an update will be provided to the Board.

Dr. Benson reminded the Board that the next budget meeting will be the public hearing on Tuesday, January 27th at Burley Middle School's auditorium at 6:30 p.m. The work session on Thursday, February 3rd will be the Board's opportunity to decide what direction to go with the Superintendent's Funding Request.

Mr. Wheeler announced that there will be a test meeting in ElectronicSchoolBoard at the meeting on Monday, January 26th. He asked that those attending bring their laptops. Mrs. Mouly asked if there would be another opportunity for a trial run for those who will not attend the meeting Monday. Mr. Wheeler suggested the Board see how the first trial run goes and then make a decision.

Mr. Wheeler noted that Virginia National Bank is displaying art work from Jack Jouett Middle School.

Mr. Wheeler commented on the Tele-Town Hall meeting held Wednesday, January 21st and asked for feedback from the Board. There was positive Board feedback. Mr. Wheeler said that there was an improvement from the last Tele-Town Hall meeting with the new vendor. He noted that the podcast of the meeting is on the web site. VSBA has asked the Board to present on Tele-Town Hall meetings at the Annual Convention in November 2009.

Agenda Item No. 12. Closed Meeting. None.
Agenda Item No. 13. Certify Closed Meeting. None.

Agenda Item No. 14. Adjournment.

At 9:32 p.m., Mr. Price offered a **motion** to adjourn the meeting of the Albemarle County School Board. Mrs. McKeel **seconded** the motion, **and the motion passed unanimously.**

____
Chairman

____
Clerk