

Approved by the Charlotte-
Mecklenburg Board of Education
March 11, 2008
Regular Board Meeting



Charlotte, North Carolina

October 23, 2007

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

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education held a Regular Board Meeting on October 23, 2007. The meeting began at 4:38 p.m. and was held in Room 267 of the Government Center.

Present: Joe I. White, Jr., Chairperson, Member At-Large;
Molly Griffin, Vice-Chairperson, (District 5);
Kaye McGarry, Member At-Large;
Trent Merchant, Member At-Large;
Larry Gauvreau (District 1);
Tom Tate (District 4); and
Ken Gjertsen (District 6)

Absent: Vilma Leake (District 2) and
George Dunlap (District 3)

Also present at the request of the Board were Dr. Peter Gorman, Superintendent; Maurice Green, Chief Operating Officer; Regina H. Bartholomew, General Counsel; and Nancy Daughtridge, Clerk to the Board.

Upon motion by Mr. Tate, seconded by Mr. Merchant, 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, including but not limited to the litigation involving M.B. White; and**
- **To consider a personnel matter of an administrative employee**

The motion was made pursuant to Section 143-318.11(a) of the North Carolina General Statutes and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

Chairperson White reconvened the Regular Board Meeting at 6:10 p.m. in Room 267 of the Government Center. CMS TV Channel 3 televised the meeting.

Present: Joe White, Chairperson, Member At-Large;
Molly Griffin, Vice-Chairperson, (District 5);
Kaye McGarry, Member At-Large;
Trent Merchant, Member At-Large;

Larry Gauvreau (District 1);
Vilma D. Leake (District 2);
George Dunlap (District 3);
Tom Tate (District 4); and
Ken Gjertsen (District 6)

Absent: There were no absences

Also present at the request of the Board were Dr. Peter Gorman, Superintendent; Regina H. Bartholomew, General Counsel; Carole Love, Manager of Board Services; Members of Executive and Senior Staffs; and Nancy Daughtridge, Clerk to the Board.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson White called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Chairperson White welcomed everyone to the Board's second meeting of the month which will be held in a Work Session format. He apologized for starting the meeting late and he noted that the Board had been conducting business in a Closed Session meeting.

A. Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Leake said she was not ready to adopt the agenda at this time because she had requested an item regarding Partners in Out of School Time (POST) to be on the agenda. The item was not on the agenda and she had not been informed that her request had been denied. Chairperson White said there is a process for Board members to follow for placing items on the agenda and he was aware that Ms. Leake had requested this item. He had left a telephone message for Ms. Leake to inform her that the agenda for this meeting was heavy and that her item would be on the agenda for the November 9, 2008 Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Leake requested that a full report on POST be added to the agenda for the next meeting to include who approved the program and the associated costs.

Chairperson White asked the Board to approve adding two items to the agenda as a result of business in Closed Session. The items were as follows:

Add Action Item III.A. (Recommend the adoption of proposed 2007-2008 CMS Goals and proposed 2007-2008 Individual Goals as outlined in Dr. Gorman's employment contract).

Ms. Griffin moved, seconded by Mr. Merchant, that the Board approve adding Action Item III.A. (Recommend the adoption of proposed 2007-2008 CMS Goals and proposed 2007-2008 Individual Goals as outlined in Dr. Gorman's employment contract), and the Board voted 9-0 in support of the motion.

Add Report Item IV.B. (Report/First Reading on revisions for Policy AE: The CMS Comprehensive Accountability System).

Ms. Griffin moved, seconded by Mr. Dunlap, that the Board approve adding Report Item IV.B. (Report/First Reading on revisions for Policy AE: The CMS Comprehensive Accountability System), and the Board voted 9-0 in support of the motion.

Mr. Gauvreau asked the Board to approve adding Action Item III.B. (Recommend approval that the Board waives its attorney-client privilege on two Closed Session documents related to the 2007 Bond campaign). Mr. Gauvreau said there were two documents discussed in Closed Session that should be made available to the public.

Mr. Gauvreau moved, seconded by Mr. Gjertsen, that the Board approve adding Action Item III.B. (Recommend approval that the Board waives its attorney-client privilege on two Closed Session documents related to the 2007 Bond campaign), and the Board voted 2-7 and the motion failed. Mr. Gauvreau and Mr. Gjertsen voted in support of the motion. Chairperson White, Ms. Griffin, Ms. McGarry, Mr. Merchant, Ms. Leake, Mr. Dunlap, Mr. Tate, and Mr. Gjertsen voted against the motion.

Ms. Leake moved, seconded by Ms. Griffin, that the Board adopt the agenda as amended, and a discussion followed.

Mr. Gauvreau requested a Point of Personal Privilege to discuss this item further. Chairperson White said this would not be appropriate at this time and he asked Ms. Bartholomew for her legal opinion on his decision. Ms. Bartholomew said there is no Personal Privilege in Robert's Rules of Order and it would not be appropriate to discuss an item that is not on the agenda. Mr. Gauvreau requested to Appeal to the Chair. Chairperson White asked the Board to vote on allowing Mr. Gauvreau request to Appeal to the Chair with no discussion.

Mr. Gauvreau requested an Appeal to the Chair. The Board voted 4-5 and Mr. Gauvreau's motion failed. Ms. McGarry, Mr. Gauvreau, Mr. Tate, and Mr. Gjertsen voted in support of the motion. Chairperson White, Ms. Griffin, Mr. Merchant, Ms. Leake, and Mr. Dunlap voted against the motion.

The Board voted 9-0 to adopt the agenda as amended.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

- A. Recommend approval of appointment of administrative personnel.
- B. Construction items.
 - 1. Recommend approval of construction contract for North Mecklenburg High School.

Ms. Leake moved, seconded by Mr. Dunlap, that the Board adopt Consent Items A. and B., and the Board voted 9-0 in support of the motion.

Dr. Gorman did not have any administrative appointments to present.

III. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Recommend adoption of the 2007-2008 Proposed CMS Goals and the 2007-2008 Proposed Individual Goals as outlined in Dr. Gorman's employment contract

Ms. Griffin moved, seconded by Mr. Tate, that the Board approve the proposed 2007-2008 CMS Goals and the proposed 2007-2008 Individual Goals as outlined in Dr. Gorman's employment contract regarding his performance evaluation, and a discussion

followed.

- Ms. Leake said she had voiced her concerns in Closed Session regarding this matter. She wants to ensure the proposed goals and process will move to close the achievement gap for all children in the district and the 2010 Plan will reduce the number of Focus Schools.
- Mr. Gauvreau expressed concern that the Board discussed three documents in Closed Session and this is the only item that will be included on this agenda. He believes the documents discussed in Closed Session should be presented to the public. Mr. Gauvreau asked Ms. Griffin to explain the motion.
- Ms. Griffin said pursuant to Dr. Gorman's employment contract, the Board is required by October 31 of each year to adopt the performance evaluation system that will be used to determine Dr. Gorman's bonus at the end of that school year. The motion before the Board is the adoption of the proposed system and the individual goals as presented by Dr. Gorman and, upon their adoption, they will become public information so that the public will know how the Board will evaluate Dr. Gorman.
- Mr. Gauvreau expressed concern that the Board would not be discussing an evaluation document that was reviewed in Closed Session.
- Chairperson White said the document referred to was a draft document that needed to be revised. That document will be adopted by the Board at a later time and, upon its adoption, it will be made available to the public. At this point, that is a draft document only.

The Board voted 8-1 in support of the motion. Chairperson White, Ms. Griffin, Ms. McGarry, Mr. Merchant, Ms. Leake, Mr. Dunlap, Mr. Tate, and Mr. Gjertsen voted in support of the motion. Mr. Gauvreau voted against the motion.

Mr. Dunlap requested that the attorney advise the Board on the proper way to address this issue. He said the Board must follow protocol because they are charged with certain responsibilities as Board members. Closed Session items should remain Closed Session items. He expressed concern that colleagues were trying to manipulate the process to discuss in public issues that are privileged information and that should not be allowed. Chairperson White said thus far, Board members have been in order with Robert's Rules of Order and the rules agreed upon by this Board. He encouraged Board members to only discuss the items on the agenda.

IV. REPORTS/INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Management Oversight Report on District Accountability System

Chairperson White called upon Dr. Gorman to introduce the report. Dr. Gorman said this presentation will be the Management Oversight Report on the district's Accountability System which is aligned with Board Reform Governance Policy AEC (Data Dashboard) and Policy AE (CMS Comprehensive Accountability System). Dr. Gorman called upon Jonathan Raymond, Chief Accountability Officer, to present the report. Dr. Gorman thanked Mr. Raymond and his staff for their time and hard work in developing the important documents. Dr. Gorman also thanked representatives from Rand Corporation, Mariner, and Cambridge Education for their contributions to the process. He said the report will also review a proposed School Progress Report. Dr. Gorman said the Data Dashboard was designed to include

specific points as outlined in Policy AEC. The goal of the Data Dashboard will enable the Board of Education and the public to monitor key indicators of system performance. The Data Dashboard will be a concise but comprehensive summary of district performance; presents data in a clear and easily understood format; communicates the priorities of the Board to the community; and contains regularly updated information. Mr. Raymond provided the Board a review of the proposed CMS Performance Data Dashboard. He said in March, the Board agreed to key Data Dashboard indicators that would be tracked for district reporting. The key indicators are related to school basics, student achievement, staffing, fiscal audits for each school, and parent community involvement. The indicators and the goals of Strategic Plan 2010 include targets and the progress being made toward reaching those targets. The data presented is the actual information for the 2006-2007 school year and the 2005-2006 school year.

Mr. Gjertsen left the Regular Board meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Board members were invited to make comments and ask questions.

- Ms. Griffin asked what is the timetable for this to be on-line? Mr. Raymond said staff is in the final stages of constructing the documents. It will be rolled out to the learning communities in November or December to ascertain if there are any capacity or server issues. The next step will be to make it available to the public and that should occur after the first of the year. Ms. Griffin said the goal is to be transparent and have the data available for parents to see how the school system is doing. She asked if the system included a method for the public to make comments or share the difficulties they may be having using the system in an effort to make this as user-friendly as possible? Mr. Raymond said yes, that can be included.
- Mr. Dunlap expressed concern that if there is no change, it is difficult to understand whether the data is moving away, closing in, or on target for the goal. He said it is important that the measures exceed the goal. Mr. Raymond said this can be better understood under the “Learn More” break-out indicator.
- Ms. McGarry expressed concern that principals and teachers are inundated with reports. She asked if this would create more or less reports and would teachers have the same access to the tools that they previously deemed useful? Mr. Raymond said this process enables staff to go to one site for data sources. It eliminates having to make individual or repeated data requests to the Office of Accountability. This is an on-line tool; it takes less time; the information can be retrieved; and paperwork is not necessary. This represents four reports in one. This tool will enable, help, and facilitate access to information and data. Mr. Raymond said not all of the information will be accessible to the public. Ms. McGarry expressed concern that parents must wait until the end of the quarter for some information. She asked if parents could continue to ask Central Office for data in the interim. Mr. Raymond said, yes. Ms. McGarry said the key indicators include flexibility and freedom, and she urged that this be implemented with a sense of urgency.
- Mr. Tate thanked staff for incorporating the suggestions made by the Board members. Mr. Tate expressed concern that it may be difficult to determine whether a desired target should increase or decrease. Mr. Raymond said this can be determined on the main Data Dashboard page and by using the help pages, this will be easier to determine as the program is used. This is a Board of Education and community tool, and its intent is to be

responsive and clear. Mr. Tate said since this is based on 2010 targets, he asked if the process was designed to grow or would it be scrapped in 2011? Mr. Raymond said the system has inherent flexibility that can be modified and improved as we move forward.

- Ms. Leake said regarding the 2008-2009 school year, what are the indicators that are on target for the students we currently have and will that guarantee them a quality education? Mr. Raymond said this uses the actual performance data for the 2006-2007 school year and the interim measure would be for the 2007-2008 school year. The data shows the actual and the interim goals. This provides a comparison of the status last year with this year and an achievement target. Ms. Leake said it is important that the public know we have the same initiatives now that we will have in 2010, and that the Board will be held accountable for achieving those goals. Ms. Leake said regarding the progress reporting as it relates to School Improvement Plans, does each school have a School Improvement Plan and are they incorporated in this process? Dr. Gorman said that would be included in the next section of the presentation. Ms. Leake wants to ensure the information is presented in a simplified manner (a one or two-page summary) so that it can inform and be easily understood by the average parent. Mr. Raymond said this information is available in the "Learn More" section.

Dr. Gorman said Policy AE relates to the general accountability system and discusses a district-wide accountability system that is rigorous, fair, and difficult to manipulate; easy to understand and describe; holds all schools and staff accountable for student achievement results and other performance tools; and rates schools by performance on a variety of measures. Dr. Gorman said Policy AE includes the three key components of School Performance Classification System, Rewards and Sanctions, and Communications Plan. This presentation will focus on the development of the Performance Classification System. Staff is in the process of developing the Rewards and Sanctions component and the Communications Plan. Mr. Raymond said the goal of the policy incorporates the Board's Vision which is to maximize academic achievement by every student in every school. A comprehensive accountability system focuses on increasing and improving student achievement. It is critical to understand that teaching and learning takes place in our schools by teachers, principals, and other administrators. They are our stakeholders. We must provide them the tools and support so they can improve student achievement. Mr. Raymond reviewed the components that they can use to help drive improvements for students which included Progress Reports, School Improvement Plans, School Quality Review, support systems, best practices, and data. Information and support are only useful if they are used. This process ensures that our schools improve and our students are making the most of their educational opportunities. Mr. Raymond reviewed the proposed School Progress Report. This report should be transparent and easily understood. It also includes an overall school grade. He asked the Board to provide their input on how this information should be displayed. He asked should the overall grade be displayed using stars, apples, numbers, or letter grades; what student characteristic information should be included; and what other performance indicators should be included such as federal, state, and School Quality Review indicators. Dr. Gorman said this report covered a large amount of information and staff believes it meets the standard that the Board was seeking in the development of Policy AE. The examples of the Progress Report include different versions of how the overall grade might be displayed. Dr. Gorman asked the Board to provide guidance on selecting one version.

Mr. Gauvreau left the Regular Board meeting at 7:42 p.m.

Board members were invited to make comments and ask questions.

- Ms. Griffin thanked staff for including the changes as suggested by the Board. She prefers using a number grade with stars to display the overall grade because it provides a better interpretation as the number by itself does not provide much context.
- Ms. Leake expressed concern that grading schools may deter from the process that all schools are good. She is opposed to labeling schools because it may be negatively interpreted that the school, teachers, or students are not successful. She also expressed concern regarding the qualifications of the people evaluating the schools. This process must include getting support from the parents for each school. This process should be focused on high achievement and not that school “x” is better than another school. This process should improve every school in the district. She said regarding career development, she is concerned about the qualifications and success of the people who are sent in to observe the school and the teachers. This process should continually reevaluate the track that a student is on to ensure they are reaching their potential because a student can improve or lower their academic progress. She believes CMS should motivate and push students to take higher level classes. She would like to know how this process will help the schools that are in need.
- Mr. Merchant expressed concern regarding the comparison factors because some schools, based upon their school boundaries, may face more challenges than other schools. He said there are obvious gaps in student achievement such as in geometry between white males and African American males. He said the rate is not the determining factor. It is more the way we are teaching or failing to teach certain people. He hopes this will not use race as a comparison factor because it may create a different set of expectations for certain schools due to their racial mix. Mr. Raymond said the policy was specific and focused on the improvement of every student in every school. The current indicators that existed (AYP and ABCs) did not do that. The policy also wanted a measure to rate schools that was fair using rigor and sophistication to provide a global perspective of that school. The real measurement is how effective we are at teaching children with particular challenges. This process will develop a measure to rate schools fairly and zero in on individual students, and whether teachers are teaching that child to its fullest potential. This will provide a comparison of how students with the same characteristics are doing at different schools. This data will ultimately result in a measure to show effective education as well as effective teaching and learning. Mr. Merchant wants this process to help all students and not isolate them. Mr. Merchant prefers the 100 point scale because most people are familiar with that and it adds a level of specificity. He believes letter grades may distort the information because one number grade could make the difference between an A and a B. He does not like using stars.
- Mr. Tate would prefer using an overall school score rather than a grade because the word “grade” suggests passing or failing, and this is based on a score of 0 to 100. Dr. Gorman asked if Mr. Tate would be comfortable with the word “rating” because rating is used in the policy. Mr. Tate said, yes. Mr. Tate asked clarifying questions regarding the gross and comparison scores on the School Progress Report and Mr. Raymond responded. Mr. Tate expressed concerns on how this will be viewed by parents because

it could become a tool for them to evaluate schools. Mr. Tate would prefer using an overall school rating and the use of stars would be okay.

- Ms. McGarry said this will provide a clear view of the strengths and challenges of each school as well as the areas that need improvement. She would prefer using numbers only and that should be sufficient. The use of additional stars or letters should not be needed. Ms. McGarry said this provides good data that is quantified and helps CMS to be transparent. She encouraged CMS to continue to use outside viewers because that would keep the process subjective. This process will also push schools to a higher level.
- Mr. Dunlap prefers the use of an overall school number score as opposed to an overall school grade because a letter grade can be interpreted differently by different people. He expressed concern that people may negatively interpret the information and parents with children attending a school with a low score may believe their child is sentenced to failure. He said sometimes less may be better. Dr. Gorman said this follows policy and it states the use of a rating. Dr. Gorman said perhaps the Board did not mean an overall rating. Mr. Dunlap said he previously asked for Dr. Gorman to inform the Board if he felt the Board was going in the wrong direction because that would allow the Board members an opportunity to reevaluate their decision. Mr. Dunlap said he does like this format because a parent may not only compare their school to another school but also their child to a child with similar characteristics at another school. He said it is important to realize that children learn differently and that should be incorporated in the process.
- Chairperson White said he likes the School Quality Review and the process of self-evaluation. Self-evaluation is taken more seriously when you understand someone from the outside will be evaluating the information because inspections lead to improvements. Progress Reports are reports on progress. He expressed concern that some schools and teachers may not be evaluated fairly. Two of his grandchildren graduated from a school considered to be failing by Judge Manning. They are now in college and doing very well. The teachers in that school were responsible for teaching his grandchildren and for them being very successful now. He does not like the idea of grading schools but that is part of the process because he understood the policy included rating schools. He prefers using a combination rating because everyone knows that a score below a 70 is a "F." He likes the use of a dual rating such as grade 88 and a number of stars because it provides a better reference point.
- Ms. Griffin noted that our schools are already being ranked and we have schools that are either low-performing or meeting AYP, and Schools of Distinction. This process includes other factors to provide a fair rating that is more relevant and transparent. Ms. Griffin expressed concern regarding the growth score because it did not include a comparison basis. Dr. Gorman said that will be reevaluated because it is confusing. She wanted the public to understand that the School Quality Review included objectivity with some subjectivity and the schools will be graded on specific areas.
- Ms. Leake expressed concern regarding the labeling of schools and wanted to ensure the Board voted to follow this direction. She would also like to hear from constituents on this process because we already have schools that are on the borderline of failing and we do not have a new pupil assignment plan in place to give parents an opportunity to make choices. She hopes this is not just something the Superintendent developed to help him with his performance evaluation. She expressed concerns regarding the

Rewards and Sanctions (staff and salaries) because the people and teachers in the Achievement Zone will not qualify for additional money in this process.

B. Report/First Reading on Policy AE, School Accountability System

Chairperson White called upon Ms. Griffin to present the report. Ms. Griffin said revisions to Policy AE are before the Board for first reading. This information was presented to the Board on October 19th as part of its work in Reform Governance. Dr. Gorman indicated that this process had been difficult to develop and it will also be difficult to meet the previously stated deadline of making the School Accountability System effective for the 2007-2008 school year. Ms. Griffin said the proposed revisions to Policy AE make changes to the dates on pages three and four only. The policy recommendation did not come through the Policy Committee because it was developed as a Committee of the Whole. Board approval for the revisions to Policy AE is on an accelerated track. The information will be on the Website starting October 24th. The Public Hearing and Board vote will be scheduled for the November 13, 2007 Regular Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

By consensus, the Board agreed to adjourn the Regular Board meeting.

The Regular School Board Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Joe. I. White, Jr., Chairperson

Nancy Daughtridge, Clerk to the Board