

DATE:	August 16, 2010	PRESENT:	Mary Grace Bright, Chair Jill Camnitz Benjie Forrest Jennifer Little Ralph Love, Sr. Barbara Owens Billy Peaden Roy Peaden Marcy Romary Dick Tolmie Mary Williams
TIME:	6:05 P.M.		
PLACE:	St. James Methodist Church		

Chair Mary Grace Bright called the Board of Education to order in Regular Session at 6:05 P.M.

Ms. Jill Camnitz led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Bright then gave recognition for Mr. Michael Dixon, who had been a member of the Pitt County Board of Education for eighteen years, by reading a Resolution from the Board in honor and recognition for all his services to the children of Pitt County and the community. Bishop Ralph Love moved, second by Mr. Billy Peaden, that the Board approve the Resolution. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Bright then opened the floor for comments from Board members regarding Mr. Dixon and their association with him, either as fellow Board members or personally. Chair Bright spoke from Micah 6:8 in the Bible stating it was one of her favorite verses. She read, "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Chair Bright shared that Michael believed in justice for all children in Pitt County. He believed in mercy and gave children the benefit of the doubt offering them a second chance, or a third chance or a fourth. Chair Bright stated Michael was humble and his standing in the community was not about him, but working to make all children more successful and making our community a better place to live. He will be greatly missed. Mr. Roy Peaden commented that he and Michael came on the Board together in 1992, and he had served the Board well as Chair, Vice-Chair and member always giving 110%. Ms. Jennifer Little stated Michael told her when she first became a member of the Board to never miss a summer school graduation, and that there was nothing like handing your own child his/her diploma, and he was right. As she handed her son his diploma on graduation day, Michael was the first to comfort her and offered his handkerchief for her tears of joy. Ms. Little stated she knew Michael was a man of God, and lived his life to serve God. She spoke about his compassion, his mercy and stated she hoped to serve on the Board as Michael Dixon did. Ms. Jill Camnitz stated she would miss terribly a colleague and friend in Michael Dixon. She commented that he always spoke perfectly, and the Board could best honor him by joining hands around the Board table listening to each other and the community for the sake of the children. Mr. Benjie Forrest commented that he and Michael had been friends for a long time before he became a Board member. Mr. Forrest felt Michael always put others first, and he feels proud to have known and serve with him for the purpose of a better education for all children. Mr. Dick Tolmie

stated Michael was a very humble person and didn't get on the grandstand to try to make a name for himself. In the thirteen years working together on the Board, he stated Michael and he had very good open, frank discussions which really helped him in forming his opinions. Mr. Tolmie also shared that Michael had a great sense of humor and had been a great friend. Ms. Barbara Owens commented that behind every good man, there is a good woman and good children and vice versa. She stated that this was very true in the Dixon household. She further stated that one of Michael's favorite comments was, "I've got your back" and that the Board needs to convey that feeling to the Dixon family. Ms. Marcy Romary stated that as she was registering to run for the Board of Education, Michael gave her a big hug and told her he was proud of her. She commented that he had a great ability for listening to others and knows that she will miss his counsel. His death will leave a huge void in the Board and the community. Mr. Billy Peaden stated that Michael told him regarding elections, if someone isn't running in this election – to watch out, they would be running next time. Mr. Peaden also spoke regarding Michael's enthusiasm for starting a Food Bank to help churches and the community reach out to people in need. Bishop Ralph Love stated he has served eighteen years with Michael and they had worked like brothers. He commented that Michael played the "good guy" and he played the "bad guy" in several situations while trying to prove a point. He asked, "Where will I find a seat partner?" Ms. Mary Williams stated that she had known Michael for many years, and he and her husband shared a common bond. She commented that more than the community, more than the school board, Mr. Dixon loved his family and each member meant everything to him. Superintendent Beverly Reep thanked Mr. Dixon's family members for sharing him with the Board of Education. She stated that he stayed involved and became an advocate within the schools to support his children, and that his commitment had strengthened with the birth of his grandchildren. Dr. Reep commented that he came to the office to talk frequently – and she knew he had heard something on the outside and wanted to discuss it with her and decide on the best approach to the problem. Superintendent Reep stated the last thing he said to her was, "I've got your back", even when they didn't agree on a particular subject – he always left her with that thought. She challenged the Board that even though they would not always agree, to support each other after a decision was made. Dr. Reep stated it was easy to see why Michael was the kind of man everyone has described for in going to see Mom and Pop Dixon to offer comfort at this tragic time, she left their home feeling comforted by them. During the ceremonies celebrating Michael's life, the term "Michael Model" was mentioned several times, and Dr. Reep felt he was a good role model for each of us in our lives.

Mr. Barry Dixon, next in line of the eight Dixon children, spoke on behalf of the family. He stated the family is very thankful and humbled for all the thoughts, prayers, calls and support they have received from the Board and others in the school system. Mr. Dixon stated he had had contact with many similar situations in his work, but never had he seen the outpouring of love and uplifting for his family as he had seen during the days following Michael's death. He spoke of the transition of moving from New York to North Carolina as a child – from the North to the South – and the many adjustments that had been made. He stated tonight, everyone is united with no forces to separate us – all cultures, races, genders, ages – all want children to be well educated.

Ms. Ruth Dixon, one of Mr. Michael Dixon's daughters, spoke regarding her father's zeal for being a member of the Board of Education in Pitt County. She stated she never understood his passion for this position, until the last election. Ms. Dixon stated at times for various reasons or by various groups, her dad's character was even attacked and still he fought for his passion because of his love for all children. She thanked everyone for the support that had been given in her father's behalf as a Board member, and to the family since his death.

After a brief recess, Chair Bright then called the Board meeting back to order and offered the Agenda for consideration. Bishop Ralph Love, second by Mr. Dick Tolmie, moved the Agenda be accepted as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

No one from the audience came forward to speak during Public Expression.

For the Spotlight on Teaching and Learning, Superintendent Beverly Reep briefly informed the Board that the School Improvement Grant (SIG) for the three high schools – North Pitt, South Central and Farmville Central – had been implemented and Administrator of the Grant, Mr. John Coleman, would summarize activity involved with the Grant. Mr. Coleman stated the SIG Grant was put into place with Federal Government Stimulus money which was divided into three tiers. In Tier II, thirty-three schools were subject to the Grant funds with twenty-five schools applying for this funding. Three Pitt County Schools qualified based on an average graduation rate at the time of application below 60%. Upon receiving notification that our application had been approved and Pitt County Schools would be receiving just over \$8 million over a three-year period, implementation began.

Mr. Coleman stated there were four models provided for implementation of the Grant – Closure, Restart, Turnaround and Transformation. Pitt County Schools chose the Transformation Model to improve graduation rates and support students and staff with valuable resources, additional instructional coaches and increased learning time. Mr. Coleman stated South Central would receive over \$3 million, North Pitt would receive over \$2 million and Farmville Central would receive over \$2 million spread out over a three-year time frame. In each school, rigorous staff development and evaluation will be implemented, as well as rewarding those who increase student achievement and removing staff who have not improved after ample opportunity to do so. Increased learning time will be factored in as well as institution of comprehensive instructional reform. The focus will be centered on attendance, academics, staff development and family engagement. Three instructional coaches – English, Math, Technology – have been hired, as well as a graduation coach, attendance specialist and curriculum teachers. Additional staff will be hired to work with the exceptional children, second language and family engagement programs. Resources will be supplemented for technology and Positive Behavior Instructional Support will be strengthened. At-Risk students will be identified and additional services be rendered as appropriate. The Twilight Academy will be expanded with transportation provided in the upcoming school year. The School Improvement Team and the SIG Team will meet to monitor progress and make changes as necessary. Monitoring will also be processed using web-based protocol, and State personnel will visit the schools for progress. Mr. Coleman stated the SIG Team and high school staff were looking forward to positive results from the implemented changes.

Under Consent Items, Mr. Benjie Forrest asked that when a vote of the Board is taken regarding an issue, he would appreciate the Board member names for ayes and nays being included in the minutes. Ms. Jill Camnitz motioned, second by Ms. Marcy Romary, that the Board approve the June 28, 2010 Minutes, the July 1, 2010 Minutes, the Personnel Report for August 2010 and the Report of Property to be Declared Surplus. Motion carried unanimously.

Under New Business, Chair Roy Peaden stated there was a Facilities Committee Meeting held August 10, 2010, and Associate Superintendent of Operations Aaron Beaulieu will summarize items discussed for the Board. Mr. Beaulieu stated bids were received for Sadie Saulter construction August 4, 2010 with all bids coming in over budget. Because of the bid results and a loss in the amount of lottery funding as well as capital funding from the State, further discussion will be tabled until the September 7, 2010 Facilities Committee Meeting. At that time, a more defined revenue picture and priority of proposed projects will be discussed.

Mr. Billy Peaden asked if rebidding is thought necessary for the Sadie Saulter Project, will Mr. Jimmy Hite's fees change. Mr. Beaulieu stated several construction options have already been discussed with Mr. Hite, but he could not state if any remodifications would have to be made.

Mr. Beaulieu then commented regarding the current construction projects stating some of them were actually ahead of schedule – phase one of the Eastern project is complete and furniture has arrived and in place. The next phase should be complete by the first of the year, which is about four months ahead of the original construction schedule. D. H. Conley's third phase is on schedule and pavement is visible as your ride by the school. The addition at Farmville Central is complete and teachers have moved in. Lakeforest Elementary should be complete by December of this year.

Mr. Beaulieu also informed the Board that refurbishing and cleaning of all schools had been in progress during the summer months with completion planned for the opening of schools August 25, 2010. He expressed to the Board that the staff of Facility Services had been aggressive this summer in working to create a better environment and atmosphere for the students and staff.

Superintendent Reep then introduced the new elementary school scenario ES 5 stating Mr. Mike Miller, OEd representative, was out-of-state and could not be in attendance this evening. Dr. Reep first discussed several data sheets placed at each Board member's seat stating this was information asked for by different members at an earlier meeting. The first data sheet provides the number of transfers to and from all schools which fall under Board Policy 10.111 - Open Enrollment transfers, Board approved transfers and the children of staff members who have been approved to have their children go with them. This is cumulative information from 2002-03 as transfers allow students to attend these schools until they reach the exit grade for that particular school. The second sheet provides the No Child Left Behind 2008-09 transfers to Choice School Selections. The green sheets give the mileage using distance from the planning segment in which the student resides to the school that they will be assigned. Dr. Reep stated OEd cautioned this is not something that you can multiply by a number and calculate the cost, but strictly compares mileage between scenarios. You can't take the current number and compare current mileage,

because you're talking about a school that has not yet opened and a school that will be coming off the routing system. Superintendent Reep stated the best use of this data is to take the total impact area and the total system-wide mileage to compare the different scenarios that we are evaluating. She stated if we asked the Director of Transportation, Joey Weathington, for a comparison, it would look very different as we don't have all the factors they have to include – the number of students who ride a bus, the number of buses, labor and so on. The data is a good way to look at the number of miles for each scenario, but is not a way to say this is what the cost would be. The last data presented shows the number of students who would stay in a particular school and the number of students who would be moved to other named schools for each designated scenario. Dr. Reep did caution that if you actually looked at the geocode figures and tried to match them to actual enrollment, the results would not match up as the geocode figures did not consider transfers but were the actual number of students who live in an impact area and are geocoded by segment to that school. Chair Bright asked about students in private schools with Dr. Reep responding that these numbers include students enrolled in Pitt County Schools.

Superintendent Reep stated that scenario ES 2 was driven by proximity/capacity and had a 43% proficiency gap. Scenario ES 4 was based on proficiency/proximity/capacity with a 13% proficiency gap. Many proficiency numbers were studied but gave similar results to those already noted above, i.e. a 17% proficiency gap resulted in a similar scenario as the proficiency/proximity/capacity scenario already provided with just as many satellites perceived on the map. In Scenario ES 5, the new middle ground scenario which was asked for at the previous redistricting meeting, we tried to keep proximity as close as possible without creating a low performing school with a proficiency gap of 30%. This scenario provided better diversity than the original proximity scenario revealed. Dr. Reep stated that none of the scenarios maps have been tampered with by human hands at this point, but were computer driven by data which had been entered. She informed everyone that humanization of the maps would mean making adjustments in the maps as needed. After input from the community has been received, hopefully by mid September boundary reviews will begin. Dr. Reep did state that only three satellites were noted in scenario ES 5 – two for South Greenville and one for Wahl-Coates. She also noted that the current range is 38.3% for reading proficiency.

Ms. Mary Williams asked regarding satellites created by the scenarios with Dr. Reep responding that there is not a scenario out there that would not have a satellite in it, particularly in helping South Greenville Elementary.

Mr. Dick Tolmie stated that public response he had received from constituents after viewing the first two scenarios mainly centered on though the proximity concept was understood, what would a map look like that kept the majority of students were they presently attend, but allow for populating Lakeforest and moving the Sadie Saulter students to another location. This would involve approximately 950 students versus 2500+/- students in other scenarios. Mr. Tolmie motioned that a scenario map showing minimal movement of students with only the needed amount moved to fill Lakeforest and closing of Sadie Saulter be accounted for. Second was made by Ms. Jennifer Little.

Ms. Jill Camnitz stated she was going to make the same speech. In adding to what Mr. Tolmie said, Ms. Camnitz stated currently our proficiency gap in the schools we're talking about is 33% - in ES 5, the proficiency gap is 30%. She stated we're talking about moving 2400 students with minimal effect on the proficiency gap. Ms. Camnitz stated if we took the current map as a starting point, populate Lakeforest, assign Sadie Saulter students and obviously more students will be assigned to Eastern to see what a scenario would look like, it would provide another option on the table.

Superintendent Reep then stated it would not be strong leadership here if she didn't say that she thought we were setting out to correct something that didn't work in 2005. She feels that taking what we have now and only moving those students mentioned above in order to move less people around, will not be a fix for what has been considered a problem. If the community is happy with how things are, then we can look at what we need to do to move those kids mentioned. Dr. Reep passionately stated that for the last almost five years, one of her goals, and she thought one of our goals, was to create a foundation upon which we could move forward. She stated it might be a little painful to move lots of kids around, but we would be laying a foundation so that hopefully in the future, we would not be moving many kids. We will be moving based on growth. She stated she didn't have a guide on what the future for growth or moves will look like if we continue to move around the fringes and don't build a foundation that states the formula we are going to use to assign students. Dr. Reep stated she didn't have a problem with stability, but we didn't start out with stability as one of the major factors. It was felt that the voice from the community has been neighborhood schools, and now that maps providing these changes have been seen - is it that the communities do not like the results and everyone now wants stability? This is what we need to hear. Is it now believed that the 2005 decision provided a result that is wanted, or do we want our present decision, even if it means moving a lot of children, to be one that in some way helps us correct the 2005 decision? If remaining stable trumps these efforts, that's fine; but Dr. Reep wants to be on record that it would not be her recommendation to you to not create a plan right now that gives you something to keep growing on.

Mr. Tolmie stated that looking at proximity and proficiency while trying to reach diversity are steps in the right direction and something to build on in the future, but we have to recognize the desires of our community in not wanting to move their children from one school to another. Having participated in the 2005 decision, one of the things that bothered people the most was having their children move from the school they were currently attending to a different school. Mr. Tolmie thinks that stability should be taken into account - not overriding everything else - but along with proximity and proficiency, and the Board would be addressing one of the major concerns of the 2005 plan.

Ms. Jill Camnitz stated that stability is in our policy - Policy 10.107 School Attendance Areas, 1-F. She feels that a scenario map which addresses problems with the 2005 redistricting plan has not been provided.

Ms. Mary Williams stated she was not on the Board of Education in 2005, but apparently "ugly stuff took place". She feels the motion that has been put out will bring up some of that old stuff again. Ms. Williams commented that redistricting and moving children to neighborhood schools is okay, but what about neighborhoods

which do not have a brick and mortar school in place. She stated the decision that we make now is supposed to correct some of the damage that was done with the 2005 redistricting, namely in the Sadie Saulter School District. Regardless of maps in place or whatever we say or do, Ms. Williams stated we have to think about the children that are involved – but not just what neighborhood is divided or whose child – because all children hurt when switched all around and have long bus rides across town to reach their destinations. She stated it was not going to be an easy decision to make, and people were not going to be happy with it. Ms. Williams stated if there is a brick and mortar school in your neighborhood, then there is nothing to complain about; and children who don't have a school in their neighborhood need to be given priority when it comes to getting on a bus. She stated that she was sorry if she hurt anyone's feelings; but she feels right now that people are changing their minds in the middle of the game. Ms. Williams stated we need to make this thing right for our children, who will go in and make friends wherever they go, but parents hold on to the old stuff. She stated we need to check our hearts and what comes out of our mouths for the decisions that we make.

Mr. Roy Peaden commented that he had received the majority of his responses desiring neighborhood schools. He stated his community has expressed that the 2005 redistricting plan was not right, and he supports proximity schools.

Bishop Ralph Love stated he was on the Board during the 2005 redistricting and that all schools were closed in his community but one. He commented that our goal for redistricting is to be fair to all children.

Ms. Marcy Romary stated that in 2005, the Board was not allowed to look at all options available. Now, we are trying to allow Board members and the public to look at one more option, and she feels we owe it to the community to explore every possible avenue that's out there to make sure we're doing what is fair for the most number of children. She also mentioned having a magnet school available for an option.

Superintendent Reep stated we are trying to get the numbers at an acceptable level. She stated once we narrow the focus and see what results we've obtained, a magnet school may or may not be an option.

Ms. Jennifer Little feels the public should see all options available. She commented that most of her community response has been about neighborhood schools, but all options should be studied. Ms. Little stated all the maps presented are fragmenting neighborhoods, which defeats what neighborhood schools are all about. She asked do we just want to move children around when the proficiency rate between the ES 5 scenario and the current scenario is not significantly changed.

Mr. Benjie Forrest feels we need more community involvement, and the map asked for would give one more option for everyone to study and give input on.

Ms. Barbara Owens asked are folks now happy with the 2005 redistricting and want stability – leaving everyone where they presently are.

Ms. Jill Camnitz feels some people are happy, their children are settled and so they're asking, "Why move them again?"

Mr. Roy Peaden stated in one of the scenarios there was a group of kids identified with a proficiency of 36% and we promised to help these students. He commented that we can hide those kids in one school or hide them in another school, but that will not help the kids one iota.

Chair Bright then stated that a motion had been made and seconded. She asked Mr. Dick Tolmie to please repeat his motion with Mr. Tolmie requesting that OREd create a scenario map based on filling Lakeforest, the additional seats at Eastern and house the students affected by the closing of Sadie Saulter minimizing the need to move students in redistricting. A vote of Board members was taken with those in favor of the motion being Ms. Jennifer Little, Ms. Jill Camnitz, Mr. Benjie Forrest, Mr. Dick Tolmie and Ms. Marcy Romary. Those opposed to the motion were Ms. Mary Williams, Bishop Ralph Love, Mr. Billy Peaden, Ms. Barbara Owens and Mr. Roy Peaden. There being a tie between the Board members, Chair Mary Grace Bright voted against the motion stating she is comfortable with the maps that we have. Thus, the motion did not carry.

Mr. Dick Tolmie then stated since the three maps which have been presented are not acceptable by a few of the Board members, work needs to be started immediately implementing the human factor into the scenarios presented.

Chair Bright then began discussion regarding filling the vacant District I, Seat A for the Pitt County Board of Education. She stated that due to the large amount of work that needs to be accomplished over the next several months, she would like to conduct business a little differently than stated in our procedure. Chair Bright stated instead of having the other Seat A Board members form a committee for interviewing the candidates, that we have the full Board present for interviewing of the candidates. Vice-Chair Dick Tolmie then moved for the purpose of filling Michael Dixon's vacancy on the Pitt County Board of Education, that we temporarily suspend the Pitt County Schools Procedure for the Appointment of New Board Members (Appendix 1.301-A), which outlines the procedures for filling vacant seats on the Board. Bishop Love seconded the motion which was unanimously approved. Chair Bright then stated August 23 had been selected as a good time to meet regarding the interviews, which will be thirty minutes apart. She informed the Board that there are four candidates and asked the Board's preference regarding start time and if they would like discussion and the vote on a separate night. The consensus of the Board was a 6:00 p.m. start time for the interviews with discussion and a vote completing the evening. Board members will receive copies of the candidates' letters of interest and resumes prior to the meeting. Questioning by the Board and answers by the candidates will all be in Open Session, as well as discussion and the vote by the Board. Chair Bright asked Administrative Assistant Brenda Pippin to please contact the candidates and schedule times for their respective interviews.

Under Old Business, there were no questions from Board members related to the August 2 Agenda Items, as this meeting was canceled due to circumstances previously mentioned.

Policy Committee Chair Jill Camnitz and In-House Attorney Rob Sonnenberg then discussed the Second Reading of the following revised/new policies:



- 1) Policy 10.103 Resident Students Enrollment Requirements  
There being no further discussion, Ms. Camnitz move, second by Mr. Dick Tolmie, that Policy 10.103 be approved by the Board as presented. Motion carried unanimously.
- 2) Policy 9.206 Comprehensive Health Education Program  
There being no further discussion, Ms. Camnitz move, second by Mr. Dick Tolmie, that Policy 9.206 be approved by the Board as presented. Motion carried unanimously.
- 3) Policy 9.212 Reproductive Health and Safety Education  
There being no further discussion, Ms. Camnitz move, second by Ms. Marcy Romary, that Policy 9.212 be approved by the Board as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Superintendent Beverly Reep stated tomorrow we will welcome back teachers as we gear up for the 2010-11 school year. She reminded everyone that a staggered Open House would be held August 23<sup>rd</sup> in all schools, and the yellow buses would roll out August 25<sup>th</sup>, the first day of school for students. Dr. Reep briefly mentioned a new job bill which had been signed last week with staff looking at schools needing the most help for additional teaching staff and resources to accelerate student achievement. She stated a follow up report will be presented at the September Board meeting.

Chair Bright thanked everyone for their support and understanding over the past couple of weeks and help in moving forward.

Bishop Love thanked everyone for their concern and prayers during his recent knee surgery and recovery.

Mr. Billy Peaden stated he had attended the Dual Enrollment Open House at Pitt Community College with his son and had obtained valuable information. He asked could Pitt County Schools possibly have an Open House for second semester in high schools as they do during first semester. He feels this is a great way to meet teachers, look at classrooms, and meet other students who might be in the same class.

Ms. Marcy Romary stated several around the Board table would not be able to attend Open House as they would be attending a Board meeting, but maybe they could attend an Open House for second semester. She also stated she is very sorry about not having the opportunity to see and present to the public the result of what one more scenario would produce.

Ms. Barbara Owens commented that the Resolution honoring Michael Dixon was beautiful and captured Michael in many aspects of his life.

Mr. Dick Tolmie dittoed what Ms. Romary and Ms. Owens had previously stated.

Mr. Benjie Forrest asked that everyone keep Michael Dixon's family in our thoughts and prayers. He also encouraged the public to stay engaged and be involved with what is going on.

Ms. Jill Camnitz asked for the time and place of the next Public Session for redistricting with Dr. Reep responding Thursday, August 19, at 6:00 p.m. in the Media Center at C. M. Eppes Middle School.

Ms. Jennifer Little congratulated the Executive Board and membership of the Academic Boosters at J. H. Rose High School for the very nice Informational Sign which has been installed at Rose.

Mr. Roy Peaden asked that everyone pray for a safe start to school and stated he appreciated all the work which had been accomplished in preparation for the opening of school.

With no further business to discuss, Ms. Jill Camnitz moved, second by Ms. Mary Williams, that the Board adjourn. Motion carried unanimously. Time 7:55 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

---

Ms. Mary Grace Bright, Chair

---

Dr. Beverly B. Reep, Superintendent