

DATE: October 11, 2010 PRESENT: Mary Grace Bright, Chair  
Jill Camnitz  
Benjie Forrest  
Jennifer Little  
TIME: 6:05 P.M. Barbara Owens  
Billy Peaden  
Roy Peaden  
Marcy Romary  
Dick Tolmie  
PLACE: St. James Methodist Church Mary Williams  
ABSENT: Ralph Love, Sr.

Chair Mary Grace Bright called to order the Board of Education in Workshop Session and welcomed everyone present. She reviewed the Guidelines for the meeting including preparation for the meeting, rules of decorum and rules of discussion. Chair Bright asked that all in attendance be respectful of each other.

Superintendent Beverly Reep then presented an overview of the journey from July 1 to tonight's meeting. She welcomed the newly elected Board of Education members – Mr. Worth Forbes, Mr. Sean Kenny, Ms. Christine Waters and Mr. Marc Whichard; three Greenville Parent Association members - Ms. Kay Godwin, Mr. Tom Mitchner and Ms. Jeanne Watkins; and three members from the Coalition for Educating Black Children - Ms. Melissa Grimes, Mr. Ozie Hall and Ms. Caroline Sutton, who were also seated around the Board of Education for tonight's discussion. Dr. Reep stated we asked for community involvement and have had several listening sessions in areas of the county. She thanked the community for their attendance at the sessions, feedback from e-mails and the many thought out and research based responses.

Superintendent Reep stated that Student Assignment Director Kay Weathington will review segment changes in beginning our boundary review that were explained during our last Board meeting held October 4<sup>th</sup>, and has prepared three additional charts with segment changes asked for since our last meeting. Our October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting will be the last regular Board meeting before the administration brings a recommendation for reassignment to the Board on November 1<sup>st</sup>. She commented that if there are any other suggestions desired, please contact us by Thursday in order to present them at the meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup>. There will also be a listening session held October 21<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Weathington then proceeded to review the segment changes in ES 5 demonstrated at the meeting October 4<sup>th</sup> and explained the three segment changes asked for in the interim between the two meetings. Though no new maps have been created, Ms. Weathington did share three new charts demonstrating the enrollment, capacity, % of capacity, proficiency and ethnicity breakdown in regards to segment changes. On the chart labeled ES 5B, the six elementary schools involved are Eastern, Ridgewood, Wintergreen, South Greenville, W. H. Robinson and Wahl-Coates. Ms. Weathington provided the number of children who will be moved with each segment change discussed and what school they will attend. On chart MS 2B, the two middle schools involved are C. M. Eppes and E. B. Aycock; and on the last elementary chart discussed ES 6, the schools involved are Eastern, Wahl-Coates, Elmhurst, South

Greenville, Lakeforest and Ridgewood. Ms. Weathington presented the same information for each chart mentioned.

Mr. Roy Peaden asked about three segments which appeared to be satellites. Ms. Weathington responded that he is correct regarding satellites with segments located along the Hooker Road area, which is currently assigned to Wintergreen schools. Mr. Peaden commented that he would like to hear from people in the area, but he does not like to see this type situation. Mr. Marc Whichard agreed that satellites are a negative aspect and not desired. Mr. Worth Forbes commented that if the parents of the children contained in the satellites are satisfied with being in Wintergreen, there would not be a problem.

Mr. Ozie Hall stated on ES 5A, the proficiency scores for Lakeforest, Wahl-Coates and Elmhurst will be below 50%.

Ms. Kay Godwin asked were the areas in gray on the charts presented not being considered at this time for redistricting, with Ms. Weathington responding that is correct.

Mr. Dick Tolmie voiced that the new map is a step forward in his way of thinking, but still need adjusting in regards to proficiency levels. He feels it does a better job of keeping neighborhoods together.

Mr. Tom Mitchner asked regarding plus or minus capacity changes due to choice. Dr. Reep commented that we cannot project choice attendance. Mr. Mitchner asked about the percentage of students going to schools they are assigned to, and Dr. Reep referred him to materials distributed which are based on the geocode

Ms. Melissa Grimes asked if a contingency plan has been discussed in case parents opt out for their children to go to the assigned school as happened with Sadie Saulter in the 2005 redistricting plan. Dr. Reep responded that if our final recommendation has schools with percentages where we do not want them to be, we will have resources and other adjustments in place and move quickly to implement these factors in each school as appropriate.

Ms. Kay Godwin asked regarding segment 172 off Firetower Road. Ms. Weathington stated there are 53 students in the segment who attend Eastern and will go to J. H. Rose High School. She also asked about segment 283. Ms. Weathington stated there are 29 students in this segment, and a decision regarding placement has not been made but is still being reviewed.

Mr. Hall commented on the socioeconomic impact that keeping neighborhoods together will have – creating a cluster of wealthy participants or a group of poor constituents – and asked has this been looked at as far as its effect on schools.

Superintendent Reep stated the United States Department of Agriculture will not let us look legally at individual student Free and Reduced Lunch numbers though our plan had been to use this data in helping us with diversity. Because of this, we decided to use proficiency score on the reading end-of-grade test. She stated we can look at property value, but this is not always accurate in a college town.

Ms. Jeanne Watkins stated we have known since February 2009 the socioeconomic statement in our School Attendance Policy is no longer allowed, and has concerns as to why it is still in the policy. She also asked if Judge Howard is aware that socioeconomic is no longer part of the formula. Dr. Reep commented that we have been trying through the USDA to use information in an aggregate form by segments, but no answer has been given by that department or the Department of Public Instruction, which is why the policy has not been changed. Attorney Ken Soo stated we are still working with the State Board of Education and the State Department but have had no discussion with Judge Howard regarding the USDA's decision. Attorney Soo feels socioeconomics will be a factor.

Ms. Mary Williams asked could we get Judge Howard's statement. Dr. Reep reported in the School Attendance Areas Policy, criteria included student achievement, socio-economic status and ethnic, racial and educational subgroups.

Ms. Weathington then reviewed the MS 2 segment changes shared October 4<sup>th</sup> with one additional chart as requested by a Board member in the interim. The schools involved in this discussion include C. M. Eppes and E. B. Aycock. Mr. Roy Peaden asked questions regarding segments 164, 264 and 337 with Ms. Weathington stating the number of students residing in each segment.

As questions were asked regarding different maps or charts, Ms. Jill Camnitz asked that a name be given for each one as it will make understanding each scenario map question more easily located. Chair Bright then named the elementary school map (involving Eastern, Ridgewood, Wintergreen, South Greenville, and W. H. Robinson) released October 4<sup>th</sup> ES 5A and the middle school map (involving C. M. Eppes and E. B. Aycock) was named MS 2A. The next elementary chart to include Wahl-Coates, Eastern, Ridgewood, Wintergreen, South Greenville and W. H. Robinson per request was named ES 5B with the associated middle school chart (Eppes and Aycock) including the requested segment change was named MS 2B. The last elementary chart (involving Eastern, Wahl-Coates, Elmhurst, South Greenville, Lakeforest and Ridgewood) with requested changes was named ES 6. Ms. Weathington listed the segments for each chart discussed giving the number of students involved per segment and what school they would be assigned to. Mr. Roy Peaden asked where the location was that a Board member requested regarding Wahl-Coates School with Ms. Weathington stating it is along Highway 33, the Britney Ridge area with students presently at Wintergreen.

Mr. Sean Kenny stated ES 6 already has schools with over 100% capacity and some schools with empty seats which is not acceptable. Mr. Dick Tolmie also has concerns with the number of schools over 100% capacity.

Chair Bright asked for suggestions for balance with Dr. Reep stating this is what we need – input in the direction you would like us to go.

Mr. Worth Forbes stated it is ridiculous to look at schools with 100% capacity because in two to three years, we would be right back at the table. He commented that we need to look at at least a ten-year span even if we have to consider adding to our present facilities. Mr. Forbes feels we need to have a long-term commitment.

Ms. Jill Camnitz stated we should not look at 100% capacity of our schools, but stay with the 90% rule. Mr. Dick Tolmie felt 90% plus could be used in low growth areas, but in high growth areas, closer to 85% capacity will be a better choice. Good judgment should be practiced. Ms. Christine Waters asked why on the charts, some schools have over 100% capacity and why would we not address all schools in this process. Dr. Reep replied that lack of funding is the main factor. Legislators will be studying the State budget and indications are not favorable for meeting our needs. We have open enrollment at Ayden Middle School which we hoped would help alleviate crowding.

Mr. Tom Mitchner stated under Judge Howard's Court Order, we need to comply with diversity and academic performance. If we are trying to provide better education to all students, how are we accomplishing that by looking at the present maps. He stated he had sent these questions to the BOE on the website and never received a response. Mr. Mitchner felt if others have sent in questions and received no response, everyone would get discouraged with the process. Superintendent Reep responded that there is no completed research to answer his question, and no map available here will give a magical researched based formula for achievement. In our effort to improve student achievement, there are no boundaries. In assessing each school, deficits are being targeted school by school. Mr. Mitchner stated NBC aired an educational series demonstrating how other school districts have implemented various programs for improvement in the educational atmosphere and are having better results in student testing. He asked why those methods aren't being used in Pitt County, with Dr. Reep responding that we are working on those methods every day whether we are or are not working on school reassignment – we are implementing methods to improve student achievement. He asked are we turning around failing schools or has creating a magnet school been discussed. Dr. Reep replied that even with opening a magnet school, we cannot predict enrollment.

Mr. Sean Kenny stated that he had spent a lot of time looking through information yesterday and in an earlier letter from Dr. Reep, legal fees regarding Unitary Status have exceeded \$190,000. He stated it would help not to be in Court and having to pay high legal fees – how many teachers would this money pay salaries for.

Ms. Mary Williams commented that we are taking steps in a forward direction in trying to educate **all** children in Pitt County, but we have decades to make up for. She stated that people who come to the public sessions are heard and get what they want. Those folks who do not attend, never get to voice their opinions. Ms. Williams stated reassignment is not about this district or that district, it's about how to best education all children in Pitt County Schools. She wants to know about race – black, white, Asian, Hispanic – how many of each race are being moved, and how many times have they been moved. Ms. Williams feels that somewhere along the way, some Board members have forgotten that we are trying to move forward and keep going back.

Mr. Worth Forbes commented that he has worked in Pitt County Schools for many years. He mentioned Moyewood as a community involved earlier with redistricting and how often they were moved – but no parents were ever heard. As a Board, Mr. Forbes stated we have to look at groups of people like the residents of Moyewood and make sure the students are assigned based on proximity, if we do that for everyone. In

looking at proficiency scores, some are very low, which tells him there is a crisis in Pitt County Schools. He feels these kids are hidden in the numbers throughout the county with needs that should be met. Mr. Forbes stated that if there is a school with a proficiency score of 43%, it sends up a red flag which may be to their advantage. This score tells us that the students have not received the education that they need, and we look at Title I funds and grants to put in this low performing school to raise student achievement and thus raise proficiency scores. Mr. Forbes feels this is why Pitt County Schools' scores are not rising to the top 5-10% proficiency, as the children are hidden in the numbers and not receiving the additional educational resources they so desperately need.

Mr. Ozie Hall stated AYP scores are not hidden and subgroups have not achieved their goals. In looking at six elementary schools and three middle schools on different maps, several small vocal groups want to keep their students together. He stated in cutting through stuff, property value and a handful of vocal people do not balance what is right for all children. Mr. Hall feels ES 4 and MS 3 are the most equitable plans for all children involved and in achieving Unitary Status for Pitt County Schools. Specific things are addressed by subgroups, assign teachers to schools as is stated in school policy and use Title I money and grants to place quality teachers in all schools. Mr. Hall stated his concern for Sadie Saulter School closing in the discussion of neighborhood schools. He feels that splitting neighborhoods will help meet socioeconomic diversity needed in all schools.

Ms. Melissa Grimes feels we need to take a close look at what we're doing. She has been with the system a long time and commented that we need to hold meetings in every neighborhood where other voices will be heard. Ms. Grimes stated some people cannot attend or do not have a way to attend PTA meetings or meetings outside their community, but they are not happy with schools closing in their neighborhood. She said these people have the same wants and needs as others.

Ms. Jennifer Little responded to Mr. Hall's comment regarding those speaking up – these people are officers in a PTA and spend countless hours volunteering within a school to help all children. She feels it would be a huge damage to split neighborhoods and shifting students does not accomplish the goal which is demonstrated by looking at ABC scores. Ms. Little feels folks embraced the 2005 redistricting plan and are growing.

Mr. Marc Whichard stated he agrees with Jennifer and Worth. He stated he has no problem with creating low performing schools in looking at proficiency – just look at staff needs and give them resources to meet their needs. In his school, this was accomplished and they grew eleven points in proficiency. If a strong leader demands excellence from his staff and students and makes parents accountable, positive growth will be achieved.

Mr. Forbes commented that he believes in neighborhood schools and proximity for all students, black and white, and keeping neighborhoods intact. He feels the 90/90/90 schools – 90% minority, 90% free and reduced lunch, 90% proficient – can be achieved with the right administration and employees in place. If a school does not have good, quality employees and administration in place to accomplish the desired goals, they need to leave Pitt County Schools.

Ms. Kay Godwin stated that in 2005, folks deviated from the algorithm. She asked how can we open a new elementary school that is racially identifiable with low performance already in place and follow a Court Order. Ms. Godwin asked what is the goal and purpose of redistricting – populate Lakeforest. She commented that fewer than fifty students in the J. H. Rose district will be assigned to Lakeforest Elementary School, so why are we rearranging elementary students in the Rose High Attendance area again.

Superintendent Reep commented that up until six weeks to two months ago, all she had been told was that the 2005 redistricting result was a mistake. For five years, she has heard “fix it”; but in August, she first heard keep the existing situation. As Sean said earlier, we have spent a lot of money in steps trying to move forward. Ms. Godwin stated we can’t rearrange students to “fix it” and move forward. Dr. Reep stated what is the validation that we are moving forward. It was asked in looking at a map, how do I know if I buy a home at a certain neighborhood, what school will my children be attending five years from now. Mr. Forbes stated we need a long-term decision, one we can grow with. He stated, yes, it may hurt at first, but we will adjust.

Dr. Reep stated some may have to suffer as we don’t have a magic map, but we deal with decisions made. We need to hear from **YOU** and make a recommendation.

Ms. Godwin stated we were putting the cart before the horse and a solid educational plan had to be proposed and should have been discussed first before any maps were presented.

Chair Bright stated folks had voiced they do not want to drive past two or three schools to get their children to their assigned school. She asked Attorney Soo how do we address the race component. Attorney Soo stated there is not a magic number for racial balance and referenced the original case of Brown vs. Ward. He stated the reason we went to Court is to provide quality education for all students. Attorney Soo stated if there is a difference among the parties involved in what is submitted to the Court, it will be more difficult to defend this decision if things are more out of whack in terms of measures that count – proficiency or race.

Regarding the reassignment decision, we need to work together to implement resources – whether it be a principal or cohort of teachers – in low performing schools. We need to reach a balance which will benefit all students – there is a strong need to reach these students, whether together or separated.

Ms. Mary Williams stated when she hears neighborhood schools, she hears resegregation. She commented that there are no “brick and mortar” schools in some neighborhoods in Pitt County. In comparing Raleigh’s schools, Ms. Williams stated there are brick and mortar schools, charter schools or alternative schools. In schools north of the river, most of the children ride a bus to school as there are no neighborhood schools. Ms. Williams stated we don’t need to think about white kids or black kids in Pitt County, we need to think about all kids in Pitt County and what is best for them.

Mr. Mitchner stated in regards to neighborhood schools - \$5.8 million is being spent to convert Sadie Saulter School into a Pre-K Center, offices and Exceptional Children's Programs placement. He asked why this money could not have been put in Sadie Saulter School with Chair Bright stating we cannot go back, the decision has been made and we are moving forward.

Ms. Jill Camnitz stated on October 4<sup>th</sup>, with presentation of ES 5A she feels we are moving in the right direction. She commented that we need to focus on the four elementary Greenville City Schools – Elmhurst, South Greenville, Wahl-Coates and Lakeforest – bringing up their proficiency level. Mr. Dick Tolmie stated he agrees with Ms. Camnitz as well as factoring in the capacity component.

Mr. Ozie Hall again stated the ES 4/MS 3 maps provide the most equitable picture considering all factors. He stated we need to focus on student proficiency and felt in schools with high poverty and segregation, there would not be quality teachers.

Mr. Sean Kenny stated regarding the quality of teacher issue, he dared anyone to go in Sadie Saulter and say you are a lower quality teacher – that is not true and the teachers need advocates. Mr. Tolmie stated he agrees and stated with the school capacity numbers shown in ES 4, we will be going through redistricting again in two or so years.

Chair Bright again stressed that the staff needs input on what maps we desire to use and move forward. She asked are there any maps that can be pulled off the table.

Mr. Roy Peaden stated the majority of his constituent response has been for community schools. He commented that some people liked the decision made in 2005, but we cannot go back. We cannot have it both ways, and we need to hear from the community.

Ms. Kay Weathington then proceeded to discuss the changes given October 4<sup>th</sup> as well as MS 2B which involves the Brook Valley area. Mr. Kenny stated his community responses had favored C. M. Eppes Middle School which would have a 100% capacity.

Ms. Mary Williams asked about Stokes showing a 140% capacity of sixth through eighth grades with Ms. Bright stating this was not the overall capacity of Stokes as it did not include grades K-5. Mr. Roy Peaden asked is Stokes a choice school with Ms. Weathington stating yes. Ms. Williams then asked about Bethel with 61% capacity, and why does one school have 140% capacity and another has 61% capacity. Dr. Reep stated Bethel has a capacity of 620 and was a former K-12 school, but now serves only K-8 with an economic impact in the community which has changed the population. Stokes wants to remain a K-8 school. Ms. Kay Godwin stated Bethel has 118 6-8 students, and Stokes only has 99 6-8 students.

Dr. Reep commented that ES 2B will need revision as several schools will be over 100% capacity.

Ms. Weathington then discussed ES 6 as was requested after the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and involves areas along Highway 33. Mr. Kenny asked that this map be taken off the table as many schools would be over capacity. Chair Bright asked were there any

objections and with none given, by consensus the ES 6 map was removed from the table.

Chair Bright stated what she was hearing was ES 5A was acceptable after further adjustments were made.

Mr. Kenny complimented the staff for listening to the community. He agreed with Mr. Peaden that everyone did not think the changes in 2005 were wrong. With the staff's vision, he feels ES 5A could be the springboard for the future with a little more work and minimal movement for stability in the years to come.

Mr. Tolmie stated he could support ES 5A or ES 5B, but not ES 2 which will eventually lead to re-segregated schools. Chair Bright asked for Board response for taking the ES 2 map off the table with a "yes" consensus given.

Mr. Marc Whichard feels the biggest problem in 2005 was mistrust and we need to fix the situation. Keeping proximity in mind, we need to look at capacity of schools and have resources, strong leadership and quality teachers in place. He concurred with maps ES 5A and MS 2B.

Mr. Worth Forbes agreed to maps ES 5A and MS 2B with close looks at capacity numbers.

Mr. Ozie Hall again stated that ES 5A and MS 2B will be a shift in balance and ES 4 and MS 3 are the most equitable. He commented that we need to look at what is best for all students. Mr. Hall voiced that there are no meetings in black communities and the Coalition defends African-American students who continue to be the victims. Mr. Whichard commented that a meeting was held at Wahl-Coates which has a large majority of African-American students with Mr. Hall stating the school itself is not in an African-American neighborhood – the students are bused to the school.

Chair Mary Grace Bright asked Mr. Hall what is a racially identifiable school with Mr. Hall responding that the Court stated "+" or "-" 15% is a racially identifiable school. Mr. Tolmie feels this is good not only because of the Court; but because we need to get a balance though ES 4 results in capacity problems and splits neighborhoods. If we work on ES 5A with adjustments to work on capacity and improving proficiency, it could work.

Mr. Forbes stated he disagrees with the "+" or "-" 15%.

Ms. Kay Godwin stated she would like to hear from the attorney that the ES 5A map would be acceptable under Court order with Elmhurst, South Greenville and Wahl-Coates having increased racially identifiable numbers than what currently exist. Chair Bright stated she would like to go a step further before answering this question and asked that we proceed with several ideas in mind.

Ask the staff to use the ES 5A map:

1. Keep capacity in the 85-95% range
2. Keep the proficiency range up



3. Have the racially identifiable school figure in the 22-29% range

Mr. Roy Peaden feels we do not need to send mixed messages and with proficiency, all areas will bleed a little. One area cannot have it all.

Mr. Tolmie stated with proficiency and racially identifiable schools, we need to get proficiency close to 52% or higher and in looking at the relationship, it would probably identify the racially identifiable schools. For capacity, in obvious low growth areas, have a higher capacity level of 96-97% if necessary in assisting some schools to keep a capacity figure of 85% or less as we know they will have students coming in because of choice. Judgment should be left to the staff in these instances.

Ms. Jill Camnitz pointed out that some numbers are there now.

Dr. Reep responded that we appreciate the flexibility. In low growth areas, we need to work on diversity and in high growth areas, capacity needs to be the driving force.

Mr. Hall commented that for long range flexibility, additions could be made to current buildings and referred to the Long Range Facility Plan. Dr. Reep stated there is lots of flexibility, but no funding. We confer with the County Commissioners, and are waiting to see what the State budget holds for the future as far as lottery, tax proceeds and other resources. Additions to present buildings versus new buildings will be explored.

Ms. Kay Godwin discussed minority vs. majority races for the current maps as compared to the ES 5A map. She stated if you decrease the white race, you decrease proficiency. Chair Bright again stated there will be further adjustments to the ES 5A map. Ms. Godwin commented that with fifty children in the Rose attendance area going to Lakeforest, we are going backward instead of forward.

Superintendent Reep stated we are way over capacity with ES 6. She stated the question becomes based on what criteria according to policy do we start moving students. In looking at boundary reviews, we have shown what the community asked to see. Ms. Godwin stated we need to fill Lakeforest and the addition to Eastern. She commented that if we leave the students in the J. H. Rose Attendance Area currently as they are, take out Sadie Saulter students and add the additional seats at Eastern, there are more than enough seats to accommodate everyone. Dr. Reep explained we look at the geocode for capacity in an attendance area - with Wintergreen having 400 available seats.

Ms. Marcy Romary asked about the areas along Highway 33 moving back to Eastern with Ms. Weathington clarifying placement.

Ms. Jeanne Watkins asked would any of the maps move us toward Unitary Status. If not, is this worth the risk of doing it wrong again. Attorney Ken Soo stated no map by itself will show Unitary Status. The bottom line is how are we treating kids – that will bring us to Unitary Status. If there is a reduction in diversity, other things are also carried out. Mr. Hall asked Attorney Soo in looking at all the maps, which map in his opinion would be the best to present to the Court for Unitary Status. Again, Attorney Soo stated you can't rank a map, there is too much in the air. He stated that he could not say more without talking to the Board in Closed Session.

Superintendent Reep stated regarding the staffing component for Unitary Status which was introduced at our last Board meeting; that whatever we do with redistricting, we have schools we need to address in many areas for the Court.

It was asked in explaining the maps that we have reassignment for these areas, but what about the rest of the system. If we end up with low performing schools, we have to be aggressive in student achievement, but it will not be fixed in two to three years. Dr. Reep stated that her goal for 2012 is to show the Court that we are taking steps forward to reach Unitary Status and will complete the job. Dr. Reep said to Mr. Hall that you stated if we do things and alienate folks, they will leave the system and we'll have the same situation that we had in 2005. Dr. Reep stated that we need to find a balance to keep folks in our system, and this will also help create diversity.

Mr. Roy Peaden stated we have schools not impacted in this redistricting that are less proficient than what Lakeforest will start at. I have confidence in our administration that these schools will get the help they need. Once a teacher is certified, he or she can be placed anywhere in the county and he or she may be needed somewhere else.

Chair Bright then outlined the goal of using ES 5A with a capacity of 85-95% with adjustments as needed, racially identifiable schools at 20-30% range and raise proficiency averages.

Mr. Whichard stated it's hard to meet racial balance and proficiency in schools across the county.

Chair Bright then discussed MS 2B. Dr. Reep and Ms. Weathington stated they would work with ES 5A with adjustments and MS 2B keeping capacities between 85-95%.

Ms. Godwin discussed switching different kids in the same schools to meet objectives.

Mr. Whichard stated the discussions have been lengthy, but direction for a realistic long-term solution is becoming clearer with each session and it appears to be best for the students, not necessarily what the adults want.

Ms. Camnitz feels without sacrificing proximity, an improved racial balance between C. M. Eppes and A. G. Cox could be accomplished. Mr. Forbes stated some shift may be needed.

In sharing the five minute summary for the Greenville Parents Association, Ms. Kay Godwin stated she needed to clarify information regarding the redistricting process of 2005 and wording regarding failure by quoting from a Court Order filed by Judge Howard in that the 2007 revised policy "failed to produce the desired effects of improving student diversity and academic performance." Student reassignment is inevitable, but there has to be an overall comprehensive education plan focusing on improving education for all students. A plan that will move us toward Unitary Status is necessary to get Pitt County Schools out from under the Court Order.

Ms. Godwin stated we need to populate Lakeforest Elementary School but does that justify moving 3000 students to boost academic proficiency in select schools. With the

addition at Eastern, the Rose attendance area elementary schools have adequate capacity for its current students as well as all the Sadie Saulter students losing their neighborhood school. She asked where does this neighborhood wish their students to attend school.

Ms. Godwin stated the school Board needs to move the school system toward Unitary Status and improve education for all students.

In his five minute summary for the Coalition for Educating Black Children, Mr. Ozie Hall stated we supported the 2005 redistricting plan and felt the Board was making a good faith effort to support African American children. He stated there are many debatable issues, but the bottom line is providing an equitable education for all children. Mr. Hall strongly commented that the ES 4, MS 3 maps created the least amount of personal bias, which is what some Board members are focusing on. We have to respect all parents who have a right to express themselves, not just particular neighborhoods. Mr. Hall stated we have to look at the impact this decision will make toward Unitary Status and think about how we treat all children. He stated we shouldn't spend \$190,000 in litigation but sit and meet together to agree on issues working toward Unitary Status.

Superintendent Reep then thanked everyone for their attendance and comments and stated she wished she had a magic solution for meeting the needs of our children. Dr. Reep announced the next public education meeting will be held Thursday, October 14<sup>th</sup> in the gym at A. G. Cox at 6:00 p.m. Following that, we will meet for our regular Board meeting October 18<sup>th</sup> at St. James Methodist Church at 7:00 p.m. Our next and final listening session will be held October 21<sup>st</sup> at a location to be announced as we are trying to move them around to different areas at 6:00 p.m. At our regularly scheduled Board meeting November 1<sup>st</sup>, the administration will make a recommendation for the reassignment plan. On November 8<sup>th</sup>, there will be a public hearing where the public may sign up to speak before the Board. Our second regular Board meeting is November 15<sup>th</sup>, which is when the Board will vote on the proposed recommendation.

Superintendent Reep also stated that the next criteria item for reaching Unitary Status will be presented at a November Board meeting. As licensed personnel and data were discussed regarding Unitary Status at an earlier meeting, we want to encourage everyone to attend all meetings to stay informed on our progress for reaching our goal of Unitary Status. Following each presentation at the Board meetings, the criteria explained will be placed on our website in our attempt to keep the community informed of our progress.

Chair Mary Grace Bright then announced that our next meeting will be October 18<sup>th</sup> at St. James Methodist Church at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

---

Ms. Mary Grace Bright, Chair

---

Dr. Beverly B. Reep, Superintendent