



MINUTES
CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Booker T. Reaves Media Center, Charlottesville High School
Thursday, March 27, 2025 (5:00 PM)

Closed Meeting of the Charlottesville City School Board was held on March 27, 2025, at 4:00 p.m., in the Division Annex Exceptional Education Conference Room, 1400 Melbourne Road, Charlottesville, VA.

PRESENT: Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Torres, and Ms. Richardson

ABSENT: Ms. Cooper

STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr., Superintendent, and Leslie Thacker, School Board Clerk

OTHERS PRESENT: Maria Lewis, Director of Human Resources

1.1 Call to Order: Emily Dooley, School Board Chair, called the closed session meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1.2 Closed Meeting: At 4:00 p.m., Ms. Burns offered a motion to go into a Closed Session as authorized by Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1) of the Code of Virginia, for the discussion of personnel matters. Ms. Torres seconded the motion, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 5 ayes, 0 nays. Ms. Richardson arrived after this action.

1.3 Closed Meeting Certification: At 4:35 p.m., Ms. Burns offered a motion that the board certify by recorded vote that to the best of each board member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the Closed Meeting were heard, discussed or considered. Mr. Morse seconded the motion, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays.

There was no action.

The board recessed from 4:34 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.

2.1 Moment of Silence: Ms. Emily Dooley, Board Chair, asked all those present to observe a moment of silence.

3.1 Pledge of Allegiance: The board began the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

4.1 Roll Call of Board Members:

The following Board Members were present:	Ms. Amanda Burns	Ms. Emily Dooley
	Mr. Chris Meyer	Mr. Dom Morse
	Ms. Nicole Richardson	Ms. Lisa Torres
		Harper Ullrich, Student Representative

The following Board Members were absent: Ms. Shymora Cooper

The following Staff Members were present:

Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr.
Mr. Pat Cuomo
Ms. Carolyn Swift
Ms. Rachel Rasnake
Ms. Beth Cheuk
Ms. Julia Green

Dr. Katina Otey
Ms. Kim Powell
Ms. Maria Lewis
Ms. Renee Hoover
Ms. Leslie Thacker

The following Staff Members were absent:

Ms. T. Denise Johnson

5.1 Approval of Proposed Agenda: Ms. Dooley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Morse, to reorder agenda items, moving action item 10.3 before action item 10.1. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Student and Staff Recognition

6.1 State and Local Honors: Athletics and Fine Arts: Andy Jones, Director of Student Activities, and Aaron Eichorst, Fine Arts Coordinator, recognized the outstanding achievements of CHS students and groups who recently earned state or other honors.

In athletics, the indoor track team was recognized for their remarkable success, with Sam Palmer and Elaina Pierce capturing state titles in the 1600M. Elaina Pierce also won in the 1000M. Other top-five track finishers were Juliana Pierce (500M) and Oliver Jackson in the pole vault. CCS staff members Terrell Mulford and Erika Pierce coached and provided support for these athletes in indoor track. Of the four wrestlers CHS sent to states, three medaled: Adriel Pena, Walter Pilkey, and Roman Calvani, all finishing in fifth place, guided by CCS staff coaches David Wilkerson and Joley Wood. Jacoby Lynch recently was the only competitor and finisher in his age group for the 50-mile Bel Monte Endurance race.

Aaron Eichorst, Director of Fine Arts, recognized Londyn Phillips, grade 1, Jackson-Via; Nadia Salazar Fraire, grade 8, Buford; and Elias Amaya, grade 10, CHS, for being selected to represent Cville Schools in the Virginia School Boards Association Art Contest. In addition, he celebrated that CHS was once again recognized as a Blue Ribbon School since the band, choir, and orchestra's top groups all received superior ratings at their assessments. Band students Julia Crum and Michelle Wong earned spots in the All-State Band, and CHS Orchestra concertmaster Elle Polifka earned a spot in the All-State Orchestra – she also directed the CHS choir which received straight superiors at their assessment. Finally, Buford Orchestra earned superior scores from the judges and A's in every subcategory! (And last month, it was announced that 13 Buford students earned spots in the junior regional orchestra!)

6.2 Public Education Foundation of Charlottesville-Albemarle Awards Teacher Innovation Grant Winners: Beth Cheuk, Supervisor of Community Relations, presented: Congratulations to the five Charlottesville City Schools teachers who had won grants from the Public Education Foundation Charlottesville-Albemarle (PEFCA) for the 2025-26 school year!

- Jessica Scott, Burnley-Moran, "BME Earth Stewards"
- Jessica Pedersen, Jackson-Via, "Equitable Access in Enrichment"
- Ida Cummings, Jackson-Via, "Writing Together: Strengthening Home-School Connections"
- Amy Wissekerke, Walker, "Classroom Economics for 6th Grade"
- Beth Bohannon, Walker, "Positive Pathways: Incentivizing Growth & Engagement"
- Amy Wissekerke & Beth Bohannon, "Walker, Together We Lead: Enhancing School Community & Engagement"

7.1 Comments from Students: There were none.

7.2 Comments from Members of the Community:

- Jenn Horne, CHS Teacher, shared comments of gratitude to the school administration and board members for their active involvement with students. She highlighted a recent meeting in her classroom where several administrators, including Dr. Malone, Maddie Bryant, Dr. Gurley, Dr. Otey, Dr. Johnson, Ms. Dooley, and Ms. Burns, were present, demonstrating their commitment to direct student interaction. Horne also acknowledged the board members who sent emails explaining their absence, reinforcing the overall sense of engagement and support. She emphasized the importance of both teacher-student and administrator-student communication and thanked everyone for their dedication.
- Parent Alex Heinsman addressed the board regarding the SRO program, urging them to discontinue the process. He argued that despite the board's good intentions, national research and, crucially, local Charlottesville data demonstrate that SROs lead to increased policing of schools, disproportionate arrests, and harsher treatment of Black, brown, and disabled students. He cited studies showing racial disparities in Charlottesville's adult and juvenile justice systems, where Black individuals face more severe charges and longer sentences. Heinsman asserted that the potential benefits of SROs, such as efficiency or threat assessment convenience, are outweighed by the inevitable harm to marginalized students, and that no policy or training can transform a police officer into a social worker.
- Cory Eicher, representing neighbors and community members at Burnley-Moran, delivered a letter urging the board to pause the current elementary school rezoning process due to its rapid timeline and significant negative impacts. The letter highlighted the introduction of a new diversity balancing goal, the detrimental effect on citywide walkability, and the disproportionate burden placed on Burnley-Moran students and Locust Grove residents, particularly those north of the US 250 bypass. They argued that the proposed plan contradicts the city's stated goals of neighborhood preservation and pedestrian access, emphasizing the importance of walkability for community health, equity, and environmental sustainability. The group requested the board to reconsider the current proposal, advocating for alternative zoning configurations that balance all city objectives and requesting city-wide walkability analysis, and a professional transportation study, stressing the long-term implications of this critical decision.

8.1 Charlottesville High School Student Representative Report: Student Representative Harper Ullrich presented student feedback to the board, encompassing both areas for improvement and positive observations. Students requested clarification and input regarding the equitable grading policy, proposed schedule changes, and the BKT schedule. They also identified departmental funding needs, specifically in English and Art, noting the impact of student-paid supplies. Additionally, students expressed appreciation for the extended lunch period, new cafeteria choices, and the opportunity to interact with elementary students at Greenbrier Elementary.

9.1-5 Adoption of Consent Agenda: The following items were included in the consent agenda; [Personnel Recommendations](#), [Minutes - December 19, 2024 School Board/City Council Joint Budget Work Session](#), [Minutes - February 10, 2025 School Board/City Council Joint Budget Work Session](#), and [Minutes - March 6, 2025 School Board Budget Meeting](#). Ms. Torres made a motion, seconded by Mr. Morse, to approve the adoption of the proposed consent agenda. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Action Items

10.1 Collective Bargaining Agreement: Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr., Superintendent, presented the Charlottesville City Schools Collective Bargaining Agreement for the Licensed Personnel Bargaining Unit. The CCS-CEA Licensed Personnel Collective Bargaining Agreement outlined the terms and conditions of employment for licensed personnel in Charlottesville City Schools from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2028. It included provisions on employee rights, management rights, work schedules, planning time, salary increases, and compensation for additional

responsibilities. The agreement specified the process for resolving labor-management disputes, ensuring that both parties could address grievances effectively.

Dr. Gurley stressed that approving the agreement would demonstrate a commitment to recognizing educator and staff voices, fostering a collaborative environment, and ultimately benefiting students. He also highlighted that the agreement would enhance teacher recruitment and retention, improve staff morale, and establish clear expectations for both employees and administration, showcasing the district's dedication to equitable labor practices.

Ms. Torres made a motion, seconded by Ms. Richardson, to approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Ms. Shannon Gillikin, President of the Charlottesville Education Association (CEA), expressed gratitude for the collective bargaining process, acknowledging its length and the collaborative effort involved. She thanked both the CEA and the school board's bargaining teams for their extensive work and emphasized the historic nature of the agreement.

10.2 [Action - 2025-2026 Career and Technical Education \(CTE\) Local Plan](#): Dr. Stacey Heltz, Charlottesville Area Technical Education Center (CATEC) Director, presented the 2025-2026 Career and Technical Education (CTE) Local Plan for Board information on March 6, 2025. The Board is now being asked to take action.

Ms. Torres made a motion, seconded by Mr. Morse, to approve the 2025-2026 Career and Technical Education (CTE) Local Plan. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Torres voting aye. 5 ayes, 0 nays. Ms. Richardson was not present for this vote.

10.3 [SRO/MOU: Discussion and Motion to Delay Action](#): On March 7, 2024, the Board received a presentation from Kim Powell, Chief Operations Officer, regarding the current safety model and stakeholder survey results. On May 18, 2024, the Board received additional information from CCS staff and Chief Kochis pertaining to resource officers. At the May 30, 2024 Board meeting, Ms. Burns made a motion and the Board took action to defer any decision about resource officers until March 27, 2025.

At the February 6, 2025 meeting, Kim Powell presented information from the independent safety audit conducted in the Fall of 2024. A recommendation was given to form a staff working group to do additional research and develop a draft MOU for consideration of reintroducing resource officers for Charlottesville. This approach will allow for community engagement around a proposal that clearly defines a program for Board consideration. The presentation tonight gives a brief update. The Board's vote at this meeting is not a new action, but a required procedural follow-up.

Chief Operations Officer Kim Powell clarified that the current vote regarding School Resource Officers (SROs) is a procedural follow-up, not a new action, stemming from previous board decisions to defer the matter. Following a safety and security audit, a staff working group, including representatives from various school departments and the Commonwealth attorney's office, convened to evaluate SROs, discussing their pros and cons and identifying necessary considerations. Ms. Powell emphasized the need for the board to now decide whether to postpone the decision further, implement an SRO model, or discontinue the process altogether, as advised by legal counsel, to address the previous motion to defer.

Discussion/Questions:

- Mr. Meyer raised a point of order, questioning the dual designation of the SRO discussion as both "information" and "action" on the agenda, and requested clarification before a vote. He specifically pointed out a discrepancy between the initial procedural outline, which included the Charlottesville Police Department (CPD) in the staff working group, and the actual working group meeting on March

12th, which, according to the presented slide, did not include CPD representation. He sought to understand this difference before any action was taken.

- Dr. Gurley clarified that while the Charlottesville Police Department (CPD) and Chief Kochis had been involved in previous discussions and provided resources, they chose not to actively participate in the staff working group meetings at this stage. Chief Kochis indicated that CPD would refrain from direct working group involvement until the board decides on whether to proceed with, pause, or discontinue the SRO review process. Dr. Gurley emphasized that CPD continues to serve the schools and provide information or comments to assist in the development of the MOU under the current arrangement, but their participation in the working group is contingent upon the board's decision.
- Mr. Meyer initiated the discussion by stating his understanding that the board's directive was to create a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Charlottesville Police Department (CPD), outlining the full scope of their collaborative relationship, which extended beyond the School Resource Officer (SRO) program. He observed that CPD, specifically Chief Kochis, seemed to be reducing their involvement in this broader initiative.
- Dr. Gurley addressed Mr. Meyer's confusion, clarifying that the board's mandate was solely to develop an MOU focused on the implementation of an SRO model. He emphasized that CPD's standard operational protocols and legal obligations would remain in effect when responding to school incidents, irrespective of the MOU.
- Ms. Burns sought to confirm a critical point: whether CPD, under Chief Kochis's direction, required a definitive "yes" or "no" decision from the board regarding the SRO model before committing to any collaborative MOU development.
- Dr. Gurley validated Ms. Burns's inquiry, confirming that the board's directive, as established on March 7th, 2024, was indeed to create an SRO-specific MOU for subsequent approval or rejection.
- Ms. Burns pointed out that this represented a significant shift in understanding. The board had previously assumed CPD would actively engage in the collaborative drafting process, leading to a more informed and refined MOU.
- Dr. Gurley acknowledged the validity of Ms. Burns's observation. He explained that CPD, while maintaining a collaborative spirit, was under no obligation to participate in the working group. The Chief had indicated that resources had been expended on previous discussions, and a clear signal of the board's intention was now required before further engagement.
- Mr. Meyer questioned the feasibility of developing an MOU in relative isolation, without the active participation of CPD, the other party to the agreement, and whether CPD would find the resulting document acceptable.
- Ms. Powell reassured the board that communication with CPD remained open. She clarified that while CPD was not committing to regular meetings, they were readily available for technical consultations and would provide feedback on feasibility and specific requirements.
- Dr. Gurley added that the development process would be informed by existing MOU templates and that CPD was being consulted informally, even if not attending meetings.
- Mr. Meyer reiterated his apprehension about the board approving an MOU that CPD might ultimately refuse to sign.
- Dr. Gurley noted that CPD would review the MOU before it was presented to the board, ensuring alignment and avoiding potential rejection.
- Mr. Meyer sought explicit assurance that the final MOU would have CPD's full agreement.
- Dr. Gurley stated that he was confident he could secure agreement from CPD, and that he wanted to avoid presenting an unapproved document. He also stated that the board had the option to discontinue the SRO process.
- Mr. Meyer broadened the discussion, questioning how the SRO-specific MOU fit within the larger context of city-school collaborations and agreements.
- Dr. Gurley clarified that other police interactions, like threat assessments, were governed by state codes and legal mandates, not by discretionary MOUs.
- Mr. Meyer cited city-provided services, such as facilities maintenance, as examples of areas where the city and school board were also seeking to establish new understandings.

- Ms. Powell discussed ongoing communication with city officials regarding these broader agreements, acknowledging that they were also under review.
- Ms. Torres stated that following the previous board's decision to change the safety policy, police and school protocols were established and posted on the school website, with the then-current police chief's signature. She inquired about the reasons why subsequent police chiefs did not sign the existing protocols, which outlined procedures for schools without School Resource Officers (SROs).
- Ms. Powell explained the limitations of pre-written protocols or "scripts" in handling the dynamic and unpredictable situations that arise during police interactions in schools.
- Mr. Meyer emphasized the need for clear protocols, regardless of the SRO decision, to ensure student safety and protect them from unnecessary involvement in the justice system.
- Ms. Torres and Ms. Burns reiterated that the SRO-specific MOU was distinct from other city-school agreements and collaborations.
- Ms. Burns confirmed that a "no" vote on the SRO model would result in the absence of an SRO-related MOU with CPD and clarified that while other city services would continue, the lack of an SRO-related MOU would leave a void in clear guidelines for police interactions with students.
- Ms. Torres called the question, moving to close the debate and bring the pending motion to a vote.
- Mr. Meyer stated his dissatisfaction with the current MOU development process. He identified two issues: the absence of a clear understanding with the city regarding CPD's service provision to schools, and the question of integrating SROs into that service. He asserted that the working group was essential for understanding the SRO program's impact on overall CPD services, and that engagement with the city council was necessary to ensure CPD's active participation. Mr. Meyer repeated his request for school board member representation in the working group, proposing the addition of two members to facilitate the development of a mutually agreeable MOU by October.
- Student Representative Ms. Ullrich reported on student feedback regarding SROs. She stated that many students expressed neutrality. Some students reported feeling safer with the idea of specially trained officers, while others expressed apprehension and requested more information. She noted that many students recalled positive experiences with SROs in elementary school. Ms. Ullrich suggested a student survey to provide information and gather student opinions.
- Ms. Burns proposed moving the decision regarding the SRO MOU to May 1st. She stated the board had engaged in extensive discussion and required a decision. She emphasized the need to provide Dr. Gurley and his team with clear direction regarding the continuation or cessation of the MOU development, to allow them to focus on other district matters. Ms. Burns also noted the absence of Ms. Cooper, and suggested that her perspective was valuable. Ms. Torres inquired about the rationale for a May 1st delay instead of an immediate vote. Ms. Burns clarified that while she was open to an immediate vote, she believed Ms. Cooper's participation was important and therefore suggested waiting for her return.
- Ms. Torres provided a historical overview of the SRO discussion, referencing the 2020 decision to remove SROs and implement a new safety model. She detailed the committee work and community input that informed that decision, which prioritized mental health and restorative justice. Ms. Torres acknowledged current questions regarding CSA roles and training. She referenced past events and the current political climate's influence on community perceptions of police. She advocated for focusing on improving the existing CSA model, suggesting a collaborative review process with diverse stakeholders.
- Mr. Meyer sought clarification from Ms. Burns regarding the May 1st vote, confirming it would be a decision on whether or not to pursue an SRO model, not a vote on a completed MOU.
- Ms. Burns confirmed this, stating the vote would provide direction to the superintendent to either proceed with or abandon the SRO model, and that without the SRO model, there would be no MOU with the CPD.
- Mr. Meyer confirmed that there would be a subsequent vote on the MOU in October if the SRO model was approved.
- Ms. Burns clarified that the October vote would be to approve the MOU and also to review possible budget implications.
- Mr. Meyer acknowledged Ms. Torres's historical overview. He noted that the proposed SRO model would likely integrate CSAs with SRO functions, selection criteria, and best practices. He stated that he was

apprehensive about voting on a model without clear implementation details and guiding principles, and noted the absence of specific requirements from the board.

- Ms. Burns reiterated that the board provided Dr. Gurley with criteria for the MOU and expected him to incorporate them.
- Ms. Torres emphasized the board's request for data supporting the need for SROs, noting the lack of compelling data in the consulting firm's report. She acknowledged the financial implications of the SRO decision, particularly in light of potential federal funding instability. She also mentioned the need to focus on instruction and support for students.
- Mr. Morse emphasized the importance of establishing clear measures and goals for safety models, whether SROs or CSAs, to ensure long-term effectiveness. He asked how the board would measure the
- Dr. Gurley stated that the administration had previously presented data to the board and community regarding the proposed School Resource Officer (SRO) model. He clarified that the goal was to adhere to the board's March directive to develop an SRO model and MOU, not to replace the current safety measures. Dr. Gurley referenced data shared concerning police call frequency and qualitative community feedback. He stated that school personnel cannot fulfill the duties of police officers, and indicated a willingness to cease SRO model development if so instructed. He concluded by emphasizing the necessity for the board to decide between proceeding with the proposed SRO model or maintaining the existing safety structure, and also addressed the effect of police presence on students of color.

Motion 1 (vote momentarily postponed because of Amended Motion 1): Mr. Meyer made a motion, seconded by Ms. Richardson, to postpone action until the October 2025 meeting.

Amended Motion 1: Ms. Burns moved to amend Mr. Meyer's motion, seconded/supported by Mr. Meyer, to delay action until May 1, 2025. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion failed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, and Mr. Meyer voting aye, and Ms. Richardson, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Torres voting nay. 3 ayes, 3 nays. The motion failed, reviving the original motion.

Motion 1 (revived after the failure of Amended Motion 1): Mr. Meyer made a motion, seconded by Ms. Richardson, to postpone action until the October 2025 meeting. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion failed with Ms. Dooley and Mr. Meyer voting aye, and Ms. Burns, Ms. Richardson, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Torres voting nay. 2 ayes, 4 nays.

Motion 2: Mr. Morse made a motion, seconded by Ms. Burns, to approve the implementation of the School Resources Officer Model. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, and Mr. Morse voting aye, and Ms. Richardson and Ms. Torres voting nay. 4 ayes, 2 nays.

Items for Discussion

11.1 [2025-2026 Special Education Annual Plan](#): Rachel Rasnake, Director of Student Services; Heather Grunden, Intensive Program Specialist; Dr. Pattye Leslie, Special Education Coordinator; and Lauren Diggs, Special Education Coordinator; presented the proposed budget for the Federal Flow Through Funding for Special Education for 2025-2026 for both school-aged and preschool for Board consideration. The Board will be asked to take action on this item at the May 1, 2025 meeting.

The presentation outlined key initiatives and improvements for Charlottesville City Schools' special education services. It highlighted the division-wide staffing structure, including coordinators, directors, and various related service providers. Enrollment data indicated a total of 600 students receiving special education services as of December 1, 2024. The presentation addressed findings from the CSEA audit, emphasizing the need for corrective actions and documentation improvements. A new Transition Specialist position was introduced to enhance community partnerships and postsecondary transition services. The LEAP program's enrollment is projected to grow from 49 to 56 students by 2025-26. The plan underscored the exemplary instruction provided for students with

autism and reaffirmed the commitment to compliance with state and federal regulations while allocating resources for professional development and community-based instruction.

Discussion/Questions:

- Ms. Torres shared appreciation for the increased utilization of DARS (Division of Rehabilitative Services), noting this marked a significant step in leveraging its full capacity, as confirmed by Ms. Rasnake. Ms. Torres shared a personal anecdote about her daughter's positive experience with DARS, highlighting the program's effectiveness in providing mentorship and facilitating successful employment outcomes for young adults post-graduation. She conveyed her gratitude for the program's support and the positive impact it had on her daughter's life, emphasizing the importance of continued connections and support for students transitioning into adulthood.
- Ms. Torres inquired about the impact of procedural deficits on student services, IEP meetings, and eligibility. Ms. Rasnake stated that documentation improvements, including separate IEP meeting attendance sheets and record access logs, did not negatively affect students. She noted that improvements in positive behavior supports directly impacted student outcomes through clearer and regularly updated behavior intervention plans. Ms. Torres then asked about the potential impact of federal funding changes on staff positions. Ms. Rasnake stated that next year's funding was already appropriated and that the division was committed to providing services to students with disabilities. She mentioned collaboration with Renee Hoover, Finance Director, to develop contingency plans.

11.2 [FY 25 & FY 26 Budget Update](#): Renee Hoover, Director of Finance, presented budget updates on Charlottesville City Schools (CCS) fiscal years 2025 and 2026 budgets. For FY 2025, the presentation detailed one-time bonus payments for instructional and support staff, including eligibility guidelines and funding details. For FY 2026, the presentation detailed additional state funding and the allocation of those funds to support new positions for student needs, specifically for projected enrollment growth at elementary schools and an attendance officer.

Presentation details included:

- One-Time Bonus Guidelines
 - Eligibility:
 - Employees must be employed with CCS on the last day of school (May 30, 2025).
 - Employees must return for the first day of work (August 4, 2025).
 - Departing employees in June or July will have the bonus deducted from their FY 2025 contract payout.
 - Prorated Bonuses Based on FTE Status:
 - 1.00 FTE: \$1,000 before taxes
 - 0.75 FTE: \$750 before taxes
 - 0.50 FTE: \$500 before taxes
 - 0.25 FTE: \$250 before taxes (includes daily permanent hourly staff such as crossing guards).
- Amended FY 26 Budget Summary ALL Funds
 - Budget Overview:
 - Approved FY 2025-26 Budget: \$124,916,290
 - Amended FY 2025-26 Budget: \$125,301,367
 - Changed Amount: \$385,077
 - Breakdown:
 - General (Operating):
 - Approved: \$102,776,598
 - Amended: \$103,161,675
 - Change: \$385,077
 - Special Revenue:
 - Approved: \$22,139,692

- Amended: \$22,139,692
 - Change: \$0
- One-Time Bonus Payments for Instructional & Support Positions
 - Designed to promote staff retention.
 - Bonuses will be paid no later than June 1, 2025.
 - State payment based on a \$1,000 bonus plus Social Security taxes for SOQ-funded positions.
 - CCS exceeds state SOQ positions by 526.59 FTEs.
 - Additional funding of \$449,998 is needed to cover the total cost.
 - Fiscal Year-End Funds will be utilized to support the payment.
- Budget Updates FY 2025 and 2026
 - School Board Meeting:
 - Scheduled for Thursday, March 27, 2025.
- Additional Positions to Support Student Needs
 - Additional Positions:
 - Teachers: 3.0 FTE for projected enrollment growth at elementary schools, costing \$302,080.
 - Attendance Officer: 1.0 FTE, costing \$82,997.
 - Total Additional Support for Student Needs:
 - 4.0 FTE, totaling \$385,077.
- 2025 General Assembly Conference Budget Changes to the Governor's Proposed Budget
- FY 2026:
 - Support positions funded in Basic Aid.
 - Additional funding for Special Education.
 - Total Funding: \$385,077.
- FY 2025:
 - Bonus payment for SOQ-funded instructional and support positions.
 - Total Funding: \$471,712.
- Next Steps
 - Actions to be Taken at the School Board Meeting on May 1, 2025:
 - Authorize a one-time bonus for instructional and support staff using funds from the FY 2025 Budget.
 - Amend the FY 2026 Budget to incorporate an additional \$385,077 in state revenue to fund 4 additional FTEs for enrollment growth at elementary schools and an attendance officer to support attendance.

Discussion/Questions:

- Mr. Meyer inquired about the proposed full-time Attendance Officer, questioning the role's scope and workload justification. Dr. Gurley clarified that the position would address chronic absenteeism through Tier 3 interventions, separating truancy enforcement from mental health support. Ms. Rasnake explained that court involvement is for mandating student services, not punishment, and emphasized a preventative, multi-disciplinary approach
- Mr. Meyer asked if the state-approved bonus for instructional and support staff included administrative staff. It was clarified that "support staff" includes administration, based on their SOQ classification. Mr. Meyer then suggested focusing on retention for school-based personnel. Ms. Dooley emphasized the importance of respecting all SOQ-funded positions.
- Ms. Torres sought clarification on how the General Assembly's funding breakdown (basic aid for FTEs, additional special education funding) translates to the proposed staff positions. Ms. Hoover explained that the special education funding is an add-on to basic aid, allowing for broader distribution across the proposed attendance officer and teacher positions. 1 The discussion highlighted differing perspectives on equitable bonus distribution and the interpretation of SOQ-funded roles.

11.3 [Elementary School Rezoning & Policy JC Update \(School Attendance Zones\)](#): Public presentations and discussions focused on elementary school rezoning began on September 5, 2024. A rezoning plan is needed because housing developments approved and in process for the current Summit attendance zone are projected to increase student enrollment to over 140% of the school's capacity within the next five to eight years. This school is surrounded by significant high-density development planned and in progress and is also land-locked with no options to expand the capacity of the school facilities.

The comprehensive process to arrive at a recommendation is chronicled at <https://charlottesvilleschools.org/zoning> and this web page links to another website constructed by the consultant (Woolpert) which provides additional information, including an interactive map with address lookup tool.

The final recommendation includes phasing options to maximize flexibility for families and CCS to navigate the changes ahead. In conjunction with the phasing, Policy JC School Attendance Zones requires an update to add a third reason (rezoning) that families may apply to attend an elementary school outside their zone of residence.

Discussion/Questions:

- Mr. Meyer confirmed with Ms. Powell that the rezoning plan and Policy JC update presented were unchanged from the January recommendations, and clarified that the current presentation served as the first reading, with a vote scheduled as an action item for the following month's meeting.
- Mr. Morse identified a bullet point in Policy JC, specifically in section A (the fifth point) regarding "limitation on participation," which he deemed inapplicable to Charlottesville City Schools. Ms. Powell acknowledged the error, confirming it was an oversight, as their district only has attendance zones for elementary schools.
- Ms. Torres raised the question of a cyclical review process for attendance zones, suggesting a review every few years, and wanted to know if a regular review schedule had been established to prevent future issues.
- Ms. Powell indicated the policy already states periodic reviews, pointing to the first paragraph, and that they monitor housing development. She referenced existing policy language about periodic reviews, but acknowledged that the specificity of frequency and process was unclear. She also highlighted that the administration is actively monitoring housing development trends to anticipate potential enrollment shifts.
- Mr. Morse found a relevant paragraph under the bullet points and suggested adding a time limit for reviews. He located a section in the document that addressed periodic reviews, but agreed with Ms. Torres that a defined timeline would provide more structure and accountability.
- Ms. Powell discussed the need to be proactive due to housing developments and suggested that the policy should address this more directly. She emphasized the importance of anticipating the impact of new housing developments on school enrollment, particularly to avoid over or underutilization of school facilities. She suggested strengthening the policy language to reflect this proactive approach.
- Ms. Burns asked Ms. Torres for a specific timeline suggestion. Seeking to move the discussion towards concrete action, Ms. Burns requested a specific time frame for the proposed review process.
- Ms. Torres suggested a five-year review period, noting the 2029 implementation timeline. She proposed a five-year cycle, aligning it with the understanding that the full impact of current changes would likely be realized around 2029.
- Ms. Powell clarified that annual monitoring of housing development progress is already in place. She reassured the group that the administration already conducts annual reviews of enrollment data and housing development progress, using this information to inform their planning.
- Ms. Torres emphasized the need to memorialize the monitoring process and communication with NDS, possibly in regulations. She stressed the importance of documenting the monitoring process, particularly the communication with Neighborhood Development Services (NDS), to ensure consistency and transparency. She suggested formalizing this process in regulations.

- Ms. Powell proposed using the annual enrollment update in the fall to discuss housing development impacts. She suggested that the annual enrollment report, presented in the fall, would be an ideal platform to discuss the latest housing development data and its potential impact on school enrollment.
- Ms. Dooley stated that she was resistant to adding a specific review period, and suggested that flexibility might be necessary for unforeseen circumstances.
- Ms. Torres clarified she wasn't suggesting bringing in a consultant every five years and clarified that her proposal was for internal reviews, not external consultant engagements.
- Ms. Dooley suggested waiting until the fall presentation to see how the topic is addressed. She proposed deferring a decision on a specific review period until the fall enrollment update, allowing the board to assess the presented data and consider its implications.
- Mr. Meyer suggested consulting with Wilpert (rezoning consultant) for best practice recommendations on review frequency. He proposed leveraging the expertise of the)ir consultants to determine the most effective and efficient review schedule.
- Ms. Powell explained that the consultants will be involved in annual enrollment projections, allowing for ongoing discussions about housing impacts. She clarified that the consultants will be assisting with enrollment projections, which will create opportunities for ongoing discussions about the impact of housing developments on school enrollment.

Board Response to Written Reports

12.1 [School Board Member Committee Reports](#): Board members shared updates on recent activities in this written report.

13.1 [Comments from Members of the Community](#):

- Zyahna Bryant, a Charlottesville resident, stated that she felt the board's actions, particularly the delays and tied votes, indicated a lack of transparency and aligned with past board failures. She referenced a perceived disconnect between board member statements and their voting records. She thanked Ms. Torres for her vote. Bryant asserted that the board's indecisiveness could discourage city partners from future collaboration. She questioned the board's claim of needing more public input, citing opportunities for engagement that were not utilized. She noted the absence of central office staff, including those responsible for community engagement, at the Black Joy event at Walker Upper Elementary School, and contrasted this with the event's high attendance and diverse participation. She suggested that the board should engage with the community outside of formal meetings and public comment sessions. She concluded by stating that the evening's votes revealed the board's true intentions and urged the public to pay attention, particularly in relation to the upcoming November elections.

14.1 [Board Member Comments](#):

- Mr. Meyer clarified his position on the bonus distribution, stating his focus on the allocation of funds to highly compensated management and the potential for alternative resource utilization. He then addressed communication, advocating for a more proactive public relations strategy, particularly regarding upcoming SOQ-related challenges. He requested collaboration between the board and administration to present an accurate representation of the school system's successes. He acknowledged the staff, administration, and CEA for their work on the collective bargaining agreement. Finally, he suggested a review of the district's endowments and foundations to assess their efficiency and strategic alignment.
- Ms. Burns highlighted efforts to amplify student voice at the high school, specifically mentioning a collaborative project with Student Representative to the Board Harper Ullrich and others to develop a survey that informs students about board agendas and provides a platform for feedback. She pointed to the successful implementation of rice bowls in the cafeteria as a direct result of student input. Additionally, she announced the upcoming application period (April 21st - May 2nd) for student school board representatives for the following year. The selection process, involving the SCA committee, group

interviews, and a final announcement, is expected to conclude with the presentation of the chosen representatives at the June 5th board meeting.

- Ms. Richardson requested clarification on the Attendance Officer position, asking who the officer would report to (Ms. Rasnake) and whether the position would oversee all city schools or just the high school (secondary level). She then stated that she was not expecting a vote on the School Resource Officers (SROs) and acknowledged Ms. Cooper's absence. She stated she was interested to see the outcome regarding the SROs.
- Ms. Torres concluded her comments by wishing everyone a happy and healthy spring break.

15.1 Superintendent's Comments: Dr. Gurley reported on recent student engagement activities, noting his time spent observing student contributions in Ms. Horne's class, the interactions between students and potential employers at a career fair organized by Ms. Heltz, and his participation in a rock-paper-scissors game with Trailblazer Elementary fourth graders following a reading of "The Legend of Rock Paper Scissors." He stated that he was impressed with the observed student engagement, and thanked the teachers involved for facilitating these events.

16.1 Work Session Wrap-Up: There were one request from the board:

- Revisit Policy JC - with fall enrollment report

17.1 Upcoming Meetings: Ms. Dooley read the upcoming meetings.


18.1 Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

A video of the March 27, 2025 meeting can be located at:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HFzp5hdUHQuoNE755r59xcNSv7xAWrZs/view?usp=drive_link



Emily Dooley, School Board Chair



Leslie Thacker, School Board Clerk