



MINUTES
CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY SCHOOL BOARD ADVANCE
Charlottesville-Albemarle Technical Education Center (CATEC) Auditorium
1000 Rio Rd. E., Charlottesville, VA
Saturday, May 18, 2024 (8:30 AM)

1.1 Call to Order: Ms. Larson-Torres, School Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

2.1 Roll Call of Board Members:

The following Board Members were present:

Ms. Amanda Burns	Ms. Shymora Cooper
Ms. Emily Dooley	Mr. Dom Morse
Mr. Chris Meyer	Ms. Nicole Richardson
Ms. Lisa Larson-Torres	

The following Board Members were absent: None

The following Staff Members were present:

Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr.	Dr. Katina Otey
Ms. Kim Powell	Ms. Carolyn Swift
Ms. Renee Hoover	Ms. Maria Lewis
Ms. Beth Cheuk	Dr. T. Denise Johnson
Ms. Julia Green	Ms. Leslie Thacker

The following Staff Members were absent: Mr. Pat Cuomo Ms. Rachel Rasnake

3.1 Approval of Proposed Agenda: Mr. Meyer made a motion, seconded by Ms. Dooley, to add a community comment period after the School Safety report and table the Literacy Data presentation until Fall 2024. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion carried with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Morse, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Larson-Torres, voting aye. 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Information Items

4.1 School Safety: Next Steps: Kim Powell, Chief Operations Officer; Todd Koogler, Coordinator for School Safety & Security; Superintendent Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr.; and Charlottesville Police Chief Michael Kochis led discussion around next steps in the continuous improvement of the CCS safety model. Information presented included presentation information below as well as Policy JFG, Regulations JFG-R, and CCS CEIA Opengate Operational Guidelines:

- Core Security Projects
 - Visitor Buzz-In
 - Visitor ID Scanning
 - Visitor Vestibules

- Access Control
- Master Rekey
- Cameras
- Additional Projects:
 - CHS Restrooms (In Progress)
 - CHS Door Monitoring & Unauthorized Egress Alarms (In Progress)
 - LMA Glass Film (Completed)
- Core Project Status
- Search Policy & Procedures
 - Updated Policy JFG
 - Updated Regulation JFG-R
 - CCS CEIA OPENGATE Operational Guidance
- Weapons Detection Roll-Out
 - CEIA Opengates delivered May 8th.
 - Introductory training will occur at CHS on May 15th.
 - Follow up training will occur on August 23rd, including practical training at the stadium.
 - It is expected that CEIA representatives will assist in working the beginning of the football game to handle any potential issues which may occur.
 - Weapons detection will primarily be used at ticketed public events with an expected attendance of 250 or more.
- Upcoming Safety & Security Trainings
 - June 10th & 11th - Train the Trainer for ALICE
 - Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, Evacuate
 - Each school will have 1 or more trainers (20+ for the division)
 - June 12th - Annual Summer Safety Summit
 - All administration, office staff and CSA's
 - Conducted in partnership with City Emergency Management, CFD & CPD
 - Pre-Week Safety Training for All Staff
 - Includes review of all response protocols
- Partnership with CPD
 - In addition to situational responses, CCS works closely with CPD to collaborate as required by the Code of Virginia for:
 - Threat Assessments
 - Mandatory Reporting
 - Crisis Planning
 - Goals for next iteration of our partnership:
 - Improve efficiencies and reduce admin burden by streamlining communications
 - Build positive relationships and provide greater accessibility to help students and law enforcement minimize or avoid youth involvement with the court system
 - Collaborate to provide more safety education and continuous improvement of practices for the school community
- Current Model
 - The school calls dispatch/911 and law enforcement responds

- The response is strictly a law enforcement response by whatever officer may be working that district that day. The responding officer will respond to the issue and handle it as a law enforcement matter within the confines of the law.
- This is different than if there was a specific officer or officers assigned to the school where an MOU is in place and police/administration relationship exists
- Data (Police response to CCS)
 - Threat Assessments, (State Code requires law enforcement)
 - 2021/2022 school year 85
 - 2022/2023 school year 105
 - 2023/2024 school year so far 88
 - Dispatched calls for service
 - 2021/2022 school year 254
 - 2022/2023 school year 290
 - 2023/2024 school year so far 138
- CPD Final Findings and Recommendations
 - Emphasis on Diversion Program to Avoid Arrest with
 - Restorative Justice Practices, instead of relying on punitive measures.
 - Restorative practices focus on repairing harm, addressing underlying issues, and fostering accountability and reconciliation among those involved in conflicts or incidents.
 - Cambridge (MA) model includes evening shifts for officers to do restorative work with home visits, community and extra-curricular check-ins and follow-ups.
 - Most issues begin in the community and transition into the schools.
- Essential Elements & Guiding Principles
 - Joint selection and management of resource officers by CCS & CPD
 - Clear roles and responsibilities for officers and school personnel
 - Specialized training in areas such as adolescent development, conflict resolution, de-escalation techniques, cultural competency, and understanding the school environment.
 - Officers already receive Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) and work closely with community mental health professionals
 - Regular collaboration with school staff
 - Mentorship for students
 - Safety support and law enforcement (when needed)
 - Community engagement
 - Culturally competent and equity minded
 - Emphasis on diversion program to avoid arrest with restorative justice practices
 - Data collection and evaluation
- Key Differences with a New Model
 - Staffing & resources (including after-school work)
 - Programming (focus on diversion to avoid arrest, in cooperation with partners)
 - Additional training in mental health first aid, youth development
 - Coordination with Care and Safety Assistants (CSAs)
 - Community engagement
 - Joint selection and management

- Equity-centered model
- CCS & CPD Partnership - Next Steps
 - May 18 - End of staff “discovery phase” about Youth Resource Officer (YRO) model. Board decides whether to include this on the May 30 agenda.
 - May 30 meeting - Possible Board vote about including YRO’s in the CCS Safety & Security Model
 - If the Board advances this model:
 - CCS & CPD host joint conversations in the community to discuss proposed changes and gather feedback about YRO’s in the CCS Safety & Security model
 - Post new model draft online for review and public comment
 - CCS & CPD collaborate to incorporate community feedback in the updated MOU & Protocols document
 - Execution of updated MOU
- Possible Community Outreach with CCS and CPD
 - If the School Board wants to continue this conversation, the following CPD “Walk & Talks” and “Courtside Chats” are scheduled for this month:
 - May 14: 4:00-5:00 PM - Community Walk at Westhaven
 - May 21: 4:00-5:00 PM - Courtside Chats Boys & Girls Club
 - May 22: 4:00-5:00 PM - Greenstone on 5th
 - May 29: 4:30-5:30 PM - Ridge/South 1st

Discussion:

Ms. Larson-Torres asked for clarification on Core Project Status items and who funds those items. Ms. Powell responded that the school division funds the items.

There was discussion to clarify the location of cameras that capture events on playgrounds, etc. (like for a recent evening event at Jackson-Via). Ms. Powell responded that state security equipment grant funding has not historically covered cameras that are not attached to the school building (light posts, etc), but more recently there has been flexibility to extend camera coverage away from the buildings.

Ms. Burns asked that a more specific breakdown on cameras camera placement (exterior vs interior) be included when security information is presented in future.

Ms. Larson-Torres asked if there is consensus to fund security cameras on larger areas on school grounds. Ms. Burns agreed.

Ms. Burns asked how the Division plans to ensure communication to the public around the weapons detection roll out. Ms. Cheuk responded that communications staff will work on a plan to more broadly communicate those details.

Ms. Larson-Torres asked about staff training for the weapons detectors. Mr. Koogler responded that training has already occurred and the vendor will provide additional training on the day of the first event (August 23) so that the protocols are fresh.

Ms. Burns inquired about the onboarding process for new hires. Ms. Powell responded by confirming that all new staff would participate in a pre-week training program.

Partnership with CPD:

Dr. Gurley clarified that the information is intended to guide the board's decision-making process as it moves forward. While it doesn't guarantee implementation by August 2024, it outlines the steps that would be involved if the board decides to pursue resource officers. Training and recruitment would need to take place, potentially delaying

implementation. This information will help staff determine the next steps and discuss which aspects are feasible within the desired timeframe.

Ms. Larson-Torres clarified that the board never directed the superintendent to reinstate a youth resource officer program. The board only requested a report on the program. In response, Dr. Gurley established a committee.

Chief Kochis emphasized that his role is to provide factual information about how a youth resource officer program could be implemented in Charlottesville, not to advocate for or against the plan. The decision ultimately rests with the board. However, if the board decides to move forward with such a program, it's important to consider the logistical implications. Training for the officers and allocating a budget would be essential elements. Chief Kochis noted that he remains available to provide the board with a clear picture of what implementing a youth resource officer program would entail.

Chief Kochis highlighted the 'Cambridge Model' as an example where a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) clearly defines the scope of police involvement in schools. Under this model, the Cambridge Police Department (CPD) responds to situations requiring a law enforcement response, while a diversion program exists to minimize arrests and explore alternative solutions. This approach aims to strike a balance between safety and student well-being.

Dr. Gurley clarified that the purpose of studying the Cambridge model of youth resource officers was to learn key elements that would serve our local community if the Board wants to return officers to our schools. Dr. Gurley advocated for structures that prioritize student support and minimize involvement with the juvenile justice system. He highlighted concerns about the previous SRO model where the role lacked clear definition. Dr. Gurley called for a model that prioritizes student well-being and offers effective support mechanisms, recognizing that issues in the community can impact schools (and vice versa).

Chief Kochis explained that the Cambridge Model is resource-intensive, with a strong focus on diverting youth from the juvenile justice system. It incorporates evening programs like mentoring and tutoring. However, building such a model takes time. Chief Kochis also highlighted that social workers often request police accompaniment during home visits.

Essential Elements and Guiding Principles:

Dr. Gurley asked the Board if they want to move forward with a version of the Cambridge model and what components are needed to be successful.

Chief Kochis reiterated that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) included in the Cambridge Model is a critical tool for keeping the board informed. This is achieved through regular data collection provided to the board.

Ms. Larson-Torres asked, with the interactions that occurred, how many resulted in youth moving forward into the system? Chief Kochis responded that he didn't have a number on hand to share.

Dr. Gurley pointed out that the model emphasizes removing students from situations and avoiding immediate transfer of responsibility to the Charlottesville Police Department

Dr. Gurley noted an increase in families pursuing legal action following incidents at school. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) could provide valuable guidance for managing these interactions.

Ms. Larson-Torres stated that the board could use a similar structure without CPD SROs involvement.

Dr. Gurley noted that the board requested that a model be brought back with additional options to consider alongside the existing CSA model. He emphasized the need for clear communication with staff regarding the next steps. Having rebuilt the framework, the board must now decide whether to implement a new model or continue with the current one. Dr. Gurley also encouraged board members to attend the upcoming 'Walk & Talks' program offered by the Charlottesville Police Department (CPD).

Chief Kochis extended a welcome to those who would like to participate in the Walk & Talks.

Ms. Cooper asked what feedback has been received about SROs during the Walk & Talks.

Ms. Burns shared that she has participated in CPD Walks & Talks for months in addition to visits to the Boys & Girls Club. Specific to the Youth Resource Officer model, Ms. Burns spoke with students who attended sessions with Ms. Bianca Johnson, and reported that students shared no concerns. She also highlighted that community violence means that families do not feel safe speaking with police in the community as others are watching, and that they are more likely to speak with a resource officer at school.

Ms. Powell shared feedback on her interactions from her walk at Westhaven with the community, which has been supportive of the possibility of returning officers to schools.

Mr. Meyer asked for clarification on the trend of violence outside schools. Chief Kochis responded that the trend is nationwide, with youth increasingly settling conflicts with violence. He attributed this to easier access to firearms and conflicts lingering due to social media, which can lead to escalation.

Ms. Dooley raised several concerns about the possibility of adding a Youth Resource Officer (YRO) program in our schools. First, she questioned if we were truly addressing the core issue. Could improved communication solve the problem without introducing police into the school environment? Regardless of the YRO decision, Ms. Dooley advocated for establishing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to clarify expectations and procedures for everyone involved. She further highlighted concerns about power dynamics within the school with a YRO. Who would hold ultimate decision-making authority? Ms. Dooley noted that with the recent budget process, we did not get all needs met and that this program is not reflected in the school or city budgets. Despite these reservations about the YRO program, Ms. Dooley voiced support for pre-arrest diversion efforts. She believes keeping students out of the justice system whenever possible is crucial.

Mr. Morse inquired about the program's estimated budget impact. Chief Kochis explained that if the Board wanted to pursue a YRO program, he recommended an initial implementation with three officers: one for the middle school and two for the high school. The first year would cost an estimated \$571,000 due to one-time hiring costs for the officers. In subsequent years, with the same model, the cost would decrease to around \$340,000 annually. Chief Kochis emphasized, as Dr. Gurley previously mentioned, that the program's objective goes beyond simply placing police officers in schools.

Ms. Richardson requested a detailed outline of the proposed Youth Resource Officer (YRO) program model. This would allow her to gain a clearer understanding of how the program would be implemented and function within the schools. Secondly, Ms. Richardson advocated for exploring alternative security measures before introducing the YRO program.

Ms. Cooper called for a data-driven approach to the Youth Resource Officer (YRO) program. She emphasized the importance of building relationships with students, and expressed interest in learning more about the successful Cambridge Model. Impressed by Ms. Bianca Johnson's restorative practices session, Ms. Cooper advocated for a more comprehensive restorative justice program within the schools. Additionally, she volunteered to participate in community outreach efforts to gather further input on the issue.

Mr. Morse inquired about the applicability of the Cambridge Model in addressing current problems in the school division. Ms. Powell acknowledged its potential effectiveness but stressed the importance of proper implementation and avoiding a reliance on individual personalities. The discussion then shifted to communication challenges. Ms. Powell highlighted the cumbersome process of conducting threat assessments without a School Resource Officer (SRO) on site. This involved gathering staff and waiting for a police response through multiple calls, hindering timely action. In contrast, an SRO could readily communicate with other officers, facilitating quicker response times and access to backup.

Ms. Burns highlighted the budgetary challenges of the school division during this year's budget cycle. The City Council's recent budget allocation left a shortfall of over \$600,000+ for student support services, exceeding the potential first-year cost of the proposed Youth Resource Officer (YRO) program (\$571,000). Ms. Burns emphasized the importance of these student support positions, such as Care & Safety Assistants (CSAs) and Knight School programs, which were previously requested but not funded. Despite ongoing efforts to recruit staff, these critical roles remain unfilled.

Ms. Larson-Torres expressed concerns about the proposed Youth Resource Officer (YRO) program, particularly the lack of transparency and community involvement in the decision-making process. She reflected back to the first needs-based budget presented to Charlottesville City Council, which was reduced by millions of dollars. She questioned why the board hasn't received an evaluation of what's not working with the current Care & Safety Assistant (CSA) model before considering any new models and advocated for a more thoughtful approach that prioritizes existing initiatives like restorative justice. Ms. Larson-Torres referenced a previous restorative justice grant that funded two positions at Charlottesville High School (CHS) and noted that understanding the impact of that program could be valuable in informing the current safety discussion.

Ms. Larson-Torres acknowledged the positive aspects of the Cambridge Model that focus on building relationships, but argued that these can be achieved without placing officers in schools.

Mr. Meyer clarified that his primary concern is the current trend of student detentions and the rise in violence spilling over from the community into schools. He emphasized that his interest in addressing this issue is not related to a specific incident from last fall.

Ms. Larson-Torres emphasized the importance of providing clear direction to the Superintendent.

4.2 Public Comment:

- Tyler Miller expressed concern about the proposed Youth Resource Officer (YRO) model. They called for improved administrative practices that prioritize empathy and ethical decision-making. Additionally, Miller emphasized the importance of a school board that functions independently and conducts thorough evaluations before approving any new initiatives.
- Allison Chapman also expressed concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model and noted that during community walks those who are not supportive of police are not likely to provide real feedback.
- Alix Heintzman shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model.
- Kathryn Laughon, member of the prior safety review committee, shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model. Dr. Laughon also shared data points around the efficacy of YRO models.
- Nic McCarthy-Rivera, History Teacher at CHS, shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model. He stated that the Care & Safety Assistants (CSA) model needs to be fully supported.
- Jalane Schmidt shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model. Dr. Schmidt also shared personal reflection on her own child's negative experience with an SRO.
- David Koenig shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model and also advocated for removing cell phones from schools.
- Laura Santiago shared comments acknowledging the difficulty of this decision and reflected on comments from previous meetings. Dr. Santiago stated that she doesn't feel strongly either way but noted that police officers are already in the buildings.
- Kisha Lashley shared comments of concern around the possible implementation of a Youth Resource Officer model and noted that students are not in support of it. She noted that CCS is different from Cambridge in regards to student enrollment and poverty levels.

Ms. Larson-Torres, Board Chair, asked board members to share their thoughts on whether they wish to continue discussion around the Youth Resource Model:

Ms. Richardson shared that she prefers to discontinue discussions around adding YROs.

Ms. Dooley shared interest in developing a more defined relationship with the Charlottesville Police Department.

Mr. Meyer shared support for voting on including the proposed YRO proposal in the current safety and security model.

Ms. Burns spoke in favor of continuing the work to gather a full understanding of the program. She also suggested that Dr. Gurley reach out to the Charlottesville City Manager and Council to inquire about funding for the \$570,000 program. Understanding their funding willingness is crucial. Are they open to discussions about financing items not funded during the budget process? In the meantime, what other options can we explore? Has there been any public input on this issue? Are we clear on the status of the CSA model? Ms. Burns supports moving forward with the current information, but is not necessarily ready to vote on May 30th.

Mr. Morse emphasized the need for further conversation before a decision is made. He suggested establishing key performance indicators (KPIs) for the CSA model to determine whether to continue, enhance, or change the model altogether. This additional information would allow for a more informed comparison of options.

Ms. Larson-Torres stated that she is not interested in moving forward with a YRO model and that she would like to know how to fully support CSAs to include training around restorative justice.

Dr. Gurley shared that discussions with Bianca Johnson, Family Engagement Coordinator and Restorative Justice Facilitator, indicated that there is a need for more restorative justice but that there is uncertainty about incorporating it using CSAs.

Ms. Cooper requested additional time to review information before a decision is made on the model. She also emphasized the importance of community engagement before a vote on May 30th.

Ms. Larson-Torres objected to rushing the decision to the May 30th meeting. She feels the process lacks transparency, respect for the prior committee's work, and sufficient justification for the proposed changes.

Ms. Dooley highlighted the lack of disciplinary collection data.

Mr. Meyer expressed support for the CSA model and suggested enhancements rather than a complete overhaul.

Ms. Powell provided background information on the historical process of the removal of School Resource Officers (SROs) from Charlottesville City Schools. She shared that there was a shift in the approach from improving the model to removing SROs entirely during the informal process that seemed to direct the committee's approach.

Mr. Meyer made a motion that the board take action on whether to move forward with the Youth Resource Officer (YRO) model at the May 30, 2024 meeting. Ms. Burns seconded, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, and Mr. Morse voted yes. Ms. Richardson and Ms. Larson-Torres voted no. 5 ayes, 2 nays.

4.2 Literacy Data: The Board voted to table this item until Fall 2024.

4.3 [Process Review for School Naming](#): Dr. Katina Otey, Chief Academic Officer, and Dr. T. Denise Johnson, Supervisor of Equity and Inclusion, presented information on the process for School Naming. Information presented included:

- School Naming - Purpose
 - To provide information about the school name review process, including the formation of the committee, required activities when soliciting feedback from the community, and other related operational action items.
 - This procedure is intended to be implemented as part of the Division's Policy FFA, Naming of Facilities and Grounds.
- School Naming - Responsibilities
 - Committee Chair
 - Principal
 - Name Review Committee
 - Communications Team

- Director of Finance
- Chief Operations Officer
- School Naming - Procedures
 - The Superintendent or designee shall conduct a review to determine whether the school or grounds should be renamed if:
 - A petition requesting that a review be conducted is signed by the parents or guardians of at least seventy-five (75%) percent of the students enrolled in the school and at least ten (10) years have passed since the school has last undergone a name change or review;
 - A petition requesting that a review be conducted is signed by at least seventy-five percent of the students enrolled in the school and at least ten (10) years have passed since the school has last undergone a name change or review;
 - The School Board directs that a review be conducted; or
 - The Superintendent decides that a review is necessary for any reason.
 - Step 1: Advisory Committee
 - Upon direction from the School Board, the Superintendent (or designee) shall form an advisory committee to conduct a name change review.
 - The committee should include various representatives:
 - Committee Chair, division-level representative
 - 2- School board members
 - Current school principal
 - 1- Teachers/support staff
 - 1-Student representatives if it's a high school
 - 2 Community members who do not currently have children attending the school
 - 2- Community member who currently has a child attending the reviewed school
 - *When practicable, alumni are encouraged to serve as members of the committee.
 - Step 2: Notify Relatives of the Individual (if applicable)
 - If a school named after an individual is subject to review, the division shall make reasonable efforts, for at least 30 days, to inform relatives of that individual and provide them with an opportunity to express opinions about the possible renaming of the school.
 - Reasonable Efforts Include:
 - External push : Publish notices / press release asking for help in reaching relatives (website, newspaper)
 - Internal push for relative search
 - Step 3: Meetings & Recommendation
 - The committee will facilitate relevant meetings and activities (i.e., community meetings, surveys, and research) culminating with a recommendation to the Superintendent.
 - Step 4: Recommendation to School Board
 - Based on the committee's findings and any additional information deemed appropriate, the Superintendent shall present a recommendation to the School Board.
 - Step 5: Debrief the Committee's Review Process
 - The Committee Chair and Superintendent will debrief the review process including reflecting on the successes and areas of growth.
 - Step 6: Finance Transfer
 - The Finance Director will provide a quote for Operations and the principal to design a budget specific to administrative and related costs Once the budget is submitted, the Finance Director will transfer over funds to the school's budget.
 - Step 7: Facility-related Adjustments
 - The Chief Operations Officer will oversee all facility action items, including the procurement of signage and other related items and working with the elections and voter registration office from the city to release new school names.

- School Naming - Timeline
 - We will be moving forward with an Elementary School Review
 - Trailblazer and Summit will not be reviewed.
 - The additional 4 schools will be reviewed starting in the Fall on 2024
 - Once the advisory board for this school is formed, Burnley-Moran and Johnson will begin at Step 3, selecting a name for the school.
 - Advisory Committees will begin meeting August, 2024.
 - Those interested in being a part of the committee can apply. Application doesn't automatically mean they will be part of the committee. Selection will be based on committee make-up requirements and reflect the diversity of CCS and promote equity of voice and thought.
 - Process completion for all schools will be completed by Winter Break, 2024.

Discussion:

Ms. Dooley asked that the renaming process be outlined for the community to better understand.

Dr. Gurley highlighted past instances where the Board's deviations from the committee's naming recommendations led to confusion. To avoid this, he promoted supporting the committee's chosen names, including moving away from the BME name/acronym. He shared that he and Dr. Korab discussed moving away from the BME name/acronym to provide more flexibility in choosing a name.

Ms. Dooley inquired about receiving an update on the next steps following the finalization of the name changes. She expressed interest in understanding the associated costs, particularly for rebranding and signage. Ms. Powell acknowledged her request and explained that while proposals for signage have already been sent out, city staff haven't received a sufficient number of responses yet.

Ms. Burns sought clarification on the timeline for recommendations and inquired whether the board could expect a recommendation to be presented for their decision in December's meeting. Dr. Gurley confirmed this, indicating that the recommendation would indeed come before the board in December for their final vote.

There was clarification that the subcommittee is tasked with the decision on whether to change the name or not.

Ms. Dooley requested clearer communication on the process, particularly regarding step 4 (recommendation to the School Board).

Dr. Gurley emphasized the importance of following through on the committee's recommendations to avoid confusion. Dr. Johnson supported this point, suggesting the Board either honor the recommendation or provide clear reasons for declining it.

4.4 [2024-2025 School Board Meeting Schedule](#): Leslie Thacker, Deputy Clerk, prepared the proposed 2024-2025 School Board Meeting Calendar for Board consideration at the first reading. The item will be presented for approval on the Consent Agenda on May 30, 2024.

Board members reached consensus to hold the routine April meeting that conflicts with the Spring Break holiday on March 27, 2024.

5.1 Comments from Members of the Community:

- Chuck Moran, descendant of Sarepta Moran and Charlottesville community member, addressed the Board with comments that if the Board had implemented the renaming process using the criteria of purpose and place, he would not be present today. Mr. Moran shared frustration with the naming process and stated that the research used for the Burnley-Moran renaming process was biased and flawed.
- Derek Hartline, Jackson-Via Teacher, shared comments of concern around the school renaming process and shared that the research is unsubstantiated.

6.1 School Board Annual Self-Evaluation: The Charlottesville City School Board establishes the vision, mission and goals for the school division. Policy BBA, Role and Evaluation of the School Board, states that the School Board will conduct a formal self-evaluation annually to ensure the proper discharge of its responsibilities to the community. School Board members discussed results of the self evaluations that were completed and focused on areas that scored less than competent and capable.

There was discussion around holding advances in rotating school buildings and potentially using Buford as a meeting space when the renovations are done.

There was discussion about potentially moving the meeting time to a later time if meeting length is reduced.

7.1 Upcoming Meetings: Ms. Larson-Torres read the upcoming meetings.

8.1 Adjourn the Public Meeting: The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Closed Session

A Closed Meeting of the Charlottesville City School Board was held on May 18, 2024 at 12:30 p.m., in the CATEC Administrative Suite.

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

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr., Superintendent

9.1 Closed Meeting: At 1:39 p.m. Mr. Morse offered a motion to go into Closed Session as authorized by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, Sections 2.2-3711 (A) (1) , for the purpose of discussing personnel matters (Superintendent Evaluation). Ms. Dooley seconded the motion, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Larson-Torres voting aye. 7 ayes, 0 nays.

9.2 Closed Meeting Certification: At 3:27 p.m. Mr. Morse 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. Ms. Dooley seconded the motion, the motion passed with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, Ms. Richardson, and Ms. Larson-Torres voting aye. 7 ayes, 0 nays.

There was no action.

The Board adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

Lisa Torres, School Board Chair

Julia Green, School Board Clerk