



**MINUTES**  
**CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY SCHOOL BOARD ADVANCE**  
**Charlottesville Area Technical Education (CATEC) Auditorium**  
**Saturday, December 7, 2024 (8:30 AM)**

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

**2.1 Roll Call of Board Members:**

The following Board Members were present:

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

The following Board Members were absent: Ms. Nicole Richardson

The following Staff Members were present:

Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr.	Ms. Kim Powell
Mr. Pat Cuomo	Dr. T. Denise Johnson
Ms. Beth Cheuk	Ms. Julia Green
Ms. Leslie Thacker	

The following Staff Members were absent:

Dr. Katina Otey	Ms. Renee Hoover
Ms. Maria Lewis	Ms. Carolyn Swift
Ms. Rachel Rasnake	

**3.1 Approval of Proposed Agenda:** Mr. Morse made a motion, seconded by Ms. Cooper, to approve the proposed agenda. Upon a roll-call vote, the motion carried with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Larson-Torres, voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**4.1 Elementary Rezoning Update:** Kim Powell, Chief Operations Officer, and Karen Jackson, a representative from education consultant Woolpert, presented a rezoning process update for Board information.

Ms. Jackson provided an update on the school rezoning process. She discussed the current status of the process, including the development of four rezoning options and the collection of community feedback through surveys and public meetings. The community's key concerns include walkability, diversity, and the impact on specific neighborhoods. Jackson also addressed questions about housing developments and how they are factored into rezoning.

Information presented included:

- **Process Overview:** The presentation outlines a comprehensive rezoning process including planning, data collection, committee work, and community engagement.

- Boundary Planning Process: This involves analyzing current school data, including enrollment, transfers, and utilization rates.
- Rezoning Committee: A diverse committee is tasked with creating rezoning options based on key considerations such as walkability, bus efficiency, neighborhood cohesion, and demographic balance.
- Community Engagement: The process includes presenting boundary options to the community for feedback, both in-person and online.
- Rezoning Scenarios: Three scenarios (A, B, and C) are presented, each with different impacts on school utilization, socioeconomic balance, and the number of students affected.
- Survey Results: Preliminary survey results show community preferences and concerns for each option.
- Future Considerations: The plan accounts for future housing developments and their potential impact on student populations.
- Implementation: The rezoning plan considers phased implementation over 4-8 years.
- Key Considerations: The process focuses on maximizing walkability, and bus efficiency, keeping neighborhoods together, maintaining or improving diversity, and ensuring longevity of at least 5 years.
- Data Analysis: Includes current state of schools, closest school analysis, live/attend analysis, density maps, walk zones, and enrollment projections.

#### Questions/Discussion:

- Ms. Powell proposed a strategy to align school rezoning with housing development timelines. This approach involves regular meetings with relevant agencies to track upcoming developments. In December of each year, a focused review will be conducted to identify developments expected to be completed within the next nine months. This information will be presented to the school board in January to inform decisions on the next phase of boundary changes. By implementing this strategy, the school district aims to avoid unnecessary student relocations and ensure that rezoning decisions are based on accurate and up-to-date information about housing development timelines.
- Ms. Burns suggested that a member of the school board should be on the planning commission to ensure a full understanding of the implications of planning decisions on the school system. Ms. Powell agreed that proactive information sharing is beneficial.
- Mr. Meyer suggested a phased approach to rezoning that focuses on geographic areas. This approach would involve outlining the eventual boundaries but implementing changes gradually based on the timeline of housing development. Families would have a clearer understanding of their child's future school but would have the option to start their child at a different school earlier if desired. Ms. Powell added that this approach would allow for the implementation of cohort-based decision-making, where families could choose to enroll their children in specific cohorts or groups.
- Ms. Powell discussed the need for continued collaboration with Woolpert to accurately project future enrollment numbers, especially given the ongoing rezoning and housing development changes. Ms. Jackson confirmed Woolpert's commitment to supporting the district and acknowledged the importance of considering early start options for families. She also explained the annual review process for rezoning plans, which will involve assessing the impact of housing developments and making necessary adjustments to the timeline.
- Ms. Dooley expressed concern about the impact of rezoning on fifth-grade students, particularly those who might experience multiple school changes due to reconfiguration and rezoning. She emphasized the importance of minimizing disruptions for these students and ensuring they have the option to stay in their current school.
- Ms. Jackson acknowledged this concern and explained that Woolpert would analyze various scenarios, including sibling placement and the potential impact on school capacity. While she acknowledged the challenges of accommodating all requests, she indicated that allowing one grade level to stay put typically has minimal impact on overall school utilization.
- Mr. Meyer asked if the current rezoning options were final or if they could be modified based on community feedback. Ms. Jackson confirmed that the options are not set in stone and that the final recommendation will likely be a combination of the best elements from each option, taking into account community preferences and the key rezoning considerations.

- Mr. Meyer expressed concern about the high percentage of low-SES students projected for Summit Elementary in options three and four. He emphasized the importance of socioeconomic diversity for better academic outcomes. Ms. Jackson acknowledged that the current projections are based on existing data and that the actual impact of new housing developments on the school's demographics is uncertain. She noted that the diversity metrics could fluctuate as new developments come online.
- Ms. Dooley highlighted the importance of the school board having a frank discussion about the trade-offs between minimizing student movement and achieving a better balance among schools. She acknowledged the impact of rezoning on Summit Elementary and emphasized the need to address these concerns through careful planning and phasing. Ms. Dooley suggested that by implementing a phased approach and considering individual family needs, the district could alleviate some of the concerns raised by the community. Ultimately, she stressed the importance of a broader conversation about the desired characteristics of the district's schools.
- Dr. Gurley emphasized the need for difficult conversations about rezoning, particularly regarding the impact of new developments like Carlton. He suggested that dividing communities, as was discussed for the Kendlewood area, could be a potential solution to address the high concentration of low-SES students at Summit Elementary. While acknowledging the potential unpopularity of such a decision, Dr. Gurley argued that it might be necessary to achieve a better balance among schools. He drew a parallel to the existing division of the Prospect area and suggested that similar strategies could be considered for other communities.
- Ms. Larson-Torres commended Summit Elementary School Principal Ms. Johnson for her engagement and presence throughout the rezoning process and acknowledged the importance of her input. She then asked Ms. Johnson to share her perspective on the matter.
- Ms. Johnson, the principal of Summit Elementary, expressed deep concern about the high concentration of low-income students at her school and the impact it has on the school's accreditation status and the ability of staff to meet the diverse needs of the student population. She emphasized the challenges faced by staff in addressing not only academic needs but also the social and emotional needs of students.
- Ms. Johnson highlighted the importance of balancing the socioeconomic diversity of schools and the need to utilize resources effectively across the district. She expressed her belief that dispersing students to different schools with available resources would benefit all students, including those at Summit. She also acknowledged the challenges of implementing change and the potential resistance from some community members. However, she emphasized the importance of considering the long-term well-being of students and the need to make difficult decisions for the betterment of the entire school district.
- Ms. Dooley acknowledged that the current rezoning options have not explored splitting communities, but noted that this idea emerged from community feedback. She questioned the community's willingness to accept such a solution.
- Ms. Powell added that the idea of splitting communities came from community feedback, and that the district is actively listening to the concerns of residents.
- Ms. Burns expressed a willingness to make difficult decisions to improve the balance of socioeconomic status at Summit Elementary, even if it means splitting communities. She emphasized the importance of providing all students with equal opportunities and addressing their needs, regardless of their background.
- Ms. Cooper raised concerns about the potential impact of splitting communities on children, particularly those from low-income backgrounds who rely on community support. She emphasized the importance of considering the perspectives of teachers and administrators, as they are directly involved in implementing rezoning decisions. Ms. Cooper suggested exploring alternative strategies, such as gradually transitioning students to different schools or focusing on improving resources and support at Summit Elementary.
- Ms. Powell introduced Renee Devall, the new Transportation Coordinator, who has experience with rezoning in Albemarle County. Ms. Powell noted that Ms. Devall's insights on issues like divided neighborhoods, phasing, and sibling groups could be valuable to the school board as they consider rezoning options for Charlottesville.
- Ms. Devall discussed the challenges of redistricting in Caroline County, particularly regarding the impact on students and communities. She emphasized the importance of phasing redistricting to minimize

disruption, citing the example of Walton Middle School in Albemarle County, which suffered from underutilization after a rapid redistricting. Devall highlighted the need to balance diversity and community cohesion, explaining how decisions were made to maintain diverse student populations while minimizing the impact on neighborhoods. She also addressed the issue of sibling transitions, noting that the district prioritized keeping rising fifth graders with their siblings for one year to ease the transition. sizing the placement of rising fifth graders with their siblings to maintain stability during transitions.

- Ms. Powell added that the district's policy regarding sibling transitions aimed to minimize disruption for families. She explained that younger siblings would remain in their current schools for one year to stay with their older sibling in fifth grade, but would then transition to their designated schools in subsequent years. She also raised the issue of out-of-zone applications, noting that the current policy limits these to childcare reasons. Expanding this policy could have significant implications and should be carefully considered by the board.
- Mr. Meyer asked if phasing the redistricting process could potentially reduce the need for additional buses and drivers. Ms. Devall agreed, noting that in past redistricting in Albemarle County, buses were strategically reassigned to accommodate student transfers, minimizing the need for additional resources. She emphasized that the specific areas under consideration in the current redistricting plan do not involve large-scale student transfers, further reducing the potential impact on transportation needs.
- Ms. Burns asked if it would be possible to see the potential impact on bus drivers in the next iteration of the redistricting plan. Ms. Powell agreed that this was a valid point and suggested that the staff work group, including Renee Devall, Dr. Johnson, herself, and Pat Cuomo, could collaborate to project the additional need for buses and drivers as the redistricting process moves forward. She explained that by reducing walkability, there may be a need for additional transportation resources.
- Ms. Devall explained that reducing walkability by 100 students citywide might not necessarily lead to a significant increase in bus routes, as it could be absorbed into existing bus routes. She also pointed out that depending on the specific redistricting plan, some schools, like Summit, might become more walkable, freeing up buses that are currently serving outer areas.
- Ms. Powell confirmed that the final recommendation would include an assessment of the potential impact on bus routes, and Ms. Jackson acknowledged that while the estimate might not be perfect, it would provide a useful indication.
- Mr. Morse expressed mixed feelings about the redistricting plan, particularly regarding Summit Elementary School. While he initially supported the idea of reuniting Greenstone families and maintaining Summit's integrity, he acknowledged concerns about potential overcrowding due to new developments in the area. He suggested that this factor should be carefully considered as the plan moves forward.
- Ms. Cheuk posed a question to the board, asking whether they would be open to considering a proposal to move all of Kindewood Elementary School's students to Burnley-Moran Elementary School. She suggested that this question would likely arise when the committee reconvenes in mid-January to discuss feedback on the redistricting plan.
- Ms. Dooley noted that this was essentially what Options 1 and 2 in the rezoning plan proposed – moving students from Kindewood to different schools (Johnson or Jackson).
- Ms. Jackson confirmed that Options 1 and 2 involved moving Kindewood students, but emphasized that minimizing student movement was not a primary consideration in the rezoning process. The key considerations were factors such as walkability, bus efficiency, and maintaining diversity.
- Ms. Torres raised a couple of questions regarding the impact of increasing students with special education needs on kindergarten programming. She inquired about the projected placement of these students across schools and whether programming differences, such as the Teach program at Burnley-Moran, would be affected by rezoning.
- Dr. Gurley, acknowledging the importance of this issue, explained that Ms. Rasnake (Special Education Director) had previously emphasized that special education support services would follow the students. He explained that specific projections for special education teacher support needs are challenging due to the ongoing identification and exit of students from special education services.
- Here's a summary of the conversation in past tense for meeting minutes:

- Ms. Torres further clarified her question regarding students in self-contained classrooms, specifically mentioning the Walker program. She inquired about the grade levels served by the Walker program's self-contained classes.
- Ms. Powell explained that the middle school level of the LEAP program (housed at Walker) operates similarly to a magnet program. Students are bussed to the program location regardless of their residential zone. While rezoning does not directly impact the placement of LEAP students, the anticipated expansion of the program was considered when assessing school capacities. Ms. Powell confirmed that the district is planning to add classrooms for the LEAP program at Greenbrier and Jackson, and these spaces were accounted for in the capacity calculations for those schools.
- Ms. Torres confirmed that the middle school LEAP program is located at Buford Middle School.
- Ms. Powell emphasized that the key consideration for these specialized programs is ensuring adequate space within each school. The capacity of schools like Jackson and Greenbrier was adjusted to accommodate the LEAP classrooms, similar to how space is allocated for other specialized programs such as art and STEM.
- Ms. Torres inquired about the number of out-of-district students, excluding city employees' children. She questioned whether removing these students from the system would significantly impact school capacity.
- Dr. Gurley confirmed that the number of out-of-district students outside of city employees' children was relatively small.
- Ms. Powell explained that at the elementary level, most out-of-district students are children of division employees. She emphasized that even for employee children, admission is based on space availability. While the district treats these students as regular students once enrolled, any policy changes regarding out-of-district students, particularly for employees, would require careful consideration. This is because the ability of staff to bring their children to the city schools is often a significant factor in attracting and retaining employees.
- Ms. Dooley expressed interest in soliciting specific feedback from the Kindewood community regarding their preferred rezoning option. She suggested asking the community whether they would prefer to stay together at Summit Elementary or if they would prefer to have the entire community move to Burnley-Moran Elementary School, acknowledging that some movement is inevitable under the current rezoning options.
- Ms. Cheuk observed that the Kindewood community has consistently expressed a preference for remaining at Summit Elementary. She rephrased Ms. Dooley's question, suggesting that the community be asked: "If a significant portion of the community is likely to be rezoned to Burnley-Moran, would you prefer to have the entire community move to Burnley-Moran to stay together?"
- Ms. Burns summarized Ms. Dooley and Ms. Cheuk's points, emphasizing that the community is essentially being presented with a choice: "Either you move together as a community, or you face the possibility of being split between schools."
- Mr. Meyer reiterated his priority of achieving socioeconomic diversity in all schools, believing it to be crucial for ensuring the best educational outcomes for all students. He expressed a preference for a modified version of Option 2, emphasizing the need for diversity not only in socioeconomic status but also in English Language Learner (ELL) and Special Education (SPED) populations.
- Mr. Meyer acknowledged that community feedback has shown a preference for Options 3 and 4, particularly from Burnley-Moran residents. However, he emphasized that these options may not necessarily result in the desired level of diversity across schools. He stated that while he is open to providing the Kindewood community with the option of moving together to Burnley-Moran, the school board should send a clear signal that it prioritizes creating diverse learning environments.
- Ms. Torres expressed interest in seeing a map illustrating the potential impact of splitting the Kindewood community. Ms. Jackson acknowledged the request and stated that while she couldn't create the map immediately, she would explore this option and present potential modifications to the rezoning committee at their next meeting. Ms. Jackson indicated that the issue of splitting versus not splitting the Kindewood community would likely be a significant topic of discussion.
- Mr. Meyer observed that the relatively limited development in the north and west side of the city, where Trailblazer Elementary is located, likely explains why fewer changes are projected for that school's

attendance zone. Ms. Jackson agreed, noting that the existing development patterns in the University area are not expected to generate significant student growth for Trailblazer, unlike other areas with more substantial development.

- Mr. Meyer emphasized the importance of seeking community input on their broader priorities for the school system. He encouraged community members to express their views on issues such as diversity, equity, and inclusion, rather than solely focusing on how rezoning might impact their families.
- Ms. Torres shared an online question regarding the minimal impact on Trailblazer Elementary's student population in the rezoning plans, despite its larger capacity. She then noted that this question had been previously addressed during the meeting discussion.
- Ms. Torres presented a question submitted by a Burnley-Moran parent. The parent inquired whether Burnley-Moran Elementary School (BME), operating below capacity, could absorb students from Summit or another part of the city without displacing existing BME students.
- Ms. Cheuk expressed concern that such a move would significantly underutilize Greenbrier Elementary School.
- Ms. Jackson confirmed that Greenbrier's current utilization rate is 51%. She explained that to increase enrollment at BME without underutilizing Greenbrier, students would need to be rezoned to Burnley-Moran or Trailblazer Elementary.
- Ms. Torres reiterated that several previous meetings had emphasized the need for students to shift towards the northern part of the city where available capacity exists. Ms. Jackson concurred with this assessment.
- Ms. Torres presented a community question regarding the analysis of survey feedback. The question specifically inquired about the tools used to analyze written responses.
- Ms. Jackson explained that the initial step in analyzing feedback involves plotting the responses geographically on maps. This visual representation allows for an analysis of community preferences and concerns within specific neighborhoods. The team will then delve deeper into areas with strong positive or negative reactions to specific rezoning options to understand the underlying reasons.
- Regarding the analysis of written responses, Ms. Jackson acknowledged that the primary tool would be manual review. The team will carefully read each comment and summarize the key themes and concerns expressed by the community.
- Ms. Powell clarified that all community comments will be published online, except those containing personal information, profanity, or highly offensive language. This transparency allows the community to assess the accuracy and fairness of how their feedback was considered in the rezoning process.
- Ms. Torres presented a community question highlighting the walkability of Summit Elementary School for residents of Belmont, 6th Street, and Garrett. The question expressed concern that splitting these communities would disrupt the existing sense of community and that Burnley-Moran Elementary School, while a good school, is not within walking distance of these neighborhoods.
- Ms. Powell acknowledged that some Kindewood families had indicated a willingness to consider bus service as an option. However, she noted that the desire for bus service was not a primary factor in their decision-making. Ms. Powell suggested that while bus service might be viewed favorably by some families, it would likely be considered a secondary factor in their overall assessment of rezoning options.
- Mr. Morse inquired about current walking practices at Kindewood Elementary, specifically regarding any changes to walking buses or partnerships like City of Promise. Dr. Gurley clarified that while there's no City of Promise partnership for Kindewood, Miss Johnson's staff walks with students to school daily. Ms. Burns emphasized that school transportation generally involves a choice between bus transportation and walking. Ms. Johnson shared concerns about the long-term impact of school choice and transportation options on the role of neighborhood schools, particularly as the district assesses the future of aging schools and the community's desire to maintain neighborhood school options.

### **5.1 Comments from Members of the Community:**

- Beth Schueler, a parent and K-12 education policy researcher, addressed the school board, advocating for student demographic balancing across schools to enhance learning outcomes and equity. While acknowledging the potential disruption of forced student transfers, she strongly emphasized the need for a

phased-in approach to minimize these impacts. Schueler argued that public resistance to balancing plans often stems from the perceived inevitability of widespread forced transfers and that a communicated phased-in approach would likely garner greater community support. She offered her research expertise to assist the school system in developing and implementing a successful balancing plan.

- Dr. Gurley shared that he and Dr. Johnson have an upcoming meeting to discuss Kindewood Elementary. This meeting is crucial because current conversations about socioeconomic status (SES) in the school system are based on the assumption that the area will be primarily low-income. However, Dr. Gurley acknowledges that Kindewood will be a mixed-income community, and understanding the phasing of different income levels within the development is essential for accurately assessing the implications for the school.
- Ms. Powell clarified that school utilization is not assessed by grade level. Classroom assignments are flexible and adjust based on cohort sizes, which can vary significantly. While the typical norm is three classrooms per grade, this number fluctuates to accommodate differing cohort sizes. Therefore, utilization is evaluated at the building level, considering the overall capacity and usage of the entire school rather than focusing on individual grade levels.
- Ms. Torres inquired about the possibility of further modifications and public feedback after the initial recommendation and public hearing. Ms. Jackson confirmed that the process is iterative. After presenting a recommendation to the public for feedback, the school board will have the opportunity to make modifications based on community input. The committee's role will be complete after the second meeting, and the board will then direct any necessary modifications.
- Mr. Meyer inquired about the process for the upcoming rezoning decisions, specifically the timing of the public hearing and the board's vote. Ms. Cheuk clarified that the public hearing would be held at the January 22nd board meeting, followed by board discussions two weeks later. She emphasized that the board retains the flexibility to set the final timeline for the vote, allowing for additional time for consideration or information gathering if necessary.
- Dr. Gurley emphasized the importance of providing the school board with all necessary information before making final rezoning decisions. He expressed concern that delaying the process by continually adding new considerations or engaging in further public input could lead to community frustration and disengagement. Dr. Gurley suggested that the school district should compile all requested information, including the input from Ms. Jackson and Woolpert, and present a comprehensive package to the board. This approach, he argued, would ensure that the board has all the necessary information to make informed decisions and would maintain public trust in the rezoning process.
- Mr. Meyer emphasized the importance of expressing any desired influence on the rezoning committee's recommendations during the current meeting. Ms. Dooley suggested that board members could also follow up directly with committee members, such as herself or Ms. Richardson. Dr. Gurley reminded everyone that the public hearing would provide an opportunity for community members to express their views and concerns directly to the board. He reiterated his desire to maintain a clear and efficient process, emphasizing the need to avoid unnecessary delays that could lead to community frustration and disengagement.
- Ms. Torres inquired about the process for public comment during the upcoming public hearing, confirming that community members could submit written statements in advance and that all submissions would be archived for board review.
- Ms. Torres acknowledged the concerns expressed by some parents that the rezoning process feels predetermined. She emphasized the importance of transparency and ongoing community engagement throughout the process to build trust and address these concerns.
- Dr. Gurley acknowledged the historical context of these concerns and emphasized the importance of continued transparency and responsiveness to community input throughout the rezoning process. He highlighted the district's commitment to adapting the plan based on community feedback and reiterated the importance of maintaining trust through open communication.
- Ms. Torres acknowledged the historical context of development patterns in Charlottesville, noting that areas historically marginalized have often borne the brunt of development pressures. She emphasized the city's commitment to addressing these historical inequities and ensuring a more equitable distribution of development opportunities. Ms. Torres expressed concern about the limited development occurring in areas like Greenbrier, which could potentially contribute to affordability challenges.

- Mr. Meyer emphasized his preference for receiving a concrete rezoning recommendation from the committee in January, including a specific phasing plan, rather than a set of options. He believes this approach will streamline the decision-making process for the board.
- Ms. Powell confirmed that the committee's recommendation will indeed include a phasing plan. She acknowledged the importance of flexibility in the phasing plan, citing the example of the "biscuit run" in Albemarle County, where construction timelines can impact redistricting plans. Ms. Powell emphasized the need for ongoing monitoring and adjustments to the phasing plan based on changing factors, such as construction timelines and enrollment projections. She also highlighted the importance of transparent communication with the community regarding any necessary modifications to the plan.
- Ms. Torres expressed her support for considering specific requests from individual families during the rezoning process, as long as these requests are well-founded and appropriate within the overall rezoning plan. She acknowledged that some families may have specific concerns or requests regarding their situations.
- Ms. Jackson provided an example of a specific request from a family. She explained that some families expressed concerns about why certain parcels within their neighborhood were included in a different rezoning zone than the rest of the neighborhood. Ms. Jackson emphasized that these types of specific requests are valuable and will be carefully considered by the rezoning committee.
- Ms. Dooley emphasized the importance of having a single, comprehensive rezoning plan in place to facilitate more specific and targeted feedback from the community.
- Ms. Jackson acknowledged the current intensity of the rezoning discussions and assured the board that the level of community engagement would likely subside once a final plan is implemented. She also noted that her experience in other districts suggests that families generally adapt well to their new schools and often become integrated into their new school communities. Ms. Jackson suggested potential strategies for facilitating a smooth transition for students, such as school open houses, ice cream socials, and field trips to their new schools.
- Mr. Morse shared his experience at a VSBA conference where a representative from Fredericksburg presented on the closure of two elementary schools. Mr. Morse highlighted the success of field trips in facilitating a smoother transition for students and teachers from the closing schools. These field trips, conducted towards the end of the school year (March or April), allowed students to experience their new school environment firsthand and interact with their future teachers, fostering a sense of welcome and reducing anxieties about the transition.

**6.1 Closed Meeting - Safety / Security Audit Report (as authorized by Sections 2.2-3711 (A) (19) of the Code of Virginia):** The closed Meeting of the Charlottesville City School Board was held on December 7, 2024, at 10:20 a.m., in the Charlottesville Area Technical Education Center (CATEC) Auditorium.

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

**ABSENT:** Ms. Richardson

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dr. Royal A. Gurley, Jr., Superintendent; Kim Powell, Chief Operations Officer; Pat Cuomo, Director of Technology; Todd Koogler, Coordinator of Safety and Security; and Leslie Thacker, Board Clerk

**Closed Session Motion:** At 10:20 a.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) (19), for the discussion of plans to protect public safety as it relates to terrorist activity or specific cybersecurity threats or vulnerabilities and briefings by staff members, legal counsel, or law enforcement or emergency service officials concerning actions taken to respond to such matters or a related threat to public safety; discussion of information subject to the exclusion in subdivision 2 or 14 of § 2.2-3705.2, where discussion in an open meeting would jeopardize the safety of any person or the security of any facility, building, structure, information technology system, or software program; or discussion of reports or plans related to the security of any governmental facility, building or structure, or the safety of persons using such facility, building or structure. Ms. Dooley seconded the motion, the motion carried with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Larson-Torres, voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays



**1.3 Closed Meeting Certification:** At 12:54 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. Burns seconded the motion, the motion carried with Ms. Burns, Ms. Cooper, Ms. Dooley, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Morse, and Ms. Larson-Torres, voting aye. 6 ayes, 0 nays

**Action:** None

**7.1 Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

A video recording of the December 7, 2024 meeting can be located at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/11Q9nN-Sgu6IDGMEqInTctBZUCI0xc9aT/view?usp=drive\\_link](https://drive.google.com/file/d/11Q9nN-Sgu6IDGMEqInTctBZUCI0xc9aT/view?usp=drive_link)

---

Emily Dooley, School Board Chair

---

Leslie Thacker, School Board Clerk