

Board Special Meeting



2445 – 3rd Avenue South, Seattle WA 98134

Work Session: District Scorecard/Operations Data Dashboard;
Work Session: Growth Boundaries Amendments; Executive Session: Evaluate the
performance of a public employee
Wednesday, November 09, 2016, 4:30-7:30pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

Minutes

Work Session: District Scorecard/Operations Data Dashboard

The meeting was called to order at 4:32pm. Directors Patu, Pinkham, Geary, Harris and Burke were present. Director Peters arrived at 4:34pm. The meeting was staffed by Superintendent Larry Nyland, Deputy Superintendent Stephen Nielsen, Associate Superintendent for Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley and Director of Research & Evaluation Eric Anderson.

District Scorecard

Deputy Superintendent Nielsen spoke about the process to develop the scorecard and Dr. Eric Anderson provided an overview of the 2015-16 District Scorecard/Operations Data Dashboard. Dr. Anderson noted this is the third year presenting these measures, and asked if Directors had any questions staff would be able to follow-up and provide the information needed. He also recognized the hard work of the research evaluation team and the Department of Technology Services (DoTS). Dr. Anderson noted the focus of the District Scorecard is primarily on these 5 categories: academic milestones, commitment to equity, effective teachers and leaders, positive school environments, and stakeholder engagement & satisfaction. Dr. Anderson went through the documents that he provided to Directors. He noted there were 31 measures, which give a comprehensive data profile.

Director Peters commented on slide #14 of the presentation regarding gap closing areas where progress was shown on 8th grade science proficiency and requested to have more dialogue with the Board and staff regarding this upward trend. Regarding slide #20 (Completing Algebra course by 8th grade), Director Peters noted that the percentage of the gap went down because the scores of white students went down and commented on the weaknesses of focusing only on the gap in isolation without looking at the context. She also noted the concerns in the community around advance learning. Director Peters noted that the current format used for the climate surveys for families, staff and students does not mention school principals or school administrators. Dr. Anderson noted there are 31 questions related to school leadership and they are asked of by all staff. However, in the past these results were not made public, noting he can provide the aggregate survey results. Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Dr. Clover Codd explained that the instructional leadership survey is connected to principal evaluation and the AWSP leadership framework, which is why the results are not made public – that is the agreement the District has made with the Principal Association of Seattle Schools (PASS).

Director Harris noted that slides #6 & #9, and most of the slides on proficiencies, are

disaggregated by race and ethnicity, but it is not until slide #37 that lower socioeconomic is mentioned. She asked staff if the Board can get disaggregated data on lower socioeconomic. Dr. Anderson noted his team organizes data in the best way they possibly can, they can work towards eventually disaggregating the data and in the future, staff can discuss a more interactive data on how one can filter the data, noting this work would need to happen in stages over time. Director Harris spoke to the importance of closing the opportunity gap and believes that socioeconomic matters a great deal and wants this to be measured as well. Director Harris asked why curriculum was not mentioned in this report. Mr. Nielsen noted this District Scorecard instrument was done in 2013 and for some reason curriculum was not added at that time, noting staff is trying to be consistent with the instrument used and that the Board might want to review/redesign the District Scorecard instrument. Dr. Anderson noted that the Research, Evaluation and Assessment Office is fully supportive of this idea and would welcome feedback and new thoughts on the instrument.

Director Pinkham asked if students who identify as multiracial are also being broken out to one of the other ethnic categories. Dr. Anderson noted per federal rules, a student is either multiracial or not. Director Pinkham noted that he would like to see more data on historically underserved students of color – African American, Native American, Hispanics and Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) – and to get more information on student dropout rates in order to have a better assessment on where and when the District is losing students.

Regarding slide #21, Director Burke commented on hearing stories from students and families that have made the transition from elementary/middle school math to algebra – that students are not prepared in arithmetic. He would like to see higher math standards set on the District scorecard.

Regarding slide #37, Director Patu asked why low income students are less likely or on average taught by a highly effective teacher. Dr. Anderson noted staff is interested in doing more research around this and then explained that one hypothesis is that there is more teacher turnover in schools that are higher poverty, but he has not looked into what the other factors may be. Mr. Tolley noted his observation over the years, particularly in the Southeast region, which has largely our Title 1 schools, is where the District has the largest number of teacher vacancies every year and the District has filled those vacancies with either replacing teachers or offering incentives. This is part of the dynamic to evaluate what is going on.

Director Geary asked whether the experience of teachers would be tracked on BSSA. Superintendent Nyland noted this is an ongoing discussion on the implementation of the regulations and was discussed at the Council of Great City Schools. Staff will continue to monitor this discussion.

Directors and Mr. Tolley discussed the Southeast Initiative that has evolved into the performance management strategy, which created the school segmentation work. Mr. Tolley also spoke to the progress made at Rainier Beach High School, Cleveland High School and Aki Kurose Middle School.

Regarding Fiscal Integrity, Director Peters asked if the District is covering every central office administration cost. Assistant Superintendent for Business & Finance JoLynn Berge noted there are many positions that are held in the central office but actually provide services out in schools. Ms. Berge noted staff is taking a look at this list.

Directors and staff discussed the importance that every student should have access to a highly effective teacher regardless of their income, neighborhood, or school. Director Patu mentioned students are successful when they have highly effective teachers teaching them. Dr. Anderson noted in the research staff has done, they have researched 8 positive outlier schools. For example, at Olympic Hills (a school that has the highest growth) the most highly effective teachers spend the most time with students who need them the most. Dr. Clover Codd noted it is a nation-wide trend that Title 1 schools tend to have a high turnover in teachers than non-Title 1 schools. Directors noted this concern is a part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, which would need to be address in order to make any changes.

Directors and staff discussed the timeline of the District Scorecard. Mr. Nielsen noted the documents on the 2016-16 District Annual Operations Data Dashboard was also included in the Board's packet for them to review.

This session ended at 5:37 pm.

Work Session: Growth Boundaries Amendments

This session began at 5:38 p.m.

This meeting was staffed by: Superintendent Larry Nyland; Associate Superintendent for Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley; Associate Superintendent for Operations and Capital, Flip Herndon; Director of Enrollment Planning Ashley Davies; Executive Director of Schools, Helen Joung; and Director of Policy, Board Relations and Special Projects, Nate Van Duzer.

Dr. Herndon began by thanking the Board for this work session on the amendments, noting that the materials show the language of the amendments received to date. He explained that staff want to understand the amendments, so they can highlight where there may be conflicts/impacts under the various scenarios. There are always impacts whenever a change is made. Flip expressed appreciation to Ashely Davies and Nate Van Duzer for all the work that went into preparing this material. He then turned the floor over to Ashley Davies, Director of Enrollment Planning

Ms. Davies said that she thought it would be helpful to provide a note sheet with all amendments received thus far from Board directors, as well as some of the impacts of the amendments and costs, which was included within the amendments packet provided to the Board. She called attention to Amendment 5A and 5B and said she was here to help moderate the discussion, so that everyone understands what the amendments are, as well as the impacts of the amendments that have been brought forward by board members.

Dr. Herndon suggested that Board members speak to the amendments they introduced.

Director Burke said he was happy to speak first to amendment to 5A and would then leave it open to the other sponsors. He stated that the impetus for the amendment is probably well understood regarding the huge cascading effect to how the district opens Cedar Park. He said we need to do right by that community when opening a new school and that what he has heard from the community is that the cascading affects have created a lot of dissatisfaction but don't necessarily improve the school communities.

Implementing means having to move kids in and out of school in the northeast corner of the city. Opening Cedar Park as an attendance area school would create a high concentration of disadvantaged students at the school. The feedback from the community and the numbers make him uncomfortable.

He went on to point out that opening Cedar Park as an option school has upsides. The draw for an option school would be broader than an attendance area school. It allows the district to maintain existing boundaries for John Roger and Olympic Hills elementary schools. And an option school would allow a natural demographic leveling effect. The difficulties of opening Cedar Park as an option school seem like things that can be fixed with enthusiasm and focus. The John Rogers and Olympic Hills communities are enthusiastic about opening Cedar Park as an option school, even if it's a school their kids won't go attend.

Director Geary then said that amendments 5A and 6A go together. She referred to the district scorecard work session just before this work session and mentioned a slide showing a correlation between a child feeling cared for and a better outcome. She said we have seen that at Olympic Hills and that she believes that when a building is healthy and self-sustaining, it does well. The board has heard from the communities that this is important to them, and they have told the board that they are willing to undergo tight logistical challenges short term, while the district works out the long-term plan.

Director Geary expressed her concern at a perceived attempt to make children flow like water, and her worry that in the process students' long-term outcomes are being sacrificed. The Olympic Hills community moved into Cedar Park, a less than ideal situation, with the anticipation of going into the new school in the future. Director Geary feels we are not meeting the "every child, every day" motto. It is too disruptive for her to support this type of boundary shift without offering families some form of mitigation. She said the changes don't consider that these are families who donate time and money into the community, and that we don't monetize that supportive community. She then said that when you pull them apart, that time and volunteering is lost. She said we are ripping apart communities.

Director Burke reported that the Olympic Hills community has done some outreach to families while determining how to work within the process of Board discussions and action. This was the framework for creation of amendments 5(a) and 5(b), and 6(b), as amendments to cause less disruption. He said the amendment was developed to build on the work already done by the Equity Team. Director Burke reminded everyone that the Board received a letter from the members of the Race and Equity Team and the Olympic Hills PTA, that they testified before the Board at the last meeting, and they also did an outreach, including a movie night, connecting with families that at neighborhood bus stops. Of 48 families, mostly from the "slice," 45 preferred Cedar Park as an option school, one preferred a combination of 5b and 6b, and two preferred the original proposal. No one was in favor of putting off the decision until January. It was clear that the community impacted most was in favor the option school proposal.

Dr. Herndon asked Director Burke for a clarification: Were the families interested in attending an option school or just want Cedar Park to be an option school? Director Burke replied that it wasn't specified. There needs to be other work around what kind of option school and we should drill down to get the specific analysis.

Director Geary said she is wondering if a science/technology school makes sense, asking

why we would that not working when Hazel Wolf is doing so well. She pointed out that with either option 5a or 5b, mitigation would be needed, and the directors putting forward the amendment anticipated this. She said we can bring an option school into an area without an option school and that this is a matter of equity.

Ms. Davies expressed that staff has concerns about the time needed to put together a plan for an option school. There is only a short time before Open Enrollment. She affirmed that any plan to support a new option school will be costly. She pointed out that families want to stay at Olympic Hills or John Rogers, so opening Cedar Park as an option school isn't going to relieve capacity if students from those attendance areas aren't assigned there. Attendance area schools allow better management of capacity and potential enrollment. With a roll-up from kindergarten, staff can know how many to expect each year.

Director Peters asked what the timeline would be to develop a focus, and asked if it would be reasonable to establish this by December? Mr. Tolley responded that staff are exploring the options and doing some cost analysis. Director Peters replied that a focus might provide an idea of what the draw would be, and she pointed out that it will be important to attract enough students to the school.

Director Harris drew an analogy to Boren K-7 STEM school saying that SPS didn't come up with it — it came from people who wanted to do something different and helped relieve the enrollment crisis in West Seattle. She pointed out that the same things were said when planning Boren: "It's too expensive, etc.," but they are thriving now. She said she believes SPS can do this if there is the political will to do so. Dr. Herndon responded that Boren had a thoughtful process in planning and that they took the time to do so. He said that when making changes, it's important to make sure all schools are successful. He pointed out that Ms. Fauntleroy, the planning principal at Cedar Park has promised to love and welcome all students, and that Mr. Tolley has said the same, that regardless of level, we want to make sure all students are welcomed.

Mr. Tolley thanked Dr. Herndon and the Board, and said we understand the significant impact changes have on families and students. The impact of the boundary changes has been a topic of conversation. He has asked Teaching and Learning personnel here to address some of the concerns. He introduced Helen Joung, an Executive Director of Schools. She previously was the principal at Olympic Hills, and she was involved in the community engagement.

Ms. Joung talked about transition plans to determine what principals, teachers and executive directors need to ensure families have the information they need and feel welcome. It will be important to ensure that all students feel valued, regardless of the decision on Cedar Park, to support all students, and to make all students and parents aware of the changes. She pointed out that often staff assumes to know what families want and move ahead. Ms. Joung said we need to get families more directly involved and focus on creative ways to smooth transitions. For past changes, SPS has rented a bus to pick up students and families and take them to the visit their new school and focused on creating relationships with families and between families before school starts. It will be important to determine what the transition looks like for each family and make sure every school is a good school. She then said that her goal as an executive director of schools is that wherever you land, you are loved and cared for.

Director Pinkham replied that yes, we need this in all schools and that all principals will

say we love and care for kids. She then pointed out that parents and students will have some anxiety in changing schools. While they will be welcomed, the Board needs to recognize that families and students will be impacted by these changes. She said she thinks that as a Board, dealing with these amendments shows that the Board is reactive to their concerns. She said 5A seems to provide a comfort zone for families, as it does not involve splitting up families, having kids change schools, or having kids go across certain boundaries. The amendment will mitigate the impact, and do it with an option school. She supports amendment 5A.

Director Geary raised concerns that the voice of the principals was missing. She mentioned that Laurelhurst, Sand Point and Bryant came together and worked together to create a solution, but she didn't get the sense that the other principals got the same chance to have a negotiation or get involved. She mentioned the statistics heard in the earlier work session that showed retaining teachers is important, and said we know that culture of the school impacts teacher retention, and disruption can impact the culture of the school. She compared a community to an organism, and said when you create a school with a high FRL population, it will impact the school. Resources won't be coming in; often these (parents of students receiving FRL) are parents who cannot volunteer or donate. She added that if it is on SPS to create a school that draws families in, so be it — it is not on families to absorb our poor planning.

Ms. Joung addressed the comment Director Geary made about missing principal voices. She explained that the conversation started long ago, and after that, the race and equity toolkit was employed. She told the Board that behind the scenes, the principals have been very involved and vocal. She also said that as far as families that aren't here, it frustrates her when we claim to speak on behalf of those who aren't participating, and that sometimes what those families think and feel is far different from what she thinks and feels, and said that we cannot say we speak for the families who are not here.

Director Geary pointed out that the Board received a long letter from the community on their own engagement efforts. She also said there were targeted conversations about Cedar Park, but that opening that school rolls out impacts across the whole north part of the district to feed students to Olympic Hills. She said she didn't know if this impact was addressed with the principals of all the schools impacted.

Director Harris said that when we say that folks are not here at the table, and there are ripple effects, that is on us. She is happy to walk her talk on community engagement, but doesn't think we're there yet.

Director Burke then said he wanted to add one more thing, for the record: The Board wants to open Cedar Park as an amazing option school for that community. Item 5 includes a commitment "to provide focused district support for the community throughout the enrollment process." But that there seems to be a barrier for some disadvantaged families. He said we need to "triple down" on that problem. In Item 6, the Board wants to place a high priority on mitigation spending and that they want to have a commitment to this in spirit and in dollars. Building this into the amendment was deliberate on the part of the Directors who introduced it.

Ms. Davies clarified that as far as engagement, in no way is it even close to where it needs to be and acknowledged that the Board sees this. She said that prior to coming to the Board with the staff recommendations in the fall, there was engagement with the principals at Laurelhurst, Sand Point and Bryant; that staff met with the community in April

to inform families about the upcoming changes approved in 2013 and gather feedback. She said staff also engaged with all impacted principals before the end of the 2015-16 school year. Some of the recommendations came because of this engagement. She then said she thinks that she has heard that the Board believes additional feedback was needed. She mentioned that the information shared was consistent with what staff shared with the Board. Regarding 6a and 6b, her understanding is that these were to go in conjunction with 5A and 5B, and said it would be helpful to know if there is any consensus among the Directors for any one option. Dr. Herndon then pointed out that it would be without a vote.

Director Burke asked a procedural question related to withdrawing 5B and 6B, as they are not getting a high response rate from the community. He asked how that could be done. Nate Van Duzer replied that it can be left on the agenda and a motion made to withdraw when it comes up for discussion or a strike through could be done on the agenda.

Director Geary asked for clarification on whether SPS will be meeting the letter of the law for reducing class size with the capacity issues, portable use and available classrooms. She asked what numbers are being used for assumptions because that makes a difference. Ms. Davies replied that all data is with the assumption of class-size reductions happening. Director Geary then said she thought there was some discussion that class-size reduction isn't practical and SPS isn't able to do it. She asked if there had been additional discussion using the numbers of status quo and related impacts. Dr. Herndon replied that there has been some discussion and some review of budgetary impacts. He then asked for clarification of whether she meant this year's status quo or going back to CBA.

Director Geary said she doesn't think SPS is meeting the letter of the law, that the district is dealing with a capacity crisis, and that the legislature is aware of this. She then said not having the correct information in front of the Board makes it a bit difficult. Dr. Herndon said that in the winter, staff will begin new projections to be ready for January when portable placement is planned. There have been discussions about class size assumptions related to 6A and 6B because it informs the number of portables to be placed, but that much of the calculation centers around class size ratio and that staff is now at the point of discussing what class size to use. Director Geary then said that it seems important, but that the Board doesn't have the data.

Director Geary asked what is the question on 6A and 6B. Ms. Davies replied that it sounded like 5B and 6B are not under much consideration by the Board at this point. Director Burke said that 5A and 6A are linked and 5B and 6B are linked and that potentially some of these will be included. He mentioned that he wanted to remove two of them. Ms. Davies mentioned concerns that 6A puts Olympic Hills into a bigger building with the same boundary, which won't utilize the added capacity. She asked if the Board had any additional thoughts on using the building capacity to its fullest. Director Burke said that the option school proposal is helpful and that having the discussion one year from now will provide a better idea of the northeast draw and the impact to neighborhood schools. He believes the new option school will draw many kids but that it's difficult to know what a building's enrollment will be until day one or day four. His thought is to choose a consistent set of proposals, implement and then revisit this again in one year.

Ms. Davies brought up portable placement and wanted to make sure the Board understands that there will be impacts. Placing additional portables at several schools will departures and placement on playgrounds. Without adding portables, there will have to

be larger class sizes. Director Geary replied that this is another assumption based on class sizes.

Director Harris asked if we can get a waiver from the legislature based on the unprecedented capacity issues. Dr. Nyland replied that many districts are unable to access the money. In a sense, you get a waiver, regardless. If you don't fulfill the requirement, you will not get the money. The added uncertainty is that SPS is a large district, and if we can show that we have hit the ratio districtwide, we may still be able to get the funding by making adjustments.

Director Geary responded that usually any adjustments that are made are on the backs of southeast Seattle, but that we cannot take away the staff needed in other areas to meet these class sizes. Dr. Nyland replied that we wouldn't be taking away from these schools. He said we would need to decide that these three schools will have larger class sizes. There may be some cost associated with overloading the classrooms, given the new legislative ratios. That is another alternative, if it can be worked out. And that working out having some larger class sizes may be better than paying \$60,000, and moving portables around. He said he and the Board are on the same wavelength.

Director Harris expressed that she is uncomfortable not seeing the changes in race and ethnicity, and lower socio-economic status at schools with these changes. She wants to look at this with updated FRL and racial data, asking if there is any movement to get us the Board this data. She asked if staff knows the consequences are of each of these decisions. Are the changes making schools more racially segregated? Do have this data for each option? Are we aware of the poverty level of these kids? She said she wants to use the word "poverty" a lot in these discussions. Dr. Nyland reminded the Board that staff provided current data about Cedar Park and Olympic Hills in different scenarios, but that we cannot know all the information about Cedar Park as an option school. On average, the district has about 20 percent poverty. He also said it is a good point that the district needs to make parents aware of and promote the new school. Dr. Nyland went on to say that we don't want to transport FRL students to other schools to balance the poverty levels. It is difficult to balance since the using FRL and the Race and Equity Toolkit doesn't make it a simple calculation. You can end up picking either option, and make the argument that one is better than the other.

Ms. Davies then asked to discuss the additional amendments that Director Peters brought forward. These are amendments 8, 9 and 10. While there has been some key feedback and testimony, it's important to provide an opportunity for discussion.

Director Peters said that both 8 and 9 establish grandfathering for fourth and fifth graders and eighth graders impacted by boundary changes. She said that based on the recent openings of other new schools, we know there is pain of pulling kids out in the last years instead of allowing them to matriculate, mentioning that the district has learned that it creates a lot of despair among the community. Making change is especially hard for kids in middle school. It's disruptive. The logic behind both amendments is to allow kids near graduation to finish their years at the school they are attending. It's in the interest of putting students first. She then outlined drawbacks, in particular that there would be one additional year with capacity challenges. In the case of Meany, there may not be as many students as desired. In terms of Eagle Staff, the same is true but it looks to her like they may be overcommitted and grandfathering might help them transition. In terms of Hamilton and Washington, they would not get as much capacity relief. For Whitman, grandfathering would delay/stagger things happening there for one to two years. At

McClure, capacity is okay — but she is not sure it is sustainable. She repeated that this would be for one transitional year and mentioned testimony from parents when JAMS opened and HCC moved to Washington and students were forced to move. The idea of the amendments is to reduce the amount of disruption. For fourth and fifth grade, she wants to let kids finish at same elementary school.

She then discussed amendment 10, which relates to Cascadia. The amendment proposes that any option for splitting Cascadia not be geo-split. Instead she wants it to be an optional path along the same design as Fairmount Park and Ingraham, saying both have been successful in helping to alleviate capacity issues. She pointed out that the staff notes say that it would make it impossible make Decatur a default school for some, but she couldn't see why it couldn't work at Decatur.

Dr. Herndon replied that a default assignment and an optional assignment can't be combined at the same school. Under a default assignment, the student is automatically assigned there. Under an option, the student opts in. He said it can be either/or, not both, and pointed out that the optional sites mentioned for HCC are also attendance area schools, so they already have costs associated with the staff assigned to them. Dr. Herndon then addressed amendment 9 and the impact it would have on Hamilton capacity. The agreement with the City was to place portables at Hamilton for only one year. While he doesn't mind working with the city to change that, he would prefer to keep the geo-split. Dr. Peters then asked if moving the seventh graders out would provide enough wiggle room for one year. Dr. Herndon did not know the answer.

Ms. Davies then addressed amendment 9. She pointed out that currently the middle school pathways are planned so that Eagle Staff opens with a geo-split to HCC at Hamilton. This puts HCC students who are in the Whitman and Eagle Staff attendance areas at Eagle Staff. She asked if grandfathering for grade 8 would be only general education students or would it also include HCC students, and said that it's important to keep the HCC cohorts together to minimize disruption.

Director Peters said her intention was to HCC to also be grandfathered for eighth grade. She is looking at them as eighth-graders across the whole school to provide stability.

Ms. Davies then asked to clarify information regarding the Cascadia geo-split. In a survey of families who are currently enrolled at Cascadia as well as those that are eligible for HCC but not enrolled, the majority said they wanted a geo-split with all in the Eckstein attendance area assigned to Decatur. The Decatur building would be closer for those in the Eckstein service area, based on current and future enrollment. The HCC cohort in the Eckstein service area would be about the right size, with fewer buses, and reduced commute time. Director Peters responded that the data shows that it's likely that students/parents would choose the option of going to Decatur. She mentioned that since 2009, the HCC cohort has been split many times and that families live in fear of it happening again. She mentioned that one family has had it happen three time and it has happened a lot to HCC. She is trying to mitigate this.

Director Geary then addressed the Directors saying she had received an email from former Board President Sharon Peasley at 5:04 p.m., and had forwarded it to Mr. Van Duzer and Ms. Davies. She then said that the email talks about a Board resolution previously passed about Pinehurst/Licton Springs being placed at Eagle Staff. Director Geary asked if that had been rolled back and said she understood it was supposed to be 14 classrooms. Director Patu mentioned that she brought this up last week and had

asked Dr. Herndon about it. Dr. Herndon replied that those classrooms are allocated in the Eagle Staff building. Director Geary asked for clarification as to whether it was 14 or seven.

Director Peters then said she had one last comment on creating clear middle school pathways for HCC to provide comprehensive services without depleting Whitman, and said she would like to talk off-line about whether this is an option.

Director Patu announced at 6:32 PM that the Board was immediately recessing the special meeting into executive session to evaluate the performance of a public employee. The executive session is scheduled for approximately 60 minutes, with an anticipated end time of 6:32 PM.

Executive Session: Evaluate the performance of a public employee

1. Director Patu called the executive session to order at 6:47 PM.
2. Directors Burke, Geary, Harris, Patu, Peters, and Pinkham were present.
3. Also present were Superintendent Larry Nyland and Lindsey Mundt from Calfo, Eakes, and Ostrovsky, PLLC.

Director Nyland left at 7:16 PM.

At 7:43 PM, Director Patu recessed out of the executive session.

The Special Meeting reconvened at 7:44 PM and there being no further business to come before the Board, Director Patu adjourned the special meeting at 7:44 PM.