



MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JANUARY 29, 2016

The State Board of Education met for its regular quarterly meeting in Room 12, Legislative Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee, at 9:00 a.m. on January 29, 2016.

Present.....9

Absent..... 2

Mr. Fielding Rolston, Chairman
Ms. Allison Chancey
Mr. Mike Edwards
Ms. Lillian Hartgrove
Mr. Cato Johnson
Ms. Carolyn Pearre
Ms. Wendy Tucker
Ms. Betty Dandridge Johnson for Dr. Russ Deaton

Mr. Lonnie Roberts
Dr. William Troutt

Chairman Rolston called the meeting to order and welcomed members of the audience. He recognized many in the audience who endured the long session during the Joint Meeting with the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and State Board of Education workshop.

I. Consent Items

- A. Adoption of Agenda**
- B. Approval of Minutes from October 23, 2015**

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved acceptance. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Action Items (First Reading)

- A. Math Standards**

Ms. Laura Encalade, State Board of Education, presented this item. She stated that this is the first reading of new math standards for implementation in the 2017-18 school year. She said that presentations were made at the workshop by **Dr. Lyle Ailshie**, Chairman of Standards Recommendation Committee, **Dr. Joseph Jones** who led the math team and **Ms. Shannon Duncan** who led the English language arts team. The new math standards have been developed in accordance with the standards review process outlined in Public Chapter 423. Standards are included for grades K-8, the required high school courses of Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II (or Integrated Math I, II, III) as well as the options for the required fourth year math course.

Ms. Encalade also recognized a member of the Standards Recommendation Committee who was unable to attend the workshop the day before the Board meeting, **Dr. Shirley Curry**.

Ms. Tucker asked if the Board would have an opportunity over the next few months to review these standards and ask questions to the staff before final reading. **Ms. Encalade** responded that the staff absolutely encourages Board members to use the time between first and final reading to look at the standards and hold discussions with staff to address questions or make suggestions for changes.

Ms. Tucker then stated that she had received an e-mail from a long time math teacher in Franklin who had some concerns and asked if staff were looking through any e-mails to see where there may be additional points to consider. **Ms. Encalade** stated that staff is doing this. **Ms. Tucker** then thanked **Ms. Encalade**, staff, and members of the Committee who spent considerable time developing these new standards.

Dr. Shirley Curry then shared that she was familiar with the edits suggested by the Franklin math teacher and stated that most of them were grammatical errors and said that she would support this teacher's edits. **Ms. Encalade** said that the staff welcomes any suggestions and that they definitely do not want these standards to go out with grammatical errors.

Mr. Johnson echoed **Ms. Tucker's** thanks to **Ms. Encalade** and her team and members of the Committee for great work.

ACTION: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. *English Language Arts Standards*

Ms. Encalade reported on the English language arts Standards. She stated that the process had been the same as the process for reviewing the math standards, and that all of her comments regarding the math standards applied to this item as well.

Chairman Rolston asked if the Commissioner would like to make any comments. She recognized **Shannon Jackson** and **Tammy Shelton** from the Department of Education for working on the standards with the State Board of Education staff and the committees.

Commissioner McQueen then invited Board members to attend an event on February 17, 2016 entitled "Read to be Ready" which is a campaign on the importance of early reading.

ACTION: **Ms. Chancey** moved acceptance on first reading. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Rolston stated that a lot of hard work had gone into this process and that it was a red letter day for Tennessee. He said that he spent a fair amount of time in

Washington with the National Assessment Governing Board and that people from around the country have talked to him about our process.

C. Removal of Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects Grades 6-12

Ms. Encalade also presented this item. State Board and Department staff are working with the standards review teams of each subject area to embed literacy standards within each of those subjects' standards. This will result in a Tennessee specific approach to content area literacy standards.

ACTION: **Mr. Edwards** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Hartgrove** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Permanent Elective Courses for English Language Arts

Ms. Encalade presented for first reading permanent elective courses to be established for the 2017-18 school year in English language arts. She stated that these changes would go into effect the same time as the new academic standards for language arts.

Vice Chair Pearre asked how many high schools have these courses. **Ms. Encalade** responded that she did not have that information available but would get back to **Vice Chair Pearre**.

ACTION: **Mr. Edwards** moved acceptance on first reading. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Educator Preparation Policy 5.504

Dr. Amy Wooten, Department of Education, presented this item. This item will revise current educator preparation policy preconditions for new providers by proving flexibility related to financial and organizational capacity as follows:

- Section 1.A – Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Programs – Eligibility (Page 3-4): Clarifies eligibility requirements related to providers that are approved in a state other than Tennessee. Changes also ensure that out-of-state providers are held to the same reporting requirements and expectations as Tennessee-approved providers. With the increased use of online preparation, the Department of Education has recognized the need for more explicit requirements related to out-of-state providers.
- Appendix A – Eligibility Requirements (Pages 109-110): Revises the policy to allow providers with a track-record of less than three years an opportunity to meet eligibility requirements. The department recognizes that new providers with innovative approaches to preparation may not have an established track record but may have the potential to provide excellent preparation. This revision maintains requirements to protect candidates, schools and districts, but creates opportunity for eligibility of new providers.

Ms. Tucker requested that the record reflect that in an abundance of caution, she asked the Board's General Counsel whether there would be a conflict with her participating in this vote, given that she currently works for a non-profit organization that is incubating a teacher prep program subject to this process. She was advised that there is no conflict.

ACTION: **Ms. Hartgrove** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Chancey** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

F. Charter School Appeals Policy 2.500

Ms. Tess Stovall, State Board of Education, presented this item. She stated that at the conclusion of the 2015 charter school appeals process, State Board of Education staff conducted feedback conversations with participants in the appeal process including sponsors, local boards of education, and charter school review committee members. Based on these feedback conversations, the following changes to Policy 2.500 were presented on first reading.

- The first change provides clarification about how sponsors submit amended applications and corrections to the application, as permitted under T.C.A. § 49-13-108(a)(4)(C), as a part of the notice of appeal. These changes are intended to minimize confusion about the requirements for the notice of appeal.
- The second change modifies some procedural aspects of the public hearings. Specifically, while the total time allocated to sponsors and local boards of education in the hearing remains the same (twenty-five minutes), the time for opening statements has been decreased to fifteen minutes and the time for closing statements has been increased to ten minutes. This change will allow participants additional time during closing statements to respond to any arguments raised in the opening statements. Additionally, there are changes to provide additional clarification around the public comment period during the hearing which is at the discretion of the Executive Director.

Mr. Edwards asked if 20 minutes is really enough time for questions when you're talking about something as complex as a charter school. **Ms. Stovall** responded that in previous hearings the district and the applicant were each given 20 minutes, following which **Dr. Heyburn**, Executive Director of the State Board of Education, asked additional questions that were not part of the 20 minute allotments to ensure the staff and members had their questions answered. Based on that experience, Ms. Stovall indicated that the staff believe the time seems adequate.

Dr. Heyburn then noted that the public hearing is only one part of the process through which the staff and board gather information, and that there are numerous other conversations held to collect relevant data.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Rolston then requested that, without objection, the Board jointly consider **Items II.G** through **II.K**, as they deal with various pieces of the same subject.

G. *Employment Standards Rule 0502-01-02-.03*

H. *Educational Interpreters Policy 5.400*

I. *Educator Licensure Rule 0520-02-03-.04*

J. *Educator Licensure Policy 5.502*

K. *Professional Assessments Policy 5.105*

Mr. Joey Hassell, Department of Education, presented these items and agreed that they could be jointly considered. He said that he would like to first thank the 19 member task force that worked with the Department to address the issues concerned in these items, the intent of which is to ensure that all students – deaf, deaf/blind or hard of hearing – have access to a qualified interpreter regardless of what district they are in across the state. He added that this access would lead to increased success for students.

Ms. Tucker said that she would like to thank **Mr. Hassell** and the task force members present in the audience for the hard work that went into these items.

Vice Chair Pearre stated that she agrees with **Ms. Tucker** but that these issues also raise the question of whether Tennessee needs more training across the state for these kinds of services. She said it is her understanding that there are only two interpreter services preparation programs within the state, both of which are in Knoxville. She said that the Board may need to discuss this matter with partners at the Tennessee Board of Regents to see if community colleges could offer these courses of study.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved acceptance on first reading. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

L. *Special Education Intervention Course*

Mr. Hassell presented two new courses for first reading: Special Education Intervention K-8 and Special Education Intervention 6-12. Students receiving services through special education require the most intensive interventions that can be offered in a school setting. Students who need this intensity of academic intervention require time scheduled during the school day and should receive course credit. On a continuum of service for students, these courses would be more intensive than intervention that general education students receive through the Tier III course codes.

Vice Chair Pearre asked **Mr. Hassell** to describe how these courses would work into the student's schedule. He replied that determining the need for an additional course would ultimately rest with a student's IEP team, but that schools could allow special education teachers to offer these courses in place of an existing resource block.

Ms. Tucker asked if this would only be for students receiving special education services who are on a general education track and **Mr. Hassell** responded that it would be for all students who have an IEP.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

M. *Statewide Dual Credit Agriculture Courses*

Dr. Danielle Mezera, Department of Education, presented this item. She said that this item presents two new courses within the Agriculture, Food, & Natural Resources career cluster through the Statewide Dual Credit (SDC) program. The proposed new courses within this career cluster are directly aligned to postsecondary courses and provide high school students the opportunity to sit for a challenge exam to earn postsecondary credit at any public institution in the state with an agriculture program.

The proposed new courses in this item include:

- Statewide Dual Credit: Introduction to Plant Science
- Statewide Dual Credit: Introduction to Agriculture Business

These courses are the first to go through the entire three-year development and pilot cycle established under PC 967. Tennessee high school and college faculty worked together to develop the learning objectives and challenge exams for each course. During the initial pilot phase, all courses undergo a validation process to ensure the learning objectives and challenge exam questions meet current postsecondary expectations across the state.

ACTION: **Ms. Hartgrove** moved acceptance on first reading. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

N. *Fire Management Services Course Standards*

Dr. Mezera presented for first reading these standards that include revisions to existing course standards that align the Fire Management Services program of study to the Fire and Emergency Services Higher Education (FESHE) standards, a national curriculum for postsecondary fire science standards. These revisions will allow for a more seamless transfer of secondary students to postsecondary institutions, are aligned to Tennessee's State Standards for literacy in technical subjects, and have been reviewed for content by business/industry, as well as postsecondary and secondary educators from across the

state. These standards revisions were completed upon request from postsecondary institutions and the Tennessee state fire chief.

ACTION: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved acceptance on first reading. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

O. *Child Nutrition Programs Rule 0520-01-06-.05*

Ms. Elizabeth Fiveash, Department of Education and **Mr. Nathan James**, State Board of Education, presented this item. The Tennessee School Nutrition Act requires school districts to comply with the minimum nutrition standards set by the State Board of Education or to comply with the nutrition standards established under the National School Lunch Act. At the July 25, 2014 meeting, the Board adopted the federal nutrition program rules (including federal nutrition standards) for all grades in Tennessee. The Board did this to ensure all Tennessee child nutrition programs were following the same guidance in order to lessen confusion and create more consistency across grade spans.

Currently all school districts in Tennessee participate in the National School Lunch Program. However, if a district decided to no longer participate in the School Lunch Program, they would still be legally required to follow the nutrition standards of the federal program under current state board rules.

This item proposes a waiver process from the federal nutrition standards for those districts that choose not to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Below is a brief summary of the key changes:

- Only high schools may request a waiver from the National School Lunch Program or the minimum nutrition standards set by the State Board.
- Schools must still provide free and reduced priced meals to qualifying students following the standards set forth by the United States Department of Agriculture.
- Districts must acknowledge that non-participation in the school lunch program disqualifies them from federal or state school nutrition funding.

Mr. James explained the process of what happens when a rule is passed on final reading. He explained that it goes to the joint committees of Government Operations and those committees decide whether those rules will go into the Rules Omnibus Bill every year. If they decide to put it on hold those rules do not take effect. The Committee made it clear to the Department of Education and the State Board of Education that they wanted as much flexibility as possible for the districts as is allowed under federal law.

Mr. Johnson asked if it was correct that this has no impact on those districts that have a large number of free and reduced lunches. **Ms. Fiveash** stated that they would most likely not choose to not participate and **Mr. James** stated that if you choose not to participate you forego significant federal funding, and that it is unlikely districts with a large number of free and reduced lunches would chose to forego such funding.

Vice Chair Pearre asked how many children would be affected by this non-participation. **Ms. Fiveash** responded that this is limited to high schools and that the number would probably be low.

Ms. Chancey asked why only high schools would be permitted to opt out and **Ms. Fiveash** stated that this model is currently in use in several other states, and the Departments of Health and Education jointly believe that promoting healthy nutrition practices in early grades must remain a priority.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved acceptance on first reading. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

P. *Salary Schedule Rule 0520-01-02-.02*

Mr. James presented this rule for first reading. It is a revision to the salary schedule rule intended to bring the rule up to date and reflect local flexibilities in determining educator salaries.

Mr. Edwards said that he thought the State required LEAs to develop differentiated salary schedules years ago. **Mr. James** responded this item is necessary to align the rule with the law.

Mr. Edwards then read the State Board's rule regarding differentiated salary schedules and extolled the positive impact of its implementation.

Ms. Hartgrove said that there are differentiated salary schedules in the Upper Cumberland district and Commissioner McQueen said that many districts in the State are utilizing them.

ACTION: **Mr. Edwards** moved acceptance on first reading. **Vice Chair Pearre** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Action Items (Final Reading)

A. *Individualized Education Account Rules 0520-01-11*

Ms. Rebecca Wright, Department of Education, presented this item. She stated that the rules being presented for final read to the Board have been revised based on feedback from the public comments and the IEA External Advisory Group. The revisions made include:

- Refer to students as 'students enrolled in the IEA Program' or 'students receiving IEAs' instead of 'IEA students.'
- Revised the definition of 'educational therapies.'
- Changed the percentage of IEA funds that must be spent each year from 90 percent to 50 percent.

Ms. Tucker said that she was surprised at how few comments were received and asked if **Ms. Wright** could explain this and if there was any way to improve the outreach of this rule. **Ms. Wright** stated that she felt the lack of comments was because during the development of the rule education stakeholders were engaged so feedback was received during the development of the rules. There were also numerous conferences across the state for feedback during the development of the rule.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved approval. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

	Yes	No	Absent
Allison Chancey	X		
Mike Edwards	X		
Lillian Hartgrove	X		
Cato Johnson	X		
Carolyn Pearre	X		
Lonnie Roberts			X
William Troutt			X
Wendy Tucker	X		
Fielding Rolston	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Rolston requested that, without objection, the Board jointly consider **Items III.B., C. and D.**

- B. Service Learning Course Standards**
- C. Jobs for Tennessee Graduates (JTG) Course Standards**
- D. High School Courses Policy 3.205**

Dr. Mezera presented these items for final reading. She stated that no changes had been made since first reading.

Ms. Hartgrove thanked **Dr. Mezera** and her team for the good work. **Chairman Rolston** added his thanks to **Dr. Mezera** and stated that he felt this was a very important area.

ACTION: **Ms. Hartgrove** moved approval. **Mr. Edwards** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- E. Child Nutrition Programs Rule 0520-01-06-.04**

Ms. Fiveash and **Mr. James** presented this item. The federal rules for the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, “establish regulatory requirements for food sold in other areas of the school campus or at other times in the school day.” However, the rules include a provision that allow states to set up “special exemptions for infrequent school-sponsored fundraisers.” “If a state agency does not specify the exemption frequency the

default number will be zero (0).” At the July 25, 2014 State Board of Education meeting, the board approved thirty (30) exemption days per year for Tennessee schools.

During the August 19, 2015 hearing of the Government Operations Committee of the Tennessee General Assembly, committee members expressed concern over the sufficiency of 30 exemption days and asked that the board consider increasing the allowable number of exemption days.

This final read item presents twenty (20) days per semester for special exemptions for infrequent school-sponsored fundraisers, with the option to request additional exemption days through a waiver.

ACTION: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

	Yes	No	Absent
Allison Chancey	X		
Mike Edwards	X		
Lillian Hartgrove	X		
Cato Johnson	X		
Carolyn Pearre	X		
Lonnie Roberts			X
William Troutt			X
Wendy Tucker	X		
Fielding Rolston	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

F. *Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy 5.201*

Dr. Paul Fleming, Department of Education, presented this item. He requested for the record to reflect that 70 districts now have a differentiated pay plan for hard to staff positions.

He then presented the following revisions to the policy:

Alternate Evaluation Models: In lieu of the state evaluation model (Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)), LEAs may select to implement an alternate evaluation model from a State Board of Education approved list. The updated policy outlines the process for submission of these models.

Student Growth/Achievement Measure: Thirty-five percent of principal and teacher evaluation is represented by the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) or a comparable measure. This addition clarifies the use of student growth in lieu of an additional measure when student growth demonstrates proficiency or above and is higher than that additional measure.

Student Surveys: The State Board of Education has approved the use of student surveys as an optional qualitative component of teacher evaluation. The updated policy provides guidance around instrument flexibility.

Chairman Rolston stated that he was glad to see student surveys offered as an option and would like to see us progress to the point to where they are a requirement.

Mr. Edwards asked what would need to happen to put student evaluations into the teacher evaluation policy. **Dr. Fleming** said that was a good question and that by April there should be a clearer picture. He offered to provide an update at that time.

Dr. Heyburn stated that to do this would take a change in policy in the qualitative portion and a cost estimate.

ACTION: **Mr. Edwards** moved approval. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

G. *State Board of Education Master Plan*

Dr. Heyburn stated that this updated Master Plan builds on work being done starting in the spring of 2015 to establish a vision and strategic priorities, establishing key policy levers within each priority area, as well as additional areas of focus. Furthermore, it articulates student achievement targets for the next five- and 10-year intervals across a host of important measures. The Board will continue to discuss these targets and policy levers between now and final reading, then use them to guide data review and policy conversations over the coming year. Policy levers and focus areas will be revisited annually to ensure careful attention to short and long term goals and monitoring. **Dr. Heyburn** also stated that changes requested by the Board during the workshop will be incorporated into the Plan.

Ms. Tucker stated that she wanted to add language to Goal Two where the sentence says “By 2020, we will raise the average to 21” to say “By 2020 we will raise the average of the scores of all students required by law to take either the ACT or SAT to 21.”

Mr. Edwards stated that he felt the staff had done exactly what the Board envisioned for a Master Plan including the incremental measuring of this Plan.

Mr. Johnson stated that he wanted to commend the staff for the community engagement part and that community involvement is not something we should take for granted and that the Board’s obligation is to the community.

ACTION: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved approval. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

H. *Special Courses for Permanent Status*

Dr. Tammy Shelton, Department of Education, presented this item. She explained that a local school district can request approval to offer a course that is not on the list of permanent courses approved by the State Board of Education. After three years, a

course may become a permanent part of the local school district upon approval by the State Board of Education. The courses are being submitted on final reading for permanent approval in that district. There have not been any changes to this item since first reading.

ACTION: **Mr. Johnson** moved approval. **Ms. Hartgrove** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

I. *Instructional Leader Preparation Program Approvals*

Dr. Fleming presented this item. He stated that sixteen programs had met expectations and were recommended for full approval in January 2015. The remaining four programs (Bethel University, Middle Tennessee State University, the University of Memphis, and the University of Tennessee Chattanooga) did not meet all expectations and, therefore, did not receive full approval based on the 2014 review process. These programs were required to submit additional evidence addressing identified areas of concern.

The University of Memphis elected to close the existing leader preparation program and has submitted a proposal for a new program. The remaining three programs provided additional evidence during the summer of 2015. The recommendations for Instructional Leader Preparation Programs at the remaining programs are:

Full Approval:

University of Tennessee Chattanooga
Bethel University

Approval with Stipulations:

Middle Tennessee State University

V. *Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC) Default Actions*

A. *TSAC Defaults*

During the October 2015 meeting, **Mr. Edwards** raised concerns about the perfunctory nature of this process given that no discretion on the boards behalf can be given. **Mr. Johnson** agreed with **Mr. Edwards** and **Chairman Rolston** asked the staff to come back in January with guidance on affecting this process.

In accordance with the desire of the Board, **Chairman Rolston** read the following:

TCA § 49-4-210 gives TSAC the authority to promulgate rules related to the suspension of licenses for default on student loan obligations guaranteed or administered by TSAC.

TCA § 49-5-108(d)(2) requires the SBE to suspend, deny, or revoke the license of a teacher who is in default, if such teacher has not entered into a payment plan or has failed to comply with a payment plan approved by TSAC.

TSAC has an extensive review process and opportunity for the debtor to request a hearing regarding determinations of default in place, TSAC Rule 1640-01-23.

SBE Rule 0520-02-03-.09 requires the SBE to vote to suspend teachers' licenses for a number of reasons, including default on student loans. SBE rules also allow for an opportunity for a hearing prior to suspension.

Suspension orders are lifted upon receipt of confirmation from TSAC of compliance with a repayment plan.

Given the extensive opportunities for not only administrative remedies but also the ability to lift a suspension through compliance with TSAC obligations, I am advised by counsel that the SBE may vote once to suspend all licenses determined to be in default during this calendar year upon notification of default by TSAC. Such a vote does not abridge the license holder's opportunity for a hearing pursuant to SBE Rule 0520-02-03-.09. A list of suspensions enacted under this vote shall be supplied to the Board at its quarterly meetings.

Therefore, as chairman, I move that upon notification from TSAC that a license holder is in default, such license shall be suspended according to State Board of Education rules, and according to the obligations of law during the time of such default; and that this motion cover all such instances during calendar year 2016, and that a list of suspensions covered by this action will be published quarterly in the minutes of this board.

Ms. Tucker stated that she was stunned to learn the time involved in the process before a suspension is requested and said that after learning that more than a year's time is involved in the process, she is more comfortable with the actions the Board is required to take.

ACTION: **Mr. Edwards** seconded **Chairman Rolston's** motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

	Yes	No	Absent
Allison Chancey	X		
Mike Edwards	X		
Lillian Hartgrove	X		
Cato Johnson	X		
Carolyn Pearre	X		
Lonnie Roberts			X
William Troutt			X
Wendy Tucker	X		
Fielding Rolston	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

V. Teacher License Actions

Mr. Philip Cramer, State Board of Education, presented this item. **Chairman Rolston** requested that the Board, without objection, jointly consider Items V.A., V.C., V.E., V.F., V.G., V.H., V.I., V.K.

Vice Chair Pearre requested that Item V.E. be considered separately.

- A. Kendra Grisham – Revocation**
- C. Bradley Martin -- Revocation**
- F. Andrea Patterson – Revocation**
- G. James Sales – Revocation**
- H. James Sanders – Revocation**
- I. Patricia Thomas – Voluntary Surrender**
- K. Heather Wardlaw – Revocation**

ACTION: **Ms. Tucker** moved approval. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

	Yes	No	Absent
Allison Chancey	X		
Mike Edwards	X		
Lillian Hartgrove	X		
Cato Johnson	X		
Carolyn Pearre	X		
Lonnie Roberts			X
William Troutt			X
Wendy Tucker	X		
Fielding Rolston	X		

The motion passed unanimously.

B. William Harwood – Suspension, one year

Ms. Tucker stated that a suspension is inadequate for Mr. Harwood’s offense and asked that this item be removed from the agenda for the staff to investigate further punishment.

Mr. Edwards asked if a substitute motion would be in order if a Board member wanted a different outcome.

Mr. Cramer stated that it would not be in order and that he would have to give the teacher additional notice and provide opportunity for a hearing.

ACTION: **Ms. Tucker** moved that this item be removed from the agenda. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

D. *Foster Montgomery – Suspension, one year*

Ms. Tucker stated that a formal reprimand is inadequate for Mr. Montgomery's offense and asked that this item is removed from the agenda for the staff to investigate further punishment.

ACTION: **Ms. Tucker** moved that this item be removed from the agenda. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

E. *Bethany Parsons – Formal Reprimand*

Vice Chair Pearre stated that she felt a formal reprimand was inadequate and stated that she believes suspension or revocation would be more appropriate for the context.

Ms. Chancey stated that she felt it important to note Ms. Parsons' attitude in the material the Board members were given and said that should be taken under consideration as well.

Vice Chair Pearre said that sometimes the members have little information to make informed decisions and they are being placed in uncomfortable positions in making these decisions without more information.

Mr. Cramer responded that the lack of information stems from not being able to get information from the districts or agencies involved.

ACTION: **Vice Chair Pearre** moved that this item be removed from the agenda. **Ms. Tucker** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

J. *Peter Wade – Suspension*

Ms. Tucker stated that a suspension is inadequate for Mr. Wade's offense and asked that this item is removed from the agenda for the staff to investigate further punishment.

Mr. Cramer stated that Mr. Wade's attorney was present and available to answer questions, but the Board maintained that the context was inappropriate, as other interested parties were not present and **Ms. Tucker** stated that Mr. Wade could request a hearing.

ACTION: **Ms. Tucker** moved that this item be removed from the agenda. **Mr. Johnson** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Adjournment

Chairman Rolston then thanked the Board members for their thoughtful deliberations and announced that the Board will meet next on April 14-15, 2016.

Approved by: _____ Date: _____