**MEETING MINUTES**

**Indian River NAACP/SDIRC Workgroup Meeting**

December 14, 2022

**Attendees**

*Members of the Workgroup*:

Anthony Brown (IRC-NAACP)

Kevin Browning (IRC-NAACP)

Merchon Green (IRC-NAACP)

Dr. Peggy Jones (School Board Member – Indian River County School Board; appeared via Teams)

Dr. David Moore (Superintendent of Indian River County School District)

Dr. Kyra Schafte (Director of Academic Compliance and Equity – SDIRC)

Eric Seymour (Assistant Superintendent of Student Affairs, Advocacy & Access)

*Counsel:*

Jodi Avila (counsel for NAACP)

Christina Dines (counsel for NAACP)

Adrienne Harreveld (counsel for NAACP; appeared via Teams)

Victor Goode (counsel for NAACP; appeared via Teams)

Matthew Carson (counsel for SDIRC)

**Agenda/Topic**

Establish Key Performance Indicators for each Section of the Joint Plan starting with Section II, Mentoring of New Teachers and Instructional Staff.

**Call to Order**

1. Meeting was called to order by Matthew Carson on December 14, 2022, at J.A. Thompson Administrative Center, 6500 57th Street, Vero Beach, FL 32967 (Teacher Education Center - TEC) and via Microsoft Teams. The meeting was also livestreamed on YouTube.
2. M. Carson invited the Workgroup to discuss Key Performance Indicators starting with Section II, with the goal of getting through as many sections of the 2018 Joint Plan as possible.

**Discussion**

* + J. Avila invited the group to set a goal for Section II and to outline indicators based on that agreed-upon goal. The goal IRC-NAACP proposed was: *To provide a formal mentor program during years 1-3 that is structured to support and assist the individual needs of African American teachers and instructional staff so that they can integrate and succeed in their roles.*
	+ M. Carson inquired whether that goal was contemplated by Section II of the 2018 Joint Plan and J. Avila inquired what specifically about the goal went beyond the scope. M. Carson read the plain language of Section II and suggested that might itself be a performance indicator.
	+ Dr. Jones stated recruiting and retaining teachers is probably the most important thing we do.
	+ Dr. Moore noted that Section II of the 2018 Joint Plan reads as a goal and that each sentence reads as a KPI. Dr. Moore stated this section is extremely straight-forward.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to the proposed Goal statement of Section II.**
	+ Dr. Schafte explained that we are looking for clarity as a Workgroup. If you add words like integrate and succeed, what is the consistent measurement?
	+ M. Green: By setting a Goal, we can craft KPIs to match those goals and come up with measurements to quantify the indicator. We would consider: Goal, then KPI, then measurement.
	+ Dr. Moore: “Those are two very different things. We are rewriting the plan, rather than assessing what was agreed-upon in 2018. If there is an opportunity to say: how do you really sustain this work overtime? I don’t know that this Plan is the way to do it.” Dr. Moore thought a policy, not this Plan, is the best way to sustain this work moving forward.
	+ Dr. Jones noted that money spent on lawyers and mediation could be better spent on the children and schools and suggested creating a model for what a district can look like through policy.
	+ K. Browning: School Boards are changing and are changing their policies. The policy is important, but it will follow our agreement here.
	+ A. Brown: Judge Graham held a piece of paper and said: “This is a court docket, and I am going to consider it a contract. Indian River County School District you agreed to it, NAACP you agreed to it. You haven’t done it. This Joint Plan is a foundation from which we work.
	+ Dr. Moore: “I don’t disagree with anything you just said. I just fundamentally do not disagree. The time is the issue, the window of time. When you stamp an end date, it becomes hard. This plan was 2018, then you do three years, then two more years, that was agreed upon.” There is a push to get out from under the Plan. It is hard to do the work when we are under a desegregation order. A unified school system is the ultimate goal. Improving the quality of instruction for African-American students is something that needs to be extended out over a significant period of time.
	+ J. Avila remarked that the best way to move forward is to do the work of the Plan. We all agree the mentor program has a purpose.
	+ Dr. Moore: What I am hearing is we need to create a goal or goals for each Section of the plan, then determine an indicator of completion or success of that particular goal, and then come back and say “here’s the work.”
	+ Dr. Schafte: We would like an opportunity to tell the story. It is a very “legal” plan. It is not education-friendly, written in language that is not how we speak. Because we have never talked about it, everybody is in defense mode. I think we agree on the goal, so let’s set the indicators. Let’s be one unit, instead of two.
	+ J. Avila: We have the goal proposed indicators for Section II for discussion. I will send to Dr. Schafte to print for the group.

Went on break at 5:27 PM

Back on record at 5:49 PM

* + Dr. Moore agrees the proposed goal is aligned to the 2018 Joint Plan.

Proposed Goal and Key Performance Indicators for Section II: Proposed Indicator 1

* + Indicator 1 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *Formal Mentor Program organized, operated, and monitored by the District through Professional Development Specialists.*
	+ Dr. Schafte asked what the measurement would be for Indicator 1. J. Avila asked where the mentoring program exists now, and Dr. Schafte said it is in a manual (TEAM-SDIRC Manual, formerly STAR). J. Avila responded that this Indicator would be measured by, for example, analyzing the manual.
	+ A. Brown said the manual and evidence of interaction between the mentor and mentee and discussed deficiencies would show compliance with this indicator.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 1.**

Proposed Indicator 2:

* + Indicator 2 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *Each newly hired or newly assigned teacher and instructional staff member shall be enrolled in the Mentoring Program, which shall run the first three-years of their employment.*
	+ Dr. Schafte: Mentors are assigned to teachers for their first year of employment. For years 2 through 3 there is scaffolding in place to help support new teachers, including a professional development plan, curriculum coach, and district level Professional Development (“PD”) specialists. The District cannot require a teacher to meet with their mentor.
	+ M. Green and A. Brown asked about the ability for mentees to remain anonymous when completing surveys or expressing concerns about their mentors. A. Brown said that he has witnessed that mentees are afraid to express concerns out of fear of retaliation.
	+ Dr. Schafte indicated that they can go to the district level PD specialists or their principal.
	+ Dr. Moore said the process is 100% in support of new employees, and changes can be made, as necessary, to help a new teacher be successful.
	+ A. Brown is concerned about the security of the process.
	+ Dr. Schafte said new mentees are told about the program and that feedback is confidential at new teacher orientation. Dr. Moore said mentors are told the same at mentor training.
	+ Dr. Schafte said the minimum expectation is that the mentor-mentee relationship last one year.
	+ A. Brown asked about the recourse that teachers have if they are not comfortable with their mentor.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 2.**

Proposed Indicator 3:

* + Indicator 3 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *All mentors participate in the Mentor Program on a voluntary basis and undergo clinical education training*.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 3.**

Proposed Indicator 4:

* + Indicator 4 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *Each new African American teacher and instructional staff has a personalized mentoring plan that identifies obstacles, concerns, and adverse conditions they experience with clearly defined steps to address those obstacles, concerns, and adverse conditions.*
	+ There were concerns from the IRC-NAACP about a survey being a comprehensive measure of this indicator because teachers may not respond honestly.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 4.**

Proposed Indicator 5:

* + Indicator 5 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *The mentee is matched with a mentor (preferably from the same school) who is a certified, highly effective, veteran teacher (i.e., with at least five years’ experience) who has similar teaching responsibilities and/or experience as mentee.*
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 5.**

Proposed Indicator 6:

* + Indicator 6 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *Each school has a PD Council representative on site who oversees the mentor/mentee relationship and who provides additional support, when necessary, to the mentor and/or mentee.*
	+ Dr. Schafte initially stated that she wanted to clarify that the proper channel is set up and that the reference to the PD Council representative is accurate. Dr. Moore said if not, we may propose an indicator that is more accurate.
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 6.**

Proposed Indicator 7:

* + Indicator 7 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *The District publicizes policy statements, guidelines, and support materials that promote the effective mentoring program.*
	+ **The Workgroup agreed to Indicator 7.**

Proposed Indicator 8:

* + Indicator 8 proposed by IRC-NAACP was: *African American teachers and instructional staff within the Mentor Program are renewed at the same rate as their white counterparts.*
	+ Dr. Moore said this is above-and-beyond criteria but is fine with the District providing that information.
	+ M. Green said it needs to be in there, because in their experience with the people that complain to them is that new teachers are non-renewed without getting the proper supports. The rate of teachers being renewed will tell the story of whether the mentoring program is successful.
	+ K. Browning referenced an instance when there were 20 ESE resource specialists. 4 were Black and 16 were white. 75% of the black ESE Resource Specialists were non-renewed by the District, compared to a much smaller percentage of white ESE Resource Specialists that were kept. K. Browning stated it is this Workgroup’s responsibility to make sure that the problem is rectified.
	+ Dr. Moore stated “I see 1 through 7 directly linking back to Section II of the Plan. But this one, transparency is transparency, if you provide the information and quite honestly if 1-7 are successful, 99% of the time, number 8 will take care of itself.”
	+ K. Browning said that when rates of hiring and retention get out of control, there is an obvious problem.
	+ Dr. Moore said that the hiring rate of black teachers has gone up recently, and that the disproportionally high hiring of black teachers necessarily led to disproportionally high non-renewal of black teachers.
	+ Dr. Moore was uncomfortable trying to push through Indicator 8 so quickly, and would prefer to spend the time necessary to get the wording correct.
	+ M. Green said this is a national standard she found in three different school districts and in a few court cases. She can send the Workgroup the link.
	+ The Workgroup ultimately agreed that Indicator 8 is an important goal and will provide the data for this measure. The SDIRC will provide the Workgroup with proposed modifications to Indicator 8 and the Workgroup can come to an agreement on the exact language of this Indicator.
	+ **The SDIRC will propose modifications to the Indicator for the Workgroup’s consideration.**

Renewal of African American Teachers:

* + M. Green felt that the way to show the mentoring program is effective is to show that African American teachers are renewed.
	+ Dr. Schafte noted that there are other reasons a teacher might not be renewed. Dr. Moore agreed.

Crafting the Indicators Moving Forward:

* + Dr. Moore asked how this work should be memorialized for the future, which he stated is important because this place can change really quick, really bad. We have to figure out how to stabilize this forever and how protect it forever.
	+ A. Brown stated the Workgroup’s decisions and agreements are memorialized in documents submitted to the Court with both parties signing off on it. It is a legal document binding you in this court saying this is what you will do. Sustainability is encumbered in what we do in this room and what we document and send to the judge.
	+ Dr. Schafte said some of the evidence will overlap over multiple indicators.
	+ Dr. Schafte proposed letting District staff attend a Workgroup meeting to discuss how the mentoring plan works. M. Green noted that we need to see the manual and protocols in place with the document. The process works in a way that we agree to indicators and then come up with measurements. We do not create indicators based on measurements the District already has.
	+ Dr. Moore proposed that the Workgroup could divide up the indicators moving forward. He thinks that when the indicators prepared by the District will probably be close to the IRC-NAACP’s indicators.

**Closing Remarks:**

Counsel will agree to a January 2023 Workgroup date.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting went off the record at 7:27 PM.

**Indian River NAACP/SDIRC Workgroup Meeting**

December 14, 2022

**SUMMARY OF WORKGROUP’S REACHED AGREEMENTS**

**Section II - Mentoring of New Teachers and Instructional Staff**

Goal Statement:

*To provide a formal mentor program during years 1-3 that is structured to support and assist the individual needs of African American teachers and instructional staff so that they can integrate and succeed in their roles.*

Indicator 1: *Formal Mentor Program organized, operated, and monitored by the District through Professional Development Specialists.*

Indicator 2: *Each newly hired or newly assigned teacher and instructional staff member shall be enrolled in the Mentoring Program, which shall run the first three-years of their employment.*

Indicator 3: *All mentors participate in the Mentor Program on a voluntary basis and undergo clinical education training*.

Indicator 4: *Each new African American teacher and instructional staff has a personalized mentoring plan that identifies obstacles, concerns, and adverse conditions they experience with clearly defined steps to address those obstacles, concerns, and adverse conditions.*

Indicator 5: *Each school has a PD Council representative on site who oversees the mentor/mentee relationship and who provides additional support, when necessary, to the mentor and/or mentee*

Indicator 6: *All mentors participate in the Mentor Program on a voluntary basis and undergo clinical education training*.

Indicator 7: *The District publicizes policy statements, guidelines, and support materials that promote the effective mentoring program.*