

CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees (the "Board") held in the Multipurpose Room, Education Centre, 1221 – 8th Street SW, Calgary, Alberta on Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at 3:00 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Board of Trustees:

Trustee P. Cochrane, Chair
Trustee C. Bazinet
Trustee J. Bowen-Eyre
Trustee L. Ferguson
Trustee P. King
Trustee G. Lane
Trustee S. Taylor

Administration:

Ms. N. Johnson, Chief Superintendent of Schools
Mr. D. Stevenson, Deputy Chief Superintendent of Schools
Mr. F. Coppinger, Superintendent, Facilities and Environmental Services
Ms. C. Faber, Superintendent, Learning Innovation
Ms. D. Lewis, Superintendent, Learning Support
Ms. D. Meyers, Superintendent, Finance and Supply Chain Services
Mr. K. Peterson, Acting Superintendent, Human Resources
Ms. L. Safran, Acting General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Ms. J. Barkway, Office of the Corporate Secretary
Ms. D. Perrier, Recording Secretary

Stakeholder Representatives:

Mr. R. Hurdman, Calgary Association of Parents and School Councils
Ms. J. Regal, Alberta Teachers' Association, Local 38
Ms. L. Robb, Calgary Board of Education Staff Association

1 | **CALL TO ORDER, NATIONAL ANTHEM AND WELCOME**

Chair Cochrane called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and O Canada was led by students from Hawkwood School by way of a DVD recording.

Chair Cochrane acknowledged and welcomed representatives from the aforementioned organizations.

2 | **CONSIDERATION/APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. Barkway noted the proposed additions to the Agenda were: Item 7.2 Strategic Communication Dialogue Session, and a public comment to be given under Item 6.1.

MOVED by Trustee Bowen-Eyre:

THAT the Agenda for the Regular Meeting of April 17, 2012, be approved as submitted, subject to the revisions noted above.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3 | **AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS**

3.1 **Lighthouse Award**

Ms. M. Levy, Director, Corporate Partnerships, introduced the Lighthouse Award recipient, Calgary Police Service, School Resource Officers Team. The School Resource Officer (SRO) program was established in 1976 and operates between the Calgary Police Service, Calgary Board of Education and the Calgary Separate School District, and over the years has had significant support from all of the partners. There are currently 14 SRO's full or part-time in all the CBE high schools and additionally four SRO's that deal with the junior high schools, both public and separate. Ms. Levy shared success stories as told by school administrators, students, and SRO's, and she elaborated further on the contributions by the SROs, including their "Student Police Academy"; training sessions for practicing school lockdowns and for rapid intervention of armed intruders; and educating their school's staff on best practices for keeping their school safe.

Ms. Levy welcomed the following members of Calgary Police Service who were in attendance: Superintendent Richard Hinse, Sergeant Duane Lepchuk, Constable Eleanor Wagner and Constable Darryl Jones. Sergeant Lepchuk shared a few words in appreciation of this recognition by the CBE.

On behalf of the Board, Chair Pat Cochrane extended appreciation, noting that the CBE is extremely grateful for this partnership. She stated that the contributions of the School Resource Officer as law-related educator, law-related counselor and law enforcement officer are making a significant difference for students and staff in many schools.

4 | **RESULTS FOCUS**

4.1 **Specific Student Fees for 2012-13**

Chief Superintendent Johnson provided introductory comments, noting that further to its newly revised policies, the Board of Trustees delegated the setting of fees to Administration. The fees constitute approximately two percent of the total annual

budget. The budget will be presented for review and consideration by the Board at a public meeting on May 29, 2012.

Chief Johnson informed that Legal counsel has advised the Board that in the event a Trustee pays fees because he or she has a child in the CBE system, in the context of voting on the budget as a whole that Trustee need not declare a pecuniary interest in respect of the fees and may still vote on the budget because of two factors. The first factor is that the Board is not determining the fees but has delegated such determination to Administration. The second factor is that the fees are a small percentage of the overall budget and Section 80(3)(g) of the School Act would apply. That Section of the Act provides that a Trustee is deemed not to have a pecuniary interest by reason only of an interest that is so remote or insignificant that he or she reasonably would not be influenced in making a decision because of that interest. It is reasonable to take the position that these two factors together should enable a Trustee to receive information concerning the fees and later vote on the budget that includes the fees without declaring a pecuniary interest in regard to the fees.

Legal counsel has further advised that in the event a Trustee brings a motion to direct Administration to reassess or review the fees again, or in the event a Trustee asks questions concerning the fees that reasonably would cause Administration to have to reassess or review the fees, then at the time the budget is voted upon by the Board, that Trustee would have to declare a pecuniary interest because he or she has influenced the determination of the fees.

Chief Johnson stressed that this does not mean that Trustees cannot ask questions concerning the fees. However, if the nature of a question would lead any person to infer that the Trustee is attempting to influence how the fees are set by Administration, then the delegation to Administration of the setting of the fees would be compromised. In that situation, a pecuniary interest would have to be declared by that Trustee when asked to vote on the budget. The School Act requires that any trustee who declares a pecuniary interest on a matter to be voted on must abstain from voting on or discussing the matter and also must leave the room during the discussion and vote on the matter.

Chief Johnson provided an overview of the contents of the report. She noted that the revenue received does not cover the costs incurred. Fees are controversial and that is why values have been posed and addressed in setting the fees. She stated that Administration in no way devalues alternative programs, as might be interpreted in looking at the structure of the fees. She noted that a breakdown of charter transportation costs has been done, but no breakdown has been done for individual students at this time. Administration can say, unequivocally, that it costs more to transport students to alternative programs, including French Immersion. The breakdown of charter transportation costs for 2010-2011 was as follows:

- \$7.6 million to regular program;
- \$3.7 million to French Immersion programs;
- \$.6 million to Mandarin Bilingual programs;
- \$2.0 million to Spanish Bilingual programs;
- \$.3 million to German Bilingual programs;

- \$12.3 million for students with special needs (not inclusive of handi-bus, taxis, aides or nurses on the bus);
- \$.5 million to Montessori programs;
- \$.26 million for All-Girls programs;
- \$.4 million to Science programs;
- \$2.5 million to Traditional Learning Centre programs;
- \$.3 million to Piitoayis program; and
- \$.8 million to Arts Centred Learning programs.

In total, the gap between what the province provides and what it costs to transport students to alternative programs is \$4.1 million; the gap for our regular program is \$2.8 million.

Chief Johnson noted that parents (including six out of ten parents with students in alternative programs) have told us they actually expected to pay a higher or much higher fee to access alternative programs. The new fee schedules reflect parent principles and the costs associated with providing that service.

With respect to noon supervision fees, some people have suggested that teachers should supervise students during that lunch hour. The CBE Administration feels strongly that teachers should be spending their time teaching, rather than supervising students during the lunch hour. Chief Johnson stated that we need to value the contribution and expertise of our lunch room supervisors. As a publicly funded organization, we are expected to set fees that meet certain criteria; the fees should be cost based; users should pay for the services they use; and services must be accessible to all. Chief Johnson pointed out that the fee framework presented at this meeting meets those expectations. She noted that there is still much to learn and Administration would continue to look to parents to help with this important work, and effective communication of student fees is ongoing.

Trustees posed questions, which were addressed by Administration and are summarized as follows:

- Approximately four years ago a provincial committee reviewed the transportation formula for metro school boards, and brought forward recommendations that have not been acted upon by the province.
- With respect to the user-pay system that some other boards across the province follow, the indication from parents within the CBE was that they wanted fees to be comparable, and not necessarily competitive. Some school boards charge more than the CBE, and others charge less. The quality and degree of the services that are offered differ from one board to the next.
- Reference was made of the charts on pages 4-15 to 4-18 of the report, and it was questioned how the net impact on parents would be zero by 2014, and in particular how this impact is calculated in relation to Noon Supervision fees. Administration noted that the model was changed for Noon Supervision and transportation, thereby decreasing the fees to parents by a total of \$1.6 million. With respect to the Noon Supervision fees going forward to the year 2014-15, the anticipated parent-paid fees

is \$2.6 million, taking into consideration the impact of waivers anticipated, which would reduce the amount of fees. Another component to the reduction to a net zero is the waivers in general; while parents would be charged more fees, a great number of parents would not be paying the fees that they currently are paying, which amounts to approximately \$900,000.

A concern noted by a Trustee was that parents clearly stated in the consultation process that they did not want waivers to come from fees that parents were paying, so we should not subtract waivers from the increase that parents are paying. The belief was shared by some Trustees that the calculations put forward by Administration in the chart on page 4-18 do not reflect a net zero impact for parents.

Superintendent Meyers clarified that the chart on page 4-15 is from the system perspective, and from the parent perspective the \$2.8 million is an increase in fees paid by parents based on the user-pay method to be implemented and for those parents who currently do not pay for their children's transportation. The \$1.2 million is actually a decrease in fees paid by parents because they are now eligible for waivers, and the \$1.6 million is a decrease in fees paid by parents because they are no longer paying for the extra 30 minutes in Noon Supervision.

- Information was shared about the different levels of transportation required for students with special needs. Some students require handi-bus support, and in some cases an attendant is required on the bus. The associated costs for these transportation needs are factored in with supplementary funding that we receive in addition to the basic transportation grant.
- Administration has committed to review the service levels of Noon Supervision, which are not the same at all schools, by the end of June. It is anticipated that a report on this subject will be available by the end of this school year. The fee for noon supervision will be based on 90 minutes, starting in September 2012, except in cases where they may have double lunch sessions; however, the service levels are still to be decided and are separate from that.
- In regards to the concern that the increase in fees may impact enrolments at alternative programs, Administration noted that the current process will continue and principals have been advised to staff on their projections; any necessary adjustments would be made in the fall. The belief was shared that parents make choices because of the quality of the program, and not necessarily because of the fees.
- Clarification was made of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Section 23. The Charter protects the rights of the language when in the minority situation; for example, if an English speaking person were to move to Quebec, the Charter would guarantee that person an education in English. It does not apply to an Anglophone being guaranteed the right to have a French Immersion program.
- A breakdown of the number of families who applied for fee waivers, as of March 9, 2012, was given as follows:
 - A total of 7,329 students were approved for waivers for Instructional, Supplies and Materials fees;
 - Of that total, 3,983 students received waivers for transportation fees;
 - 649 students received waivers for Music Instrument Rental fees; and

- The 7,329 students come from 3,791 families.
- Administration shared examples of how costs were reduced over the past few years to address the transportation budget shortfall. A review was made of each and every bus route and, where possible, single routes were changed to dual routes with school start and end times rearranged to achieve significant savings; and congregated stops were created for alternative programs. If the CBE were to move away from congregated stops, the fees would increase significantly.
- A Trustee questioned the definition of personal choice and queried why the definition does not include other decisions made by parents, such as residing in a community that does not have a school, or sending their children to a school that they are not designated to attend.

Mr. P. Coppard, Stormy Lake Consulting, who was involved in the community engagement on fees, was asked to speak on the issue. He shared that the gist of the discussion with parents was in relation to any additional costs that might be associated with transportation, as opposed to any costs at all. Paying a basic busing fee was less of a concern than being charged incremental fees.

Chief Superintendent Johnson noted a Program Classification Framework report was presented to the Board in June 2010, in which programs were classified as regular programs, alternative programs, or special needs programs, pursuant to the School Act. Administration made the decision to define personal choice around the choice of an alternative program, as it would be too difficult to define it any other way.

- Administration confirmed that the transportation fees are based on an average.
- Further discussion ensued about the anomalies that exist with busing our students. Chief Superintendent Johnson reiterated that the anomalies and impacts will be reviewed by Administration, under the guide of the established principles, and subsequent to additional dialogue with parents and an in-depth analysis of the fees, there may be opportunity to better attend to those issues.
- In regards to families who experience financial hardship and who do not qualify for fee waivers, Administration suggested that those parents should converse with the school principal for consideration on a one-by-one basis.
- An error was noted in the chart on page 4-17, in that reference to footnote 13 in the columns "7-9 Transit, alternative" and "10-12 Transit, all" is incorrect, and that the footnote applies only to "conditional charter".
- The cost of providing employee parking encompasses the services of snow-removal, sweeping, electricity, and repair of plug-ins at the sites, which amounts to a little more than \$1 million per year. Currently, the return from employee parking fees is approximately \$100,000 per year.
- Administration addressed a question about the typical default rate for payment of fees and whether that would be expected to change. A partial breakdown of the fees collected and what is outstanding, as known to date, was provided. Chief Superintendent Johnson shared the belief that the changes made in the collection of

fees may assist in lowering the defaults, i.e., payments can be made online and payment installments are accepted.

- Chief Superintendent Johnson stressed the point that the CBE does not deny student access to programs based on their ability to pay. Deputy Chief Stevenson noted that work has been started on matters surrounding this issue with our area directors. It is not a standard that every principal would adhere to but, rather, an individual circumstance. Principals are experienced in dealing with families who face financial hardship, and it should not be projected that this would be a cost to the school, but would be decided on a one-to-one basis with the support of an area director, and those costs could be covered.
- The noon supervision is considered as child care under the federal tax system.
- In the CBE budget for 2012-13, it is anticipated to receive \$1 million in federal grants for the study of French. This funding is not applied to the transportation of these students, but it is applied to curriculum development, textbooks, resources, and perhaps some professional development; it would also be applied to the opening of a new site if that was anticipated.

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

THAT the Board of Trustees receives the report *Specific Student Fees for 2012-13* as information.

Trustees considered the motion, and their comments are summarized as follows:

- This is felt to be an acceptable report with workable solutions to cover costs associated with fees.
- The Board has delegated the setting of fees to Administration and it would be inappropriate and impossible for the Board to take that work back for a possible fee restructure at this time.
- There has been much feedback received from parents and it is important that Administration receives the feedback to get a better understanding of the issues and concerns of parents.
- Appreciation was shared to Administration for working with parents through public engagement, which was believed to be a very good and rich process. The Board governs through policy, that at this point does not give much direction in regards to fees, and that may be a change for consideration at some other time.
- It is understood that some of our parents will be happy with these fees, and some parents will not, and there is no way possible to please everyone when it comes to fees. It was pointed out that the CBE costs exceed funding.
- There is nothing that would prevent the Administration from making further adjustments to this fee structure this year.
- The belief was shared that parents are not seeing a clear link between the fees and the services that they are getting, and that it has not been proven to our parents that the fees are truly reflective of the costs for transportation and program quality.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5 | OPERATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

There were no items.

6 | PUBLIC COMMENT

6.1 Ms. P. Halla, representative of parents from Mayland Heights School

Ms. Halla noted her belief that if the proposed structure of fees goes forward, choice will be taken away from many of the families with children in French Immersion. She noted that a number of parents from Mayland Heights School are trying to give their children an opportunity for something they themselves never had – a better education. With respect to the new waiver system that is proposed, a parent with one child and earning an income of \$24,500 annually, in 2014 and 2015 will have to pay \$61.50 per month for their child to attend an alternative program in the CBE.

Ms. Halla questioned whether the cost of living in Calgary was taken into consideration when the fees were considered. She pointed out that at Mayland Heights School there are approximately one dozen children each day who receive the lunches that are donated by outside programs. She expressed her opinion that Mayland Heights is a have-not school, and to increase the fees to this degree to send a child to a publicly-funded French Immersion program will leave struggling families with no choice but to pull their children from the program. Ms. Halla urged the Board of Trustees to consider the detrimental effects that these fees may have on families who struggle to make ends meet, before the CBE Administration implements this fee structure.

Recessed: 5:25 p.m.
Reconvened: 5:40 p.m.

7 | MATTERS RESERVED FOR BOARD ACTION

7.1 Delegation of Authority to the Chief Superintendent

Ms. L. Safran, Acting General Counsel and Corporate Secretary, provided an overview of the contents of the report. She provided clarification on issues in question by Trustees, pertaining to the delegation to the Chief Superintendent, the power to terminate the services of a teacher, the appeal processes contained in the Administrative Regulations, and the process that remains in place with respect to the Board of Reference.

MOVED by Trustee Taylor:

- 1. THAT the Board of Trustees approves the Delegation of Authority Resolution, as follows:**

- A. THAT the Board of Trustees rescinds the Board of Trustees' October 26, 2010 resolution on delegation of authority.**
- B. THAT, pursuant to its powers under section 61 of the *School Act*:**
- 1. The Board of Trustees delegates to the Chief Superintendent, including (subject to Paragraph B.2 below) the power to sub-delegate thereafter, the power to do any act or thing or exercise any power that the Board may or is required to do or exercise except:**
 - (a) those matters which, in accordance with section 61(2) of the *School Act*, cannot be delegated;**
 - (b) the appointment of an auditor under section 146 of the *School Act* and the examination of the auditor's report under section 150 of the *School Act*; and**
 - (c) those specific matters and decisions reserved to the Board of Trustees in its Governance Policies (i.e., Results, Operational Expectations, Board/Chief Superintendent Relationship and Governance Culture policies).**
 - 2. Notwithstanding Paragraph B.1 above, the Board of Trustees delegates only to the Chief Superintendent without the power to sub-delegate thereafter:**
 - (a) the power to suspend the services of a teacher including, without limitation, the power under Section 105(2) of the *School Act* to suspend a teacher from the performance of the teacher's duties without prior notice if the Chief Superintendent is of the opinion that the welfare of students is threatened by the presence of the teacher; and**
 - (b) the power to terminate the services of a teacher.**
 - 3. With respect to the powers specified in Paragraph B.2.(a) above, the Board of Trustees requires the Chief Superintendent to:**
 - (a) advise the Board of Trustees forthwith in writing of any suspension directed pursuant to such delegated power;**
 - (b) advise the affected teacher forthwith in writing of the reasons for the suspension of the teacher; and**
 - (c) forward a copy of the notice of suspension together with a written statement of the facts alleged, to the Board of Trustees and to the Minister.**
 - 4. With respect to the powers specified in Paragraph B.2.(b) above, the Board of Trustees requires the Chief Superintendent to:**

- (a) advise the Board of Trustees forthwith in writing of any termination made pursuant to such delegated power; and
 - (b) provide the affected teacher with written notice of any termination made pursuant to such delegated power in accordance with the requirements of the *School Act*.
5. No decision of the Chief Superintendent to suspend the services of a teacher, or to terminate the services of a teacher, or to terminate a designation made pursuant to section 19, 95 or 96 of the *School Act*, may be appealed to the Board of Trustees.
- C. THAT, pursuant to its powers under section 61 of the *School Act* and section 95 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the Board of Trustees designates the Chief Superintendent as head of the Calgary Board of Education for purposes of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.
- D. THAT, pursuant to its powers under section 9 of the *Student Record Regulation*, the Board of Trustees designates the Chief Superintendent to be responsible for ensuring that the policies and procedures established by the Board of Trustees relating to student records and to information referred to in section 3 of the *Student Record Regulation* comply with the *Student Record Regulation* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.
- E. THAT, pursuant to its delegation of authority specified in Paragraph B. above, and in accordance with section 123 of the *School Act*, the Board of Trustees resolves to establish the appeal procedures set out in the Chief Superintendent's Administrative Regulations or Chief Superintendent's Directives, including:
 1. Administrative Regulation 3003 - Special Education Programming
 2. Administrative Regulation 3006 - Home Education
 3. Administrative Regulation 3013 - Program Issues and Challenges
 4. Administrative Regulation 3017A - Admission of Students
 5. Administrative Regulation 3018 - Student Placement and Promotion
 6. Administrative Regulation 3081 - Staff and Resource Allocation Decisions
 7. Administrative Regulation 4027 - Code of Conduct for Employees
 8. Administrative Regulation 4027.2 - Personal and Sexual Harassment

9. **Administrative Regulation 4080 - Workplace Violence**
10. **Administrative Regulation 5001 - School Councils and School/Parent Societies**
11. **Administrative Regulation 5007 - Concerns and Complaints**
12. **Administrative Regulation 6001 - School Discipline**
13. **Administrative Regulation 6091 - Student Admissions and School Choice**
14. **Administrative Regulation 6093 - Fourth Year of High School**
15. **Administrative Regulation 6095 - Student Transportation**
16. **any other student appeal procedures set out in the Chief Superintendent's Administrative Regulations or Chief Superintendent's Directives; and**
17. **any future student appeal procedures set out in the Chief Superintendent's Administrative Regulations or Chief Superintendent's Directives as long as the Chief Superintendent gives notice in writing to the Board of Trustees prior to the approval of such by the Chief**

and

2. **THAT the Board of Trustees approves that the Delegation of Authority Resolution, as noted above, be approved as Board-Chief Superintendent Relationship Policy 4E, and that this policy will replace the current B-4E Delegation of Authority Resolution.**

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7.2 Strategic Communication Dialogue Session

Trustee Bowen Eyre provided a summary of the issue, noting that the report lays out the framework for initiating a communication dialogue process with two groups to begin with: representative community leaders; and then students; and then to go forward with future engagement sessions with multiple stakeholders, including parents and parent groups.

MOVED by Trustee Bowen-Eyre:

THAT the Board of Trustees approves proceeding with Strategic Communication Dialogue Sessions, pursuant to further details provided in the report.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8 | BOARD CONSENT AGENDA

8.1 Approval of Minutes

- Regular Meeting held March 6, 2012

THAT the Board approves the minutes as submitted.

8.2 Correspondence

THAT the Board of Trustees receives the following correspondence for information and for the record, in the form as submitted:

- Letter dated March 30, 2012 from Board Chair Pat Cochrane, to His Worship Mayor Naheed Nenshi, regarding the approved Calgary Board of Education Three-Year School Capital Plan, 2013-2016.
- Letter dated April 3, 2012 from Board Chair Pat Cochrane, to Dr. Y. Hébert, Professor, and Dr. S. Roy, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Calgary, regarding second language learning and the Calgary Board of Education's Framework for Second and International Languages.
- Letter (via email) dated April 4, 2012 from Mr. D. Anderson, Executive Director, Alberta School Boards Association, to all Board Chairs, regarding ASBA Budget and Bylaws Bulletin.

9 | CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT CONSENT AGENDA

9.1 Locally Developed Courses

1. THAT the Board of Trustees approves the following renewed Calgary Board of Education senior high locally developed courses and resources, as listed in the course outline submitted to Alberta Education, for use in Calgary Board of Education schools for the period listed within each course outline:

Autobody Repair K&E

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Creative Writing and Publishing

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 3 and 5

Dance

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 3 and 5

Journalism

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Korean Language and Culture

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Musical Theatre

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Sport Psychology

Level: 25 Credits: 5

Yoga

Level: 15, 25 Credits: 5

2. THAT the Board of Trustees approves the following re-acquired Calgary Board of Education senior high locally developed courses and resources, as listed in the course outline submitted to Alberta Education, for use in Calgary Board of Education schools for the period listed within each course outline:

Ballet

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Ceramics (Advanced Techniques)

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

Contemporary Dance

Level: 25, 35 Credits: 5

Dance Composition

Level: 35 Credits: 5

Jazz Dance

Level: 25, 35 Credits: 5

Painting (Advanced Techniques)

Level: 15, 25, 35 Credits: 5

3. THAT the Board of Trustees approves the withdrawal of the following expiring or expired acquired Calgary Board of Education senior high locally developed courses from the list of approved courses available for use in Calgary Board of Education schools:

Sports Performance

Level: 25 Credits: 3 and 5

4. THAT the Board of Trustees approves the following renewed Calgary Board of Education junior high locally developed course and resources required to teach them for use in Calgary Board of Education schools for the period listed within the course outline:

Dance

Grades: 7, 8, 9

ESL Beginner English Language Development

Grades: 7, 8, 9

Exploration in the Fine and Performing Arts

Grades: 7

Leadership/Service

Grades: 7, 8, 9

Training for Excellence in Sports

Grades: 7, 8, 9

10 | **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Cochrane declared the meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.