

**WIL LOU GRAY OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL
MINUTES OF JULY 17, 1985
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

The Board of Trustees convened for a scheduled meeting on July 17, 1985, in the Archives Room of the William T. Lander Administration Building at 7:30 p.m. Trustees in attendance were: Mrs. Hannah Meadors, presiding; Mr. Devon Belcher; Mr. Walter Dahlgren; Mr. Vince Rhodes; Ms. Linda Spivey; Mrs. Elizabeth Thrallkill; Ms. Patricia Watt; Dr. Marvin Efron, and Mrs. Mickey Lindler. Staff members present were: Mr. Sam F. Drew, Jr., Superintendent; Mr. Pat G. Smith, Director of Administration; Dr. Jonnie Spaulding, Director of Student Development; Mr. George Smith, Development Officer; Mr. John W. King, Jr., Fiscal Affairs Officer; Ms. Gloria Lloyd, Personnel Specialist; and Mrs. Brenda Stork, Secretary.

Mrs. Meadors called the meeting to order and stated for the record that notice of the meeting was provided to the public in conformance with the requirements of the S. C. Freedom of Information Act, Section 30-4-80(d) of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976 as amended.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees, Mrs. Meadors welcomed a new member of the Board, Mrs. Mickey Lindler.

At this time the Board made a special presentation to Mrs. Virginia Taylor. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Meadors presented to Mrs. Taylor a Certificate of Appreciation for her outstanding service to the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School as Principal for several months during the year of 1985. Mrs. Meadors commented on the splendid job Mrs. Taylor did while serving as Principal of the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School. Mr. Drew stated that Mrs. Taylor had gone above and beyond the call of duty, and he was very proud of the way she willingly and

very ably stepped in and took over that position.

A motion was made by Mr. Rhodes to adopt the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Efron. The motion was passed.

The next order of business was the approval of Minutes of the May 8, 1985, Board meeting. Dr. Efron made a motion that the Minutes be accepted as written. Ms. Watt seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Mrs. Meadors called for the Superintendent's Report. Mr. Drew informed the Board we were in the process of making renovations to the school building such as painting and removing walls in several classrooms for three new GED labs. He also indicated that the dorms were being painted this year and the furniture was being refurbished by the Department of Corrections. Mr. Drew apologized for the poor condition of the school grounds over the past two months. He explained that the maintenance staff got behind with routine maintenance last year due to the asbestos removal efforts. He said that with the student labor we will have this summer we should be able to catch up on the maintenance of the grounds. He commended Mr. Smith's staff for their hard work in getting the grounds back into shape.

Mr. Drew next reported on the status of the 1985 budget request. He explained he had briefly reviewed some of the budget items with the Budget Committee during dinner. Mr. Drew referred the Board to the budget request items he outlined at the previous Board meeting. He stated that the legislature appropriated basically every item we had requested. He indicated, however, that in the final days of the legislative session, in order to balance the budget, the legislature rendered an across the board twenty-five percent cut in personal service

funds appropriated for the new positions. Although the legislature indicated that this action was simply a delay in the hiring of new positions until October 1, in effect, it was a twenty-five percent cut in the funds appropriated, and was used to balance the budget. Mr. Drew said that information he had received led him to believe that these funds would not be restored for FY 1987. Therefore, we received less of an increase in personal service funds than our request. Mr. Drew also informed the Board that our FTEs were not reduced. Therefore the agency will have a surplus of FTEs. Mr. Drew stated that he would ask for this personal service money in the FY 1987 budget request to enable us to fill all the positions that have been approved for us.

Other funding granted by the legislature was for the purpose of extending services to help deal with the problems of truancy statewide. Mr. Drew reminded the Board of discussions about this program at the last meeting on May 8.

In summation Mr. Drew stated that the agency has received approximately a twenty-five percent increase in our budget over the 1984-85 year. He went on to say that over the past two years the operating budget of the agency has been increased by approximately one hundred and one percent. Also, the overall budget of the agency in two years has been increased by approximately fifty-four percent. Therefore, the five year goal established by the Board has been met in two years. Mr. Drew felt that these additional appropriations will enable us to provide better programming and add additional employees, particularly Youth Counselors. Mr. Drew noted that Mr. Rhodes had pointed to the need previously for better qualified Youth Counselors. Mr. Drew agreed and said they are difficult to find. Mr. Drew further stated that he had worked diligently for the past two or three months to work out an agreement with Midlands Technical College to provide training for our Youth Counselors. This agreement will allow us to offer in-service training on our campus to Youth

Counselors leading to an Associate Degree in that area. Additionally, the agreement would provide us with applicants from a pool of people being trained by Midlands Technical College specifically for residential counseling jobs. Mr. Drew stated that he felt we were very successful with the legislature in our budget efforts last year. He was enthusiastic about the programming improvements these additional funds will make possible.

Mr. Drew explained that we have not had adequate time as of this date to fully develop the 1986-87 budget. He said there are some budget issues that arise out of the last session regarding the amount we were cut back from our original request. That is the twenty-five percent cut back. He explained that he thought we should request these funds for FY 1987 so we could fill the FTE positions granted for FY 1986.

In reference to the Bond Bill request, Mr. Drew explained we succeeded in getting our items in the Bond Bill, however, the Legislature failed to pass the Bond Bill this year. However, they did pass a proviso to allow them to pass a Bond Bill next year. This is a budget issue that we will pursue next year.

Mr. Drew further explained that there are a few items we might review in the way of increases. One may be some small equipment and supplies money for the training center we are proposing for the purpose of disseminating information about the work of the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School to others around the State. Another is an increase in appropriations under the EIA to assure that our teachers keep pace with the surrounding school districts. Other than the items mentioned, the agency will not need additional operating funds next year. Mr. Drew said he felt we have come out well in the past couple of years and he felt we should concentrate our efforts this year on reassessing our directions and subsequent funding needs.

The various departments of the school will be developing their budgets over the next week or two. Mr. Drew explained that he will develop a budget from this and he asked the Board if they would allow him to work with the Budget Committee over the next two to four weeks in developing the first draft of the budget which is due in August. The Board would be provided with copies of the proposed budget. Mr. Drew felt this required the action of the Board. A motion was made by Dr. Efron to empower the Superintendent to work with the Budget Committee to submit a preliminary budget. Vince Rhodes seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

In reference to the final expenditure report listed on the Agenda, Mr. Drew explained that this was not a final or close-out report, but rather a report that goes through the 30th of June, which is the end of the fiscal year. The final close-out date is July 25th. Mr. Drew informed the Board that he had reviewed these figures with Mr. King and the school will not turn back any State funds. Dr. Efron asked if the vehicles in the Opportunity School's parking lot were new. Mr. Drew said that the vehicles were new. He informed the Board that the agency had purchased three new cars and a van. Mr. Drew further stated this was one of our long range goals. Dr. Efron said he had no objection to this matter. Mr. Drew explained that one of the goals next year was to replace the grounds equipment. He said the old cars were turned over to State Surplus and brought approximately \$225.00 at auction.

Mr. Drew next called the Board's attention to the Expenditure Report under Personal Service Salaries. The negative figure was misleading, he said, and did not mean we had overspent. Mr. Drew further explained that because of the States new salary payment schedule some expended funds were attributed to this fiscal year that really are accountable in the next fiscal year. This matter has to do with the change in the State's way of paying people. Mr. King had reconciled this and Mr. Drew did not want the Board to be misled by the report.

There being no questions on the previous matter, Mr. Drew directed the Board's attention to the information in their file pertaining to the 1984-85 Audit. Mr. Drew expressed that he hoped the Board was as pleased with the Audit as he was. He explained that this was the best audit we had had in some years and that this was a direct result of he, Mr. King and his staff, and Mr. Smith meeting and resolving a lot of the internal problems we have had in the past. Mr. Drew advised the Board that they would be receiving a Procurement Audit that was done this year. The auditors found several exceptions in the procurement process, however, ninety percent of them have already been corrected. Mr. Drew felt that the work done to correct procurement problems helped a great deal with the overall financial audit. He pointed out that in the Management Letter, a copy of which was provided to the Board, the auditors made two positive statements. One had to do with an audit problem that had already been corrected and therefore was not cited. The other amounted to a "pat on the back" for modifying our procedures to remit indirect costs in a timely manner this year. He reminded the Board that this was a problem on last year's audit and we were advised to set up a separate account for indirect costs. There was only one actual citation. It was minor and has already been corrected. Mr. Drew said he would be glad to answer any questions the Board may have pertaining to the audit. He advised the Board that the audit comes at a time when Mr. King and his staff are doing everything by hand because we have not yet received the computerized system that the State promised us several months ago. One of the people in Mr. King's department has retired leaving that department shorthanded. Mrs. Thraikill commended Mr. King and his staff.

Mr. Drew explained that the Annual School Report, next on the agenda, had not been completed. He asked the Board to recall that when we completed that report last year it set forth a three year plan. Basically the report is a checklist of those objectives that have been completed and those objectives that are continuing for next year. Therefore, there will not be

any new information in the plan that the Board has not already seen with the exception that we have added one objective on in-school suspension that was not contained in the plan before. Mr. Drew advised the Board that this will be completed and mailed to the Board.

As it relates to program plans for the 1985-86 school year, Mr. Drew explained that a Planning Committee was formed again this year to focus primarily on instructional improvement. He reminded the Board that last year the Committee focused on the process of delivering services which resulted in the case management system and Opp Teams. That process was refined by this committee utilizing the experience we gained over the year and in addition to this they focused heavily on improvements to the instructional program, again based on the initial assessment that we did last year. He explained that several changes will be made as a result of that planning. One is that we will have in effect next year a computer based, individualized diagnostic prescriptive program. We have already purchased the computer program. It is a program that allows us to build in our own objectives and resources, although it does have a standard set of objectives and resources built in. He further explained that our teachers have already taken those objectives built in and crossed referenced our own objectives. The main advantage in this system is that we can build this program over the years to fit our particular needs. When students come in they will go through a diagnostic process and the computer will analyze the assessment information and write prescriptions. Teachers then will manage instruction in the classroom by means of these prescriptions. This will apply to the diploma program as well as the GED program. The GED program will be much more individualized. The diploma program will continue to look more like the traditional high school program. To accommodate the GED program we are making some modifications to the building by taking out walls in two classroom areas and creating two large GED labs. Teachers will also be teaming for instruction in those labs.

Mr. Drew explained that the other major change which he had already addressed, involved the hiring of additional Youth Counselors. He stated that he had discussed this with the Personnel Committee. We will have for the first time some Youth Counselor III's, as well as Youth Counselor II's. Youth Counselor III's will perform in a formative supervisory capacity. They will be the contact with the Opp Teams. They will know all of the students on campus, have planned activities in the dorms, and will also act as substitute counselor if someone is out. We will be able to double the number of counselors in each dorm and provide coverage from 11:00 to 8:00 a.m.

Mr. Drew explained there are many other small improvements which are too numerous to mention. He felt the Board would see improvements in all programs as the year progressed.

Mr. Drew next presented the Personnel Report. He informed the Board that Mr. Jimmy Gadsen had resigned his position as a cook. Mr. Harry Williams has been hired as Art Teacher to replace Mr. Scott Carruth effective the 12th of August when the teaching staff returns. Mr. Drew explained that we had several good applicants for the position of Auto Mechanics Instructor. Mr. Bill Shumaker has been hired for that position. He has a great deal of experience in small engine repair and he is also experienced in developing learning modules. Mr. Drew said that the position of Building Instructor will be re-advertised as we did not receive any applications that were suitable. Mr. Drew also informed the Board that Linda Marshall will be on maternity leave for the first two or three weeks of school. He further explained that the interviews for the position of Principal had been completed and a decision for this position would be made by the end of the week. Mr. Drew stated that he thought it would be

premature for the Board to approve someone at this point. He explained that he was not certain that any of the applicants that were prioritized would accept the position. Several applicants dropped out because the salary was lower than what they were making. Mr. Drew said he anticipated this. We reclassified the position so that we could obtain a salary range of \$32,000. to \$40,000., so we would be competitive. Dr. Efron asked if we were competitive with teachers it seems that we could also have some sort of resolution with the legislature to be competitive with our Principal's position as well. Mr. Drew explained that for the first time this year we are drawing some EIA money to make that position competitive. He further explained that this was one reason that he was able to reclassify that position. However, we are restricted somewhat by the Superintendent's salary. By law, an employee of a state agency can only make within \$500.00 of the Director of the agency. Mr. Drew explained he was hoping he would be able to offer this person approximately \$38,500. to \$39,000. He still felt that we have an adequate number of applicants who would come in at a salary range of \$36,000. to \$37,500. Finally, Mr. Drew informed the Board that Mr. Hugh Gibson had not contacted the agency to further extend his extended sick leave. Mrs. Lloyd had phoned his home on two different occasions but was not able to reach anyone. In the absence of a request for additional extended leave Mr. Drew was advised by State Personnel to terminate Mr. Gibson for inability to work due to illness. Mr. Drew said that he had done this. A motion was made by Dr. Efron that the Board accept the recommendations of the personnel actions as given by the Superintendent. Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Mr. Drew directed the Board to the proposed Cooperative Services Agreement with the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. He explained that the agreement was the same as last year. It worked well for us this year and he recommended that this Agreement be approved by the Board. Dr. Efron moved that the Board accept the Superintendent's recommendation to

adopt the Vocational Rehabilitation Cooperative Services Agreement for 1985-86 as submitted. Ms. Watt seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

The last item of the Superintendent's Report dealt with the Status of F Dorm. Mrs. Meadors explained that she had had a very beneficial exchange with Mr. Roy Stone. She further explained that Mr. Drew met with Mr. Dusenbury and came up with a proposed plan. Mr. Drew explained that he met with Mr. Dusenbury and discussed in general our intent with respect to F Dorm. Mr. Drew explained that he and Mr. Dusenbury agreed to joint occupancy of the building. He said that our Educational Support Services staff will be moving into the building soon. He said that he and Mr. Dusenbury would agree on the space that can be utilized jointly. Mr. Drew stated that since a resolution to this problem has been found through compromise he would recommend that the Board revoke its previous action to require a Lease on the building. He said that with an agreement for joint occupancy there was no longer a need to lease the building. He said that in the course of his meetings with Mr. Dusenbury and Mrs. Meador's meetings with Mr. Stone it was confirmed that when the twenty year time limit on Rehabilitative use of the building had lapsed the building reverted back wholly to the Opportunity School. A motion was made by Mr. Belcher to revoke the lease issued by the Board at an earlier meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Efron. There was no additional discussion. The motion was passed.

At this time Mrs. Meadors called the Board's attention to the next item on the Agenda, Committee Reports. She called Dr. Efron for his report. The Program Committee met and Dr. Efron was asked to give this report in the absence of the committee Chairman. Dr. Efron explained that the committee discussed two items: 1) Programs for the coming year. They would like to request that the Superintendent as part of his report provide them with the

number of students overall enrolled in addition to a breakdown of students in the academic and vocational programs. Mr. Drew responded that one item that he failed to mention in discussing the program plans for 1985-86 school year was that we have developed a data base now to collect information on students so reports can be made in a number of different ways. The second item discussed by the Program Committee, Dr. Efron explained, was the Policy Manual revisions. Dr. Efron stated that one of our goals for this year is to complete the Board Policy revisions. At that last Board meeting, Dr. Efron explained, the Superintendent was asked to work with them and Mr. Drew came up with a Board Policy Revision Management Plan, a copy of which the Board was provided. Dr. Efron felt the revision would not be difficult but would be time consuming. He further explained that the first section is on the Board itself. Section A has to do with how the agency is made up. This section requires only minor revisions. The committee will be meeting on this matter at a later time. He informed the Board that they will be involved in every step and they would have overview responsibility and have the opportunity for input on revisions. Dr. Efron stated that this matter did not require action from the Board.

Mrs. Meadors asked if there were any additional reports to be presented at this time. Mr. Belcher commented that should the need arise for their Budget Committee to meet he would bring in other Board members on the off month meeting in the next few weeks. Dr. Efron recommended that during dinner, next time, before the Board meeting, that we have three tables set up. One table would be used by each committee and the appropriate staff would sit at that table so they could meet with the committees at that time. Mr. Drew said this would be done.

Mrs. Meadors asked Mr. Dahlgren if he had a report to present to the Board on the Foundation. Mr. Dahlgren reviewed the Foundation By-Laws for the Board. He felt that the

Articles of Incorporation in the By-Laws had been prepared very well. They were very thorough and he personally felt good about this. He further explained that the duration of the corporation shall be perpetual, the corporation being the foundation. He felt that it would be best to provide the Board with a copy of these By-Laws before they gave their final approval. There were several important facts he felt the Board should review. First, the purpose of the foundation is to promote educational programs and research programs for the Opportunity School by making gifts and grants to the school and to individual departments, teachers, students, and student groups. The foundation, he explained, provides a vehicle with which to do this.

Another key point Mr. Dahlgren presented was the initial extra agents of the corporation, Mrs. Meadors, Mr. Drew and himself, as members of the Board appointed to set up the foundation. He pointed out that the foundation director cannot be involved in legislation or participate in political campaigns. The corporation cannot engage in anything that is contrary to Section 50C of the Internal Revenue Code which essentially qualifies the Foundation as a non-profit organization. None of the earnings can benefit directors or officers from the foundation. If the foundation dissolves, according to the Articles of Incorporation, any monies in the foundation shall be transferred to the Opportunity School and the Opportunity School Endowment. Under the foundation all gifts received or made to the foundation are tax deductible. He further explained that on the Board of Directors of the foundation there will be at least three ex-officio members, these being the Chairman of the Opportunity School Board of Trustees, the Superintendent of the Opportunity School and a member at large of the Board of Trustees of the Opportunity School. He explained that generally a foundation of this type will draw most of its Board members from the outside. The foundation will have officers - President, Vice-President and Secretary-Treasurer and any others that the Board of Directors would like to select. The President will have the general control of the foundation. Several

committees will be set up, including the Executive Committee, Finance Committee, the Nominating Committee, and a Public Information Committee. Each committee will have at least three members from the foundation. The annual meeting presently is designated in July. However, Mr. Dahlgren explained that he felt this was a difficult time of the year for meetings due to vacation time, etc., and he would suggest another meeting time, possibly in the Fall. There will be regular meetings quarterly. There can be called meetings with a majority of all the Directors of office constituting a quorum. The fiscal year for the foundation will begin July 1, the same as the agency. The Treasurer of the foundation would be bonded. There would be liability insurance for all Board members, which is required.

Mr. Dahlgren explained that he thought that our school endowment is restricted to gifts as scholarships. Mr. Drew explained that this is a Board policy. From the State's perspective, it is simply another account with only State laws governing its use. Mr. Dahlgren further explained that the money would come to the school from the foundation at the discretion of the foundation. Any gift or donation received by the foundation which is designated for a particular purpose shall be used by the foundation in such a manner as the Board deems best. Undesignated gifts may be merged by the foundation with other undesignated gifts - used as a single unrestricted gift. Mr. Dahlgren further explained that when mini-grants are made, the approval of the Board of Directors must be made. Mr. Dahlgren shared his own experience at Anderson College with the Board. He explained that he personally looks forward to helping build some deferred gift input. At this time Mr. Dahlgren said he had reviewed only the high points. He felt that the Board should have a chance to review the entire document. He did recommend that we go forward with this and have it registered by the Secretary of State and begin a development plan. Mr. Drew stated that we would forward this to the Board members and he asked the Board to keep in mind the particular changes and recommendations they may

have. We would then make revisions and initiate it. Mr. Drew also said that George Fulton gave us a lot of help with this at no charge. Mr. Fulton had worked with Georgetown School District in developing their foundation and had a lot of experience with this. Mr. Dahlgren recommended that we send Dr. Fulton a letter of appreciation for his assistance. Mr. Drew said he thought this would be appropriate. Dr. Efron made a motion that the Board send Dr. Fulton a letter of appreciation for his work. Mr. Dahlgren seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Mrs. Meadors asked Mrs. Thrailkill for her presentation of the Personnel Committee. Mrs. Thrailkill explained that she had met with Mr. Drew earlier today in reference to the Superintendent's Evaluation. Her committee was composed of Mrs. McBride and Mrs. Scott. Mrs. Thrailkill said she appreciated the interest and input from the Board members who responded to her mailouts.

Mrs. Thrailkill further explained that the Personnel Committee had their first meeting in June. She reminded the Board that both the Superintendent's Evaluation for 1984-85 and the planning document for 1985-86 are due August 15 (both the blue and beige forms). Roger Poston, from the Division of Human Resources Management, State Personnel, and Linda Elliott who is a Personnel Consultant met with the committee in June. Mrs. Thrailkill said the Personnel Committee had tried to involve the Board as much as possible. However, some documents in their folder were just finalized as a result of the discussions this week. Mrs. Thrailkill asked the Board to review them at this time. State Personnel did commend the Personnel Committee and said that they were far ahead of some other agencies in this evaluation process. At this time Mr. Drew recommended that before the Board entered discussions in reference to his actual performance that they call an executive session. Mrs. Thrailkill said they would do this but asked that Mr. Drew remain present for discussions on the

first half of the blue form. She explained the blue copy is a document that begins this evaluation procedure for the past year. The beige form is for the upcoming year. When we file both of them on August 15th the evaluation document is final. The planning document (beige form) can be amended at any time during the year. The evaluation form is final and it cannot be amended.

Mr. Drew explained that the blue form is actually an evaluation of last year's performance.

Mrs. Thraikill explained that the beige form (1985-86), which requires goal setting, will be the evaluation form for 1985-86. Mrs. Thraikill explained that the committee has taken the goals the Board adopted at Myrtle Beach and developed them into the format they are provided with in their folder. She brought to the Board's attention an error which needed to be corrected on the next to the last page. "Plant" operations should be used in lieu of "plan" operations. Mr. Drew added that the goals which the Board had developed could be used as long range goals and then each year the Board could develop from these the particular objectives that they would like for him to work on. Mrs. Thraikill indicated State Personnel commended us and said that our Board was ahead of the process. They stated that State Personnel has received very few documents done this well from other agencies.

Mrs. Thraikill next explained that the Board needed to review the service delivery goal area A as it applies to the first half of the blue form. Mrs. Thraikill explained that the first half of the blue form (Agency Head Performance Appraisal) is based on response to what the Board adopted in Myrtle Beach. In reference to the comments on the second part, provided in the Board members' folders, which was provided by the Personnel Committee which is a composite of performance characteristics, Mrs. Thraikill asked the Board to review these, and she requested that Mr. Drew be present to respond to any questions about pages one and two of the blue form. The Board would then review these without him being present. As it related to the beige form, Mrs. Thraikill asked the Board to review the long range goals that they would

like Mr. Drew to work on next year and then let the committee and Mr. Drew work up specific objectives to submit to the Board and to Personnel. The Board agreed to this procedure. At the next Board meeting these could be revised if needed. After additional discussion among the Board, Mr. Rhodes made a motion that they list the goals on page one of the blue form under agency head performance appraisal. Dr. Efron seconded the motion. The motion was passed. Dr. Efron read #2 "Describe how well the agency head used available fiscal resources in meeting the agency's programmatic objectives". Dr. Efron explained that he felt this was self explanatory. Dr. Efron made a motion that they include in #2 the results that have been given to the Board from the goal areas together with any other information Mr. Drew has given us. Mrs. Thrailkill seconded the motion. The motion was passed. Mr. Rhodes moved that the Board accept from the Committees those items which respond to Item 3 "Describe how well the agency head used available human resources in meeting the agency's programmatic objectives". Dr. Efron seconded the motion. The motion was approved. Mrs. Meadors commented that the second half of the Performance Appraisal was the actual performance rating. The Board moved, on a motion from Mrs. Thrailkill, into Executive Session for matters of Personnel.

The Board reconvened after the executive session. Dr. Efron moved that in public session the Board of Trustees ratify the Agency Head Performance Appraisal as scored in executive session. Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Dr. Efron then made a motion that the Board return to executive session for personnel purposes to review Mr. Drew's evaluation with him. The motion was seconded and approved. No further action was taken after the executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Spivey

Linda Spivey
Secretary